**Social Change in Social Entrepreneurship**

*In slightly different words, SE emerges as the rational and strate- gically better third sector (or nonprofit sector) response to a changed and challenged macrosituation: a situation comprised of the perceived breakdown of the welfare system (Cook, Dodds and Mitchell, 2001), increased financial pressure on social-purpose organizations, increased costs in many areas of the social sector, and a decrease in public and private grants and donations (Dees and Elias, 1998; Boschee and McClurg, 2003). According to these positions, the innovation, intrinsically tied to the term entrepre- neurship (Bruyat and Julien, 2000), is defined as the ability of third sector actors to reinvent themselves through a process of nonprofit expertizing.*

*On the opposite extreme, it is possible to single out the upholders of a widened SE theory: these authors (see Henton, Melville and Walesh, 1997; Dees, 1998a; Johnson, 2000; Thompson, Alvy and Lees, 2000; Grenier, 2002; Hockerts, 2004; Mair and Martí, 2004) believe that the phenomenon can be considered as a new and inde- pendent (Dorado and Haettich, 2004) and extremely intersectorial (Johnson, 2000; Mair and Martí, 2004) domain of research. They stress the social content of entrepreneurial initiatives, as founding the field. In this sense, they define the social entrepreneur as only that innovator able to actively contribute to social change with the creativeness and innovative-orientation typical of the classical entre- preneurial process. The juridical form of these organizations and their sectorial belonging fade into the background, subordinated to the social change purpose.*

Perrini, F., & Vurro, C. (2006). ‘Social entrepreneurship: Innovation and social change across theory and practice’. In Mair, J., Robinson, J., & Hockerts, K. (Eds.). (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 57-85

**Social Change as Change of Power Relations**

*Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship (SEE) has done little to solve the systemic social problems it purports to address, many of which have actually got- ten worse. In fact, SEE’s rise distracts from and undermines the critical role of an orga- nized citizenry, political action, and democratic government in achieving systemic social change, by o ering itself as a private, market-based alternative. SEE is founded on neoliberal ideology: a belief that markets, not government, produce the best social and economic outcomes. SEE advocates construct social problems as knowledge problems that can be solved by technical innova- tion driven by competition among individual social entrepreneurs, operating through for-profit, nonprofit, or hybrid enterprises.*

*In contrast, a political approach sees social problems as power problems. Dealing with them requires collective political action by organized constituencies that use the power of democratic government to overcome resistance to structural social change. Successful examples of this approach include the social movements that fought for abolition, public education, agrarian reform, labor rights, civil rights, women’s rights, and envi- ronmental protection, in the United States and elsewhere.*

Ganz, M., Kay, T., & Spicer, J. (2018). Social enterprise is not social change. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, *16*, 59-60.

**Social Change through Education**

*In our view, transformative social change involves the interweaving of structural critiques with the enactment of alternative forms of here-and-now activity that open up qualitatively distinct social relations, forms of learning and knowledge development, and contribute to the intellectual thriving and well-being of students, teachers, families, and communities*.

Megan Bang & Shirin Vossoughi (2016) Participatory Design Research and Educational Justice: Studying Learning and Relations Within Social Change Making, Cognition and Instruction, 34:3, 173-193, DOI: 10.1080/07370008.2016.1181879

**Social Change through Protest/Indignation**

*Ignasi Carreras notes that social change can only happen when there are high doses of indignation, together with an attractive proposal and a viable plan of implementation, abiding by the formula C = I + M + P, where C is ‘change’, I ‘indignation’, M a ‘model for change’ and P a ‘plan’ (2012). Carreras, Ignasi. 2012. Lectures on Leadership and Social Innovation. Madrid: ESADE.*

Gutiérrez, M. (2018). *Data activism and social change*. Londres: Palgrave Macmillan.

**Social Change as Relational to Multiple Circumstances**

*By social change I mean all processes that describe and explain how a given community, group, or society becomes different than their earlier iteration, demographically, geographically, culturally, politically, and economically.*

Simandan, D. (2020). Being surprised and surprising ourselves: a geography of personal and social change. *Progress in Human Geography*, *44*(1), 99-118.

**Social Change as Change of Everyday Practices**

*Theories of practice, while in principle applicable to any domain of activity, have offered partic- ular and well known affordances to the study of sustainable consumption (Cohen, Brown, & Vergrart, 2013; Kennedy, Cohen, & Krogman, 2015; Shove & Spurling, 2013, Warde, Welch, & Paddock, 2017). At the same time it has been widely acknowledged by its advocates that: “one key challenge for practice theory is whether it can develop conceptual schemes adequate to mapping and explaining large social phenomena” (Schatzki, 2014 p.10; cf. Coulter, 2001; Schatzki, 2016; Nicolini, 2016; Welch & Warde, 2015). Practice theoretical accounts of socio‐technical change (e.g. Shove, 2003; Shove, Pantzar, & Watson, 2012) have tended to neglect the role of purposive political projects, social struggles, strategic action and collective agency (Welch & Warde, 2015).*

*Conversely, work dealing directly with these phenomena, for example transition studies and social movement studies, tends to understand collective actors as fundamental and presupposes their particular form of ‘strategic activity’ to be the primary motor of social change. This bias towards the dominant model of the collective “agentic actor” (Meyer & Jepperson, 2000; cf. du Gay, 2007), naturalised in modern culture and much actor‐based social thought, systematically misattributes effects to formally organised collective actors and obscures other kinds of collective agency. It tends to ignore contingent, non‐purposive forms of change, such as the co‐evolution of technologies, cultural expectations and meanings, which practice theoretical approaches have been successful at identifying (e.g. Shove, 2003). And finally it ignores recursive relationships between collective action and everyday routines, such as those which reproduce patterns of consumption.*
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