

Not for reproduction or citation without permission of the author

**Growing Social Entrepreneurs in a Liberal Arts University:
The Intersection of Social Science Curriculum and
Community-Based Academic Service-learning**

Idee Winfield, Ph.D.
College of Charleston

A discussion paper prepared for the meeting on Liberal Education and Entrepreneurship at the College of Charleston, November 14 & 15, 2003. The meeting is supported by a grant from the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.

Growing Social Entrepreneurs in a Liberal Arts University: The Intersection of Social Science Curriculum and Community-Based Academic Service-learning

It is your responsibility to change society if you think of yourself as an educated person.

James Baldwin

Introduction

In the aftermath of September 11th, corporate accounting scandals, and escalating criticism of Western multinationals and governments by anti-globalization activists, college students are showing more social consciousness and interest in careers and that fit their values (Vogt 2002a, 2002b). At the same time there is an emerging model of social entrepreneurship that combines the enterprise and innovation often associated with the private sector with the grassroots accountability necessary to develop sustainable solutions in the public sector. The social entrepreneur combines nonprofit and for-profit ventures centered on social issues, philanthropic capital and entrepreneurial spirit to change the system ([Benetech](#) 2003; Drayton 2000; Dees 1998). Proponents of social entrepreneurship argue that the concept is well suited to the current economic and political climate, in which social service providers increasingly must compete for a smaller piece of a rapidly shrinking pool of funds, because “[i]t combines passion of social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation, and determination” (Dees 1998, p.1). [Muhammad Yunus](#), founder of the Grameen Bank argues that social entrepreneurs can create a social-consciousness-driven private sector. Going one step further, [Jerr Boschee](#), director of the National Center for Social Entrepreneurs and the more recent Institute for Social Entrepreneurs

argues that the traditional boundaries between the public, private, and nonprofit sectors are blurring, and a new sector is emerging-- the "social purpose business" sector.

Nonprofits are adopting entrepreneurial strategies and starting businesses; for-profits are invading territory previously occupied only by nonprofits and government; and public sector agencies are forming partnerships with the other sectors and developing entrepreneurial strategies of their own. **In every case, the distinguishing characteristics of the new sector are the direct or indirect impact on one or more social needs** and the emphasis on earned income rather than philanthropy or government subsidy (Boschee 2003, emphasis added).

How can liberal arts and sciences universities use this historical moment to grow social entrepreneurs? What are the necessary conditions for nascent social entrepreneurs to emerge -- what skills knowledge and experiences are needed to develop social concern and link it with entrepreneurial spirit? These are big questions for which we have only the beginnings of some answers. In this paper I use our current understanding of entrepreneurship to examine how the intersection of service-learning and social science curriculum in schools of arts and sciences provides a rich liberal learning environment for the growth of social entrepreneurs in pursuit of social value.

In the first section of the paper I examine current understanding of what entrepreneurship is and how nascent entrepreneurs differ from non-entrepreneurs, with specific attention to how this applies to social entrepreneurship. In the second part of the paper I examine how liberal learning in the social sciences develops skills, knowledge, and orientation conducive to growing nascent social entrepreneurs.

Following that, I turn to the role that community-based academic service-learning can play in linking social science skills and knowledge with social entrepreneurship. The

third section of the paper consider some models for ways liberal arts and sciences universities can and do promote the growth of nascent social entrepreneurs and discuss how the social sciences can play a central place in these activities and programs.

I. Social Entrepreneurs Are Grown, Not Born

There is no one definition of entrepreneurship. Some view it as the process of creating innovation (Schumpeter 1934), of responding to the opportunities made possible by change (Drucker 1995), or of exploiting ambiguity (Stark 2000), while others see it as actively bringing about change in “how we see and understand and handle things or people in some domain” (Flores and Dreyfus 1999 p.39; also see Changemakers.com and Ashoka.com). Dees, Economy and Emerson (2001 p. 4) argue that the common factors in the myriad of definitions are that “entrepreneurs are innovative, opportunity-oriented, resourceful, value-creating change agents” (but see Aldrich and Kenworthy 1999 for a dissenting view). This applies not only to business entrepreneurs but also to social entrepreneurs.

Although both business and social entrepreneurship emphasize innovation, opportunity and change, social entrepreneurship differs from business entrepreneurship in some important ways. According to Dees et al. (2001), the key difference is that social entrepreneurs set out with an explicit social mission in mind. Their main objective is to make the world a better place -- to create social value. As they put it,

Social entrepreneurs create social enterprises. They are the reformers and revolutionaries of our society today. They make fundamental changes in the way that things are done in the social sector. Their visions are bold. They seek out opportunities to improve society, and they take action. They attack the underlying causes of problems rather than simply treating symptoms. And, although they

may act locally, their actions have the very real potential to stimulate global improvements in their chosen arena, whether that is education, health care, job training and development, the environment, the arts, or any other social endeavor (p. 5). This vision affects how they measure their success and how they structure their enterprises (p. 4). The best measure of success for social entrepreneurs is not how much profit they make, but rather the extent to which they create social value (p. 5).

However, lest we fall into the trap of assuming that entrepreneurs, social or business, are “certain kinds of people,” qualitatively different in nature from non-entrepreneurs, we need to bear in mind that there is strong evidence that in today’s world entrepreneurs do not really differ much in personal motivations from those who don’t start businesses. Using data from the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics (PSED), a prospective study of nascent entrepreneurs, Cartera, Gartner, Shaver and Gatewood (2003) found that entrepreneurs are no more likely than non-entrepreneurs to report a desire for self-realization, financial success, innovation, or independence. In fact, the only difference they found is that entrepreneurs are even less frequently motivated by what other people think or by a desire to follow in the footsteps of role models than are non-entrepreneurs. As Cartera et al. (2003, p.33) point out, that the two groups are more like than different suggests:

Individuals can be taught knowledge, skills, and behaviors to improve their effectiveness in the tasks necessary for business creation. **Knowledge and skills may have more of an impact on an individual’s choice of starting a business than any assumed innate desire** (emphasis added).

Indeed, in a review of the literature on entrepreneurship, Aldrich and Martinez (2001) conclude that “knowledge is just as vital as capital for entrepreneurs” (p. 16).

Social entrepreneurship is a rapidly developing area in which many different strategies are used to create social value. Nevertheless, there do seem to be a few distinct types of social entrepreneurial endeavors that range from for-profit to nonprofit. For many nonprofit organizations, entrepreneurial behaviors and techniques are a necessity for survival and growth. A simple search of the Internet reveals a multitude of resources and programs for nonprofit organizations that take business frameworks and apply them within a community context to create social value.¹ Muhammad Yunus (2003, p1.) founder of the Grameen Bank puts it this way:

[A] social entrepreneur works within a scale ranging from zero to 100 percent cost recovery. If they distribute food to the hungry, they are operating at zero cost recovery. If they provide health services and charge a fee to cover part of the cost, they are operating at a positive cost recovery. Once they reach 100 percent cost recovery, they become a sustainable social entrepreneur. If a social entrepreneur remains sustainable, they can become a legitimate player because they can draw on the resources of the market. The more sustainable social entrepreneurs there are, the more powerful they become as a business community.

If people are not born entrepreneurs, but rather people learn to think and be entrepreneurial, what conditions promote pursuit of social entrepreneurship among college students? What skills and knowledge are needed, and how can liberal learning in the social sciences promote those skills and knowledge? In the remainder of this paper, I develop the argument for why liberal education in the social sciences that

¹ For example, see Dees, Economy, and Emerson's *Social Entrepreneur's Toolkit*, and the growing number of social entrepreneurship training programs, such as the one at the University of St. Thomas Center for Nonprofit Management).

includes community-based academic service-learning, can provide a rich environment to grow nascent social entrepreneurs.

II. Social Entrepreneurship Through Liberal Learning in the Social Sciences

The job of a social entrepreneur is to recognize when a part of society is stuck and to provide new ways to get it unstuck. He or she finds what is not working and solves the problem by changing the system, spreading the solution and persuading entire societies to take new leaps. [Ashoka](#)

Students remember
10% of what they read,
20% of what they hear,
30% of what they see,
50% of what they see and hear,
70% of what they say, and
90% of what they say and do.

Sandra Reif 1993, p. 53.

Before you can teach nascent social entrepreneurs skills and knowledge to be successful social entrepreneurs (the nuts and bolts of doing business and creating social capital) you first have to create an environment that grows nascent social entrepreneurs -- those who not only see a “problem” that needs fixing, but also have the skills, knowledge, and belief that they should and can do something about it. The social sciences, as part of liberal learning, can play an important role in growing nascent social entrepreneurs by providing a way of seeing the world that goes beyond individual experience, and by helping students to develop the skills needed to envision innovative solutions to social problems. For this potential to be realized, however, universities and faculty in the social sciences in Schools of Arts and Sciences and Schools of Business

will need to address some of the tensions between “theoretical” and “applied” knowledge, between “scientific investigation” and “advocacy”, and between the language of “business entrepreneurs” and the “language of social justice.”

In this section, I address the potential for growing social entrepreneurs by examining the intersection of social science curriculum and community-based service-learning. Specifically, I first examine how the social sciences develop skills, knowledge, and an orientation to social problems conducive for growing social entrepreneurs. Following that, I then discuss experiential learning through community-based academic service-learning with a focus on how it can provide the link between social science skills and knowledge and social entrepreneurship by bridging theoretical and applied knowledge as well as social science and advocacy. I conclude the section with a discussion of the need to translate the meaning of social entrepreneurship for faculty and students and the need for a more intentional approach to including opportunities for social entrepreneurship in the curriculum. With the addition of this, liberal arts colleges and universities stand poised to become a central force in promoting entrepreneurship in all its forms.

The Social Sciences.

A single agreed upon definition of what the social sciences are and what makes each of the social sciences distinctive is impossible. Indeed, it is the subject of endless debates in the philosophy of science, in the sociology of knowledge, and among social scientists. Nevertheless, collectively the social sciences offer something distinctive for growing social entrepreneurs -- a way of seeing the world that goes beyond individual experience and a way of explaining human behavior in the context of the social, political, economic, and cultural systems of a time and place. Students in the social

sciences learn to empirically examine and assess complex problems through the development of skills of critical observation. This is a necessary foundation for developing the ability to envision alternative responses and develop innovative solutions.

Stevens and VanNata (2002) contend that critical or analytical thinking and emotional engagement are enhanced by set of analytic skills they call critical observation. Critical observation is the ability to recognize the limits of the types of claims we can make about an observation and to identify links between individual actions and structural constraints. They further argue that critical observation is comprised of three core skills: (1) the ability to make a clear distinction between an event and the analysis of the event (i.e., the observed behaviors and the meanings we assign to them); (2) the ability to identify the assumptions, expectancies, and stereotypes we bring to our interpretations of behaviors and to recognize when we are relying on them rather than empirical evidence; and (3) the ability to identify the context in which observations are embedded -- the constraints that surround the behavior and give meaning to it.

Students who come into the social sciences often want clear cut simple solutions to complex questions and problems, but if they stay around long enough what they develop is the ability to think critically and complexly about their world. There is an analogy here between the role of the liberal education in the social sciences for growing social entrepreneurs and research on the birth of new business ventures, particularly that part of the literature that examines the environmental conditions that promote or inhibit the birth of new business ventures (Granovetter 2002; Ucbasaran, Westhead, and Wright 2001; Aldrich 1999; Burt 1992). Both put behavior in a context, where

choices and the consequences of those choices are shaped by the opportunities and constraints in the larger environment. The social sciences teach students to recognize the importance of that environment -- groups, families, networks, the social, cultural, political, legal and economic institutions -- and how to empirically “see” the environment. Students learn to think in terms of the contextual character of all human social, cultural, political and economic action.

Students also come to understand that inquiry in the social sciences is a ongoing process of creation, dissolution and reformulation of problems, concepts, and explanations through the use of critical observation. Thus, learning in the social science is not simply knowledge of the social world, but knowledge about how the way we think about the social world shapes that world. Unlike the physical or natural sciences, students in the social sciences learn that how we think about a problem can change the very nature of the problem. Consequently, they learn that reflecting imaginatively on the taken for granted in relation to a particular notion of social value can lead to recognizing problems and imagining new solutions. This is the foundation of the entrepreneurial spirit: to see the gaps or holes that other do not see, to envision alternatives that are rooted in explicit social value. If critical observation is the mechanism that links the theoretical to the real world of experience, how can it be developed in such a ways as to promote social entrepreneurship?

Service-learning

Experiential learning through community-based service-learning provides the link between social science skills and knowledge and social entrepreneurship -- provided that we employ a model of service-learning that links application of theoretical and

empirical knowledge in the service of social value.² Indeed, in his study of university-community partnerships, *Beyond the Campus* (2001, p.22), David Maurrasse quotes Ronald Mason, Jr., the President of Jackson State University as saying that service is an important part of the mission of a university “because it keeps the teaching and research honest. It keeps then connected to everyday problems.”

The idea of integrating service experiences into academic curricula and connecting schools with communities is not new. Community-based service-learning has been around since the late 1960s, when action research, participatory planning, and community development were used as alternative teaching and learning methods. At that time the teaching and learning goals focused on combining critical consciousness with reflection and empowered action (Stanton, Giles, and Cruz 1999). Advocacy was an explicit part of the activity. In the last two decades, however, the service-learning movement on college and university campuses has used the term service-learning rather broadly to cover many different activities that vary widely in the nature and extent of their relationship to academic content and empowered action (Rhoads 1997; Kendall 1990). In this paper I restrict my discussion to academic service-learning.

The emerging consensus is that academic service-learning is designed to blend academic learning and experiential learning by encouraging the careful integration of an academic perspective and real-life community-based experiences (Howard 1998; Hatcher and Bringle 1997). Community-based academic service-learning is much more than simply volunteer activity in the community or “doing good deeds.” Rather, learning

² In addition to academic learning, an intended outcome of service-learning is social change, i.e., increased student awareness of and participation in efforts directed at the root causes of community problems. Maybach (1996) describes the role of social change in service-learning.

and service are joined so that the work in the community makes the academic study relevant and the academic study directly informs the work in the community. Students face and work through the tension created by contrasting the abstract side of knowing with the concrete side of knowing (Kretzman and McKnight 1993). Studied reflection and critical thinking distinguish academic service-learning from volunteering or other activities that provide time for structured reflection but which are not directly tied to academic content. What I discuss here is more limited in scope than what is covered by the term civic engagement and more directly concerned with academic service-learning that develops critical observation in the service of advocacy (Mooney and Edwards 2001).

Academic service-learning has its roots in the work of the early educational philosophers who stressed the importance of integrating active learning experiences into the curriculum to provide a framework for learning (Dewey 1938; Tyler 1949). They, as with many educators since then, noted that much of what takes place in the traditional college classroom is at odds with how learning occurs in the community and workplace (Resnick 1987). The contemporary version of this argument is constructivist learning theory, which argues that teaching should guide rather than direct student activity by modeling behavior, and providing opportunities to work with complex examples (Resnick and Klopfer 1989). Constructivist theory builds on cognitive scientists' concern for knowledge that can be used in practice. Studies of how we integrate concrete experience with abstract thought find that knowledge acquired through repeated involvement in complex situations increases the likelihood that this knowledge will be used (Bransford and Vye, 1989). In other words, students learn more deeply when they have multiple concrete referents for abstract concepts. Furthermore,

they are more likely to develop the capacity for critical thought if they are challenged both by surprising experiences and by reflective teachers who help them explore these experiences and question their fundamental assumptions about their world (Lynch 1996; Mezirow 1991, 1994). Comparison of changes in capacity for problem analysis for students in highly reflective and less reflective service-learning experiences show that students in the highly reflective courses made more significant progress in complexity of analysis, showed a greater tendency to frame the problem and solution in systemic ways rather than focusing on individual deficiencies, and demonstrated increased coherence of a practical action strategy (Eyler & Giles 1999).

Of particular relevance for our discussion of growing social entrepreneurs are models of academic service-learning that address social problems and work to create social justice through a partnership between the university and the community (Maurrasse 2001; Emory University's [Theory Practice Learning](#)).³ Indeed the early "service-learning" of the 1960s was itself built on the legacy of progressive reformers such as Jane Addams and the settlement house movement, which thrived in the United States between 1885 and 1930 (Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley 2003; Morton and Saltmarsh 1997). Although often characterized simply as the earliest of social workers, these progressive reformers were really social entrepreneurs who researched,

³Unfortunately, volunteerism is pervasive in service-learning programs because it is the easiest to organize and carry out. Increasingly, much of the literature on service-learning questions not only how effective volunteering can be, but whether it is ethical. If service-learning courses require volunteer work without also requiring a critique of volunteerism, "community service [becomes] at best an exercise in observing otherness and at worst a missionary expedition" (Forbes et al. 1999, p.162). Similarly, David Sibley (1995 p. 29), warns that "limited engagement, a superficial encounter might result in the presumption of knowledge which could be more damaging than ignorance if this knowledge were in the province of state bureaucracies or academia." Avoiding superficial encounters begins with the recognition, already in place among service-learning advocates, that one assignment, one semester, is not enough; this is why it is important to make long-term commitments to communities and to create sustainable projects.

problem solved, crisis managed, advocated, politicized publicized, and financed community development. Although at that time the market was not central to their way of thinking about problem solving, they were nonetheless community development social entrepreneurs who used social science theory and methods to create innovative solutions to complex social problems.

For the purposes of growing social entrepreneurs, academic service-learning programs can learn much from the legacy of the settlement house movement by moving beyond students asking “how can we help these people” to the more difficult question “why are conditions this way?” In other words, advocacy informed by critical observation. The settlement house movement combined systematic empirical analysis through action research to understand “why” with a concern for promoting social justice (how). These early social scientists (Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley 1998, 2003) played a vital role in improving the lives of individuals and groups and in shaping government policies to produce a more just society, in that sense, the settlement house movement provides an excellent model for growing social entrepreneurs.

Academic service-learning, which provides sustained interaction with community-based organizations, links substantive knowledge gained in the social science classroom to practical experience in working for social justice and building social capital in a community. Students can see meaningful applications of the curriculum, while engaging in activities that improve a variety of skills including critical observation, analysis, and application. It is important to note that, because the academic service-learning is centered on community-related activity and social issues, it is not simply preparation for creating a new business or nonprofit venture. In the best instances, students engaged in community-based service-learning can improve basic

competencies while engaging in activities that also exercise their social conscience. Furthermore the involvement together with improved competence can reinforce both academic and personal confidence, which is a necessary goal for any program that seeks to grow nascent social entrepreneurs.

Getting Past Barrier of Language, Discourse, and Reward

In order for the potential of social science curriculum in conjunction with community-based academic service-learning to become a reality there will need to be faculty committed to doing the work of inculcating an active, problem solving orientation to study of social, political, economic, and cultural conditions within a framework of social entrepreneurship. I think this is quite doable in light of the social-justice orientation of many of the social science faculty in undergraduate liberal arts institutions, but getting there requires that we address some of the tensions between “theoretical and applied” knowledge, between “scientific investigation” and “advocacy”, and between the language of “business entrepreneurs” and the “language of social justice.”

By virtue of working in a university, most of social science faculty find themselves surrounded by a system of opportunities, expectations, and rewards (tenure, promotion, merit review) that privilege “theoretical” knowledge and “systematic scientific-empirical investigation” over “applied” knowledge and “advocacy.” This is probably more true for the social sciences located in arts and sciences (particularly political science, sociology, cultural anthropology, and social psychology, urban studies) than in business schools (economics). Maurasse (2001) argues that effective community-university partnerships (i.e., the ideal structure for combining social science and academic service-learning) require a commitment by university leadership to formalized structures that not only promote, but also provide rewards commensurate with those usually given for traditional

scholarship and teaching. For example, a joint university-community needs assessment that involves students in gathering, analyzing and interpreting data is not going to be published in a peer reviewed journal even though it may take a year of the faculty member's time to complete. Clearly no faculty in his or her right mind, regardless of a commitment to social justice, is going to put that much time and effort into a project that doesn't "count" in a system that privileges peer reviewed publications.

If institutional support were in place, I think that many of the social science faculty would be among the first to embrace a program to consciously growing nascent social entrepreneurs through liberal education in the social sciences. I say this because what draws many of the faculty to the social sciences is a concern with social, political and cultural, issues and ways that research can inform efforts to create social justice. The remaining sticking point, however, is perceptions and meaning attached to the language and discourse of "entrepreneurship" compared to the more familiar (for social scientists) language and discourse of "social justice."

In a paper on the battles between Nike founder Phil Knight and social activists, David Boje ([2001](#)) describes the battle as being over who gets to claim the role of the Roadrunner, running the straight moral line, and who gets cast as is the crafty but tragic Wile E. Coyote. The mental model is one of dichotomy in which only one can be the Roadrunner. If entrepreneur means a focus on the language of commodities and markets, while activism means a focus on the language of social justice and civic virtue, then there indeed would appear to competing claims to the role of Roadrunner. Yet, if we look at the skills and knowledge generally described as being necessary for success as a business entrepreneur and as an activist, they are not all that different. Both the successful business entrepreneur and the successful activist draw on their belief in what

they are doing to motivate their actions and speak their mind. Both learn that the path to the goal is a lot easier and more stable when you earn support and build alliances along the way. Thus, the successful business entrepreneur and the successful activist tend to develop skill in building a well-developed network comprised of relationships with contacts that share information and provide legitimacy. In short, while activists have a lot in common with business entrepreneurs, they are not usually identified as entrepreneurs. Nor do they claim the status. As Ogbor (2000 p. 618), in his review of the entrepreneurial literature, put it, "activists challenge the reified ideology in contemporary entrepreneurship discourses."

So where does this leave us? Social science faculty who perceive themselves as oriented to actively working for social justice will not immediately embrace a program for growing social entrepreneurs unless they first learn that social entrepreneur is not an oxymoron. There will need to be a conscious effort to change mental models by introducing social science faculty to the dynamic area of social entrepreneurship in ways that build on their expertise in the social sciences and their application of this expertise to issues of social justice, social involvement, and civic engagement. Similarly, faculty who traditionally teach business entrepreneurship will also need to change their mental models to include analysis of social, political, and cultural problems in addition to business and economic problems. What sort of programs can bridge this gap and integrate academic service-learning with the strengths of the curriculum in the social sciences, with the strengths of the entrepreneur curriculum in Schools of Business?

III. What Others Do that Can Be Used to Grow Social Entrepreneurs

Assuming that liberal arts and sciences universities decide to concretely bridge the barriers just described, what are some concrete ways to incorporate social science curriculum, community-based service-learning, and entrepreneurship curriculum into a larger program that nurtures the growth of social entrepreneurs? In this section of the paper I first discuss an ideal type model for a program in social entrepreneurship. I then review several existing programs at universities in the U.S. with attention to how they present opportunities for adding intentionality to growing social entrepreneurs in a liberal learning environment. By intentionality I mean an explicit mission to promote social entrepreneurship through the development of critical observation skills and community based service-learning that focus on analyzing problems and developing solutions. My focus is those programs and activities that can spark an interest in social entrepreneurship under the presumption that specific courses on creating and operating a new venture will be offered in conjunction with faculty in the school of business. Thus the “business” side of the skills and knowledge is separate from my focus on translating social science knowledge and perhaps a pre-existing social consciousness into an entrepreneurial spirit.

What Does a Liberal Education in Social Entrepreneurship Look Like?

I am starting from the assumption that when it comes to social entrepreneurship, undergraduate students do not walk in the door with an orientation to being an entrepreneur. To my mind, the ideal liberal education program for growing social entrepreneurs has four key curricular components that together can build an interest in entrepreneurship by engaging with or developing students’ social consciousness.

1. Social science courses that explicitly incorporate discussion of solutions to problems, particularly social entrepreneurship, into the existing approach of identifying social, political, economic, and cultural causes of problems. The shared focus on solutions indirectly unites the courses across various social science disciplines as well as the longstanding divide between theoretical and applied knowledge.
2. Courses in economics, marketing, management, and finance that explicitly incorporate examination of social value as part of strategic decision making processes and how this differs from traditional business models.
3. Interdisciplinary courses that examine opportunity recognition and creation as a complex process involving individual perception, market and social structural, and institutional factors. The interdisciplinary character of the courses serves the purpose of explicitly linking courses across the “business entrepreneurs” and “social justice.” divide as well as the theoretical versus applied distinction.
4. Community-based academic service-learning with a focus on creating community partnerships and entrepreneurial approaches to community problems. This could entail progressively greater involvement in one or more jointly defined “problems” across the undergraduate experience, with more and more work developing action plans blending strategic analysis with an appreciation of the distinctive values underlying the community partnership. For those who choose, a culminating yearlong capstone experience as a community-based social entrepreneur would satisfy the requirement for graduation with Honors in Social Entrepreneurship. All service-learning is

made academic by a companion course either that has both an academic component and exposure to real world social entrepreneurs (through campus visits or video conferencing).

What Are Others Doing?

How is social entrepreneurship part of liberal learning at other institutions across the U.S.? My review of a wide variety of universities indicates there are currently several different ways in which social entrepreneurship is being addressed: internships, courses, community engagement programs, residential living and learning programs, and interdisciplinary centers. Some of these activities and programs explicitly integrate social science curriculum and others do not.

Internships: Both Agnes Scott College and Notre Dame University offer an internship experience with a concurrent course on social entrepreneurship. The internship placement is usually in a nonprofit organization and the student works on a project that serves the social entrepreneur's goals. The associated course covers traditional entrepreneurship topics such as vision, organizational culture, grant writing, creating an independent income model for a nonprofit. In both cases, the interns are paid through a Kauffman Foundation grant. At both institutions the internships are run through programs in the School of Business and have no explicit connection to social sciences on the Arts and Sciences side of the university. This represents a business-dominated approach to social entrepreneurship. Its counterpart on the Arts and Sciences side of the university tends to be an unpaid placement in a nonprofit or public organization, emphasizes the social analysis of service provision, sometimes includes conducting an empirical study for the organization, but rarely frames the internship in

terms of social entrepreneurship. The internship program in my own department is an example of this approach.

Courses in Social Entrepreneurship: A search of the Internet for undergraduate courses on social entrepreneurship reveals two facts. First, there are many more graduate level courses than undergraduate-level courses. Second, the typical pattern is for social entrepreneurship courses in Business Schools to emphasize business concepts and skills for the social and nonprofit sector and developing a business plan, while social science courses in Schools or Colleges of Arts and Sciences tend to emphasize the historical origins and current causes of entrepreneurship in through a study of organizational theory. Much less frequently do we find course that blend the two approaches, but when they exist, they are more likely to be interdisciplinary. For example, Stanford University offers an interdisciplinary public policy and urban studies course entitled [Social Entrepreneurship: Mobilizing Private Resources for the Common Good](#). The course is described as:

The search for innovative responses to social needs, the role of private initiatives, for-profit and not-for-profit, and the challenges associated with these initiatives in the U.S. and internationally. Theoretical issues: defining the social good and assessing the role of market forces, philanthropy, and government. Practical issues: developing an organizational mission, recognizing specific opportunities for social improvement, forming an enterprise that responds to those opportunities, developing organizational and funding strategies, evaluating performance, managing the enterprise, and creating sustained positive impact and social value.

Here we see an example that clearly bridges the tension between theory and application and the language of social justice and business.

Service-learning: The same distinctions appear in the way programs organize service-learning activities. Students in the J. Whitney Bunting School of Business at Georgia College and State University volunteer their business skills acquired in academic classes to benefit community nonprofit organizations. The focus on individual and team projects provides students with opportunities to apply classroom skills in professional business settings while learning the significance of community service. In contrast students in a seminar at Kalamazoo College, Michigan, titled “A Neighborhood Organizing Practicum,” put themselves in the role of community organizers. Students spend nine hours a week going door to door in low-income neighborhoods to inform families that grant money has been made available to assist them with minor repairs to their homes under the condition that all families interested work together to identify needs and do the work. Students organize the overall program, working with 35 to 75 residents per project. Residents work with the students to plan time and events. While the students’ work provides small-scale repairs for residents’ homes, it also helps to build larger relationships among community residents who interact as a result of the project.

Tufts University provides an example of academic service-learning that is neither volunteer work, nor community development, but rather part of a well-integrated set of programs integrated into a campus wide interdisciplinary approach. The [Community Engagement Program](#) strives to find new ways to make the relationship between the institution and community more meaningful and sustainable by using institutional knowledge and resources to work with local communities to address community-defined issues and, in turn integrating this experience into the education process at Tufts. This

Fall the program included a conference for undergraduates “Balancing Society and Economy,” which included two different sessions on social entrepreneurship.

Pitzer College and Bates College are two other examples of liberal arts universities that seek to offer a more integrated, campus-wide interdisciplinary program that promotes social entrepreneurship. Bates College already has a Kauffman Foundation grant to expand entrepreneurial career programming for students and alumni and raise awareness of entrepreneurship in the liberal arts. As part of that initiative Bates and the Lewiston/Auburn communities are engaged in cooperative activities including the possibility of establishing “The Entrepreneurship Academy” and “The Entrepreneurial Community.” Pitzer College, a liberal arts institution recognized for its commitment to the integration of teaching, research and community involvement, has been working in partnership with community organizations to create an a cultural immersion model adapted from Pitzer’s successful study abroad programs. The cultural immersion program provides students with both the academic structure and experiential opportunity to develop and practice social entrepreneurship through the cultivation of local citizenship. A key component of this program is that students live and take their courses in the partner community.

Liberal arts universities that have a more integrated set of programs, such as Bates and Pitzer, often combine academic course-work and community-based service-learning with residential living and learning programs that create a community of learners who collectively enhance the depth of reflection and integration of the theoretical with the applied. Students in programs that integrate the living, learning, and community components are in a position to better see the link between advocacy and social entrepreneurship. As we consider how to build on the model of liberal learning

for social entrepreneurship, we can look to these programs for insights about how they promote innovative thinking.

In conclusion as we prepare to meet to discuss building a consortium for liberal education and entrepreneurship, I hope that we keep in mind that the qualities we want to develop in the liberally educated students -- independent thinking, the ability to critically observe, analyze and assess, and the power to communicate effectively verbally and in writing -- are the same qualities that will engage the entrepreneurial spirit and help grow future social entrepreneurs.

References

- Aldrich, Howard. 1999. *Organizations Evolving*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage
- Aldrich, Howard E. and Martha A. Martinez. 2001. "Many Are Called But Few Are Chosen: An Evolutionary Perspective for the Study of Entrepreneurship." *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 25(4):41-56.
- Aldrich, Howard E. and Amy Kenworthy. 1999. "The Accidental Entrepreneur: Campbellian Antinomies and Organizational Foundings." Pp.19-33 in *Variations in Organization Science: In Honor of Donald T. Campbell*, edited by Joel C. Baum and Bill McKelvey. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Benetech. 2003. "The Benetech Initiative and Social Entrepreneurship."
<http://www.benetech.org/about/index.shtml>
- Boje, David M. 2004. "Is Nike Roadrunner or Wile E. Coyote? A Postmodern Organization Analysis of Double Logic." Forthcoming in *Journal of Business & Entrepreneurship*. <http://cbae.nmsu.edu/mgt/jpub/boje/nikerrcoyote/index.html>
- Boschee, Jerr. 2003. "Introduction to Social Entrepreneurship, Mapping the Social Purpose Business Sector." Institute for Social Entrepreneurs.
http://www.socialent.org/intro_to_se.htm - mapping
- Burt, Ronald. 1992. *Structural Holes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bransford, John. D., and Nancy J. Vye. 1989. "A Perspective on Cognitive Research and Its Implications For Instruction." Pp. 173-205 in *Toward the Thinking Curriculum: Current Cognitive Research*, edited by Lauren. B. Resnick & Leopold. E. Klopfer. Washington DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Cartera, Nancy M., William B. Gartner, Kelly G. Shaver, and Elizabeth J. Gatewood. 2003. "The Career Reasons of Nascent Entrepreneurs." *Journal of Business Venturing* 18:13-39.
- Dees, J. Gregory. 1998. "The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship."
faculty.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/files/dees-SE.pdf
- Dees, J. Gregory, Peter Economy, and Jed Emerson. 2001. *Enterprising Nonprofits: A Toolkit for Social Entrepreneurs*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dewey, John. 1938. *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier Books.
- Drayton, William. 2000. What is a Social Entrepreneur? Ashoka
http://www.ashoka.org/fellows/social_entrepreneur.cfm

- Drucker, Peter F. 1995. *Innovation & Entrepreneurship*. New York. Harper Business.
- Eyler, Janet, and Dwight E. Giles, Jr. 1999. *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Flores, Fernando, and Hubert L. Dreyfus . 1999. *Disclosing New Worlds : Entrepreneurship, Democratic Action, and the Cultivation of Solidarity* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Forbes, Kathryn, Linda Garber, Loretta Kensinger, and Janet Trapp Slagter. 1999. "Punishing Pedagogy: The Failings of Forced Volunteerism." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 27, nos. 3-4: 158-68.
- Granovetter, Mark. 2002. A Theoretical Agenda for Economic Sociology. Pp 35-60 in *Economic Sociology at the Millenium*, edited by Mauro F. Guillén, Randall Collins, Paula England, and Marshall Meyer. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hatcher, Julie A., and Robert G. Bringle. 1997. Reflection: Bridging the gap between Service and Learning. *College Teaching* 45:153-58.
- Howard, Jeffrey P. F. 1998. "Academic service-learning: a counternormative pedagogy." Pp. 21-29 in *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, Academic service-learning: pedagogy of action and reflection* edited by Robert A. Rhoads and Jeffery P.F. Howard. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kendall, Jane C. 1990. "Combining Service and Learning: An Introduction." *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service, Volume 1* Raleigh, NC: National Society for Experiential Education.
- Kretzmann, John and John McKnight. 1993, *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.
- Lengermann, Patricia Madoo and Jill Niebrugge-Brantley. 1998. *The Women Founders: Sociology And Social Theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lengermann, Patricia Madoo and Jill Niebrugge-Brantley. 2003. "Back to the Future: Settlement Sociology, 1885-1930." *The American Sociologist* 33(3):5-20.
- Lynch, Cindy L. 1996. "Facilitating and Assessing Unstructured Problem Solving." *Journal of College Reading and Learning* 27:16-27.
- Maurrasse, David J. 2001. *Beyond the Campus: How Colleges and Universities Form Partnerships With Their Communities*. New York: Routledge.

- Maybach, Carol Wiechman. 1996. "Investigating Urban Community Needs: Service-learning From a Social Justice Perspective." *Education and Urban Society* 28:224-36.
- Mezirow, Jack. 1990. *Fostering Critical Reflection In Adulthood: A Guide To Transformative And Emancipatory Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, Jack. 1991. *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, Jack. 1994. Understanding transformation theory. *Adult Education Quarterly* 44(4):222-235.
- Mooney, Linda and Bob Edwards. 2001. "Experiential Learning in Sociology: Service-learning and Other Community-Based Learning Initiatives." *Teaching Sociology* 29:181-94.
- Morton, Keith, and John Saltmarsh. 1997. "Addams, Day, and Dewey: The Emergence of Community Service in American Culture." *Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning* 4:137-49.
- Ogbor, John O. 2000. "Mythicizing and Reification in Entrepreneurial Discourse: Ideology-Critique of Entrepreneurial Studies." *Journal of Management Studies* 37(5):605-35.
- Resnick, Lauren B. 1987. *Education and Learning to Think*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Resnick, Lauren B. and Klopfer, Leopold E. (Eds.). 1989. *Toward the Thinking Curriculum: Current Cognitive Research*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rhoads, Robert A. 1997. *Community Service and Higher Learning: Explorations of the Caring Self*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rief, Sandra F. 1993. *How to Reach and Teach ADD/ADHD Children: Practical Techniques, Strategies, and Interventions for Helping Children with Attention Problems and Hyperactivity*. The Center for Applied Research in Education.
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1934. *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sibley, David. 1995. *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West*. New York: Routledge.

- Stanton, Timothy K., Dwight E. Giles Jr., and Nadinne I. Cruz. 1999. *Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice, and Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stark, David. 2000. "For a Sociology of Worth." Keynote address for the meeting of the European Association of Evolutionary Political Economy, Berlin, November 2-4, 2000. <http://web.mit.edu/sloan/osg-seminar/stark.doc>
- Stevens, David and Michelle VanNata. 2002. "Teaching Critical Observation as a Sociological Tool." *Teaching Sociology* 30:243-53.
- Tyler, Ralph W. 1949. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ucbasaran, Deniz, Paul Westhead, and Mike Wright. 2001. "The Focus of Entrepreneurial Research: Contextual and Process Issues." *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* 25(4):57-80.
- Vogt, Peter. 2002a. "Redefining Career Values." Monster.com featured reports September 11, 2002. <http://featuredreports.monster.com/911/reevaluation/>
- Vogt, Peter 2002b. "Ground Zero's Heroes Rekindle Interest in Service Careers." Monster.com featured reports, September 11, 2002. <http://featuredreports.digitalcity.monster.com/911/heroes/>
- Yunus, Muhammad. 2003. Opening comments at the online *Social Edge* event, "What Does It Take to Be a Social Entrepreneur?" Archived at <http://skoll.socialedge.org/?14@141.Z2L1aCqmalZ.0@.1adaeb99>