

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

Chapter 1 : Economics of Sustainability – Sustainability in Poland – Contents

84 *The Role of Personal Values in Social Entrepreneurship.* entrepreneurship are concerned with the explanation and definition of the concept.

A means for reducing such inequality mentioned by Picketty is a democratization of wealth ownership that extends more widely the opportunity to become full fledged capitalists. Instead of pursuing this line of reasoning, Picketty instead focuses on a global wealth tax as a more realistic strategy for mitigating economic inequality, but in doing so he just might be selling short capital democratization. Perhaps he avoids this approach on grounds that it is too radical to be of practical importance, but a tried and true method compatible with modern economic arrangements is available—expanding the participation of employees in the ownership and governance of businesses for which they work. If employees become substantial owners of capital, then wealth automatically de-concentrates, bringing down economic inequality. Employee ownership and control not only matters for the inequality of income received from business profits, but also for the relative distribution within an enterprise of income from wages and salaries. An employee owned and controlled enterprise turns the hiring decision on its head. Instead of management hiring labor, labor now hires management and can directly control income inequality by establishing maximum ratios between the earnings of the highest and lowest paid positions within the business. The modern phenomenon of manager-controlled boards setting top management compensation at extraordinary levels now disappears. Democratically elected, employee controlled boards can set internal maximum income ratios between the highest and lowest pay scale at the minimum necessary to attract managers with the appropriate skills to run the show. In short, managers under employee ownership lose the power to set their own rates of compensation. Evaluations of managerial marginal product, the actual addition they make to the bottom line, would rule the day in setting compensation, not managerial political power. Workers would also be able to influence organization decisions on the normal workweek, overtime, vacations, and the organization of work itself, constrained, of course, by the requirements of competition in the larger economy. These features post-materialists will find appealing on the job, since they place freedom of expression and having a say at work ahead of economic growth as essential social goals. Millennials also express a greater willingness than others to sacrifice income for meaningful work that has an positive social impact. They want the work they do to matter. Conventional businesses run on top-down authority as opposed to a bottom-up democratic form of decision making, and their fundamental drive is to maximize profits and and shareholder value as opposed to achieving broader social goals such as economic equity or democratic participation. Post-materialist values as a consequence get short shrift. A reasonable solution to both the social desire for democratic participation and economic equity is a relative expansion of employee ownership in the economy as a whole. To be certain of this we need to look in more detail at the feasibility of employee ownership as a form of business organization and how its expansion can occur. Founded in by 25 workers educated together at a local technical school, the first Mondragon cooperative has grown into a federated system, known as the Mondragon Cooperatives Corporation, composed of companies employing some 80, throughout Spain in manufacturing, retail, finance, and education. The Caja, a jointly owned second degree cooperative, greases the financial skids of growth for the system as a whole and fosters the creation of new enterprises through its Empresarial division by seeking out and assisting those desiring to start new cooperatives. A close second in importance for the success of the larger system are a number of educational cooperatives, including the Mondragon University, that pair academic instruction with extensive technical training. At the economic foundation of the cooperative system is its industrial sector producing an array of home appliances, furniture, sporting goods, motor vehicle components, and capital goods. Mondragon differs fundamentally from a conventional corporation in its ownership and governance structure. Employees, not stockholders, own each cooperative and through membership in a general assembly elect its management committee. The committee in turn hires managers and

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

oversees their performance. On becoming a member, each employee purchases a share in the cooperative, usually financing it with a loan paid back through a payroll deduction. These retained funds provide a key source of finance for new capital plant purchases and other investments by the cooperative system as a whole. In short, labor hires and controls capital, turning conventional capitalism on its head, making a big difference in both the work experience and distribution of income and wealth. Economic inequality within each Mondragon cooperative is directly controlled by a ceiling on the ratio of the highest to lowest base pay over all employment positions. In the early days, the ceiling was set no greater than 3 to 1, meaning that pay for the top manager in a cooperative could be no more than three times that for the lowest paid position. In recent years, to attract good managers, the official ratio has risen to 9 to 1 for some cooperatives. Capitalist corporations rarely make any attempt to explicitly control internal economic inequality; in cooperatives operating on Mondragon principles, internal inequality is under democratic control, and an increase in inequality occurs only if it benefits the organization as a whole. A bonus for post-materialists in a cooperative economy would be satisfaction of their desire for more say on the job. If in comparison to capitalist enterprises cooperatives possessed a lower rate of productive efficiency or a lesser capacity to withstand competitive pressures, their participatory virtues would be trumped by threats to their ultimate survival in the global marketplace. The five-decades of survival and growth of Mondragon offers strong evidence for the capacity of a cooperative system to experience long-term economic health and prosperity. Comparative studies find that Mondragon cooperatives exhibit greater productive efficiency than their capitalist counterparts and greater rates of growth in output and employment. Their array of supporting institutions for education, research, entrepreneurial support, and finance appear to give Mondragon cooperatives a special advantage compared to their capitalist competition in both productivity and innovation. Given its competitive advantages over the conventional businesses, the lack of a more expansive global cooperative economic sector looks puzzling at first glance. The essential barrier to the creation of a cooperative economy turns out to be the rare conditions required for its initial formation. Once a cooperative system is established it can be self-perpetuating as the Mondragon experience suggests. Individual new cooperatives can be established within a larger system by way of internal schemes of support for entrepreneurs with ideas and plans for new ventures. The problem comes in establishing the cooperative system itself. Using his knowledge of economics, cooperative history, and Catholic social teaching, Don Jose sought to bring back prosperity to the local Basque economy, gravely damaged in the Spanish Civil War, by establishing a technical school for training the young in industrial skills and the principles of cooperation. Graduates soon founded the first cooperative for the production of cook stoves, and Don Jose spearheaded the formation of a credit cooperative to help fund local development. Today we would call Father Arizmendi and his students "social entrepreneurs," individuals who establish business organizations for both the achievement of a social purpose and the earning of an income. The social purpose of Mondragon is to advance economic prosperity for everyone in the Basque region of Spain as well as to promote the principles of social and economic cooperation. In the context of a profit driven global capitalist system, social entrepreneurship looks like a fairly rare phenomenon, but we will see later that such may not be the case looking into the future. Sticking with "idealistic social values" for a huge organization such as Mondragon in an intensively competitive global economy can be a serious challenge. By hiring outsiders, each member will gain a larger piece of the profit pie in a shrinking pool of full cooperative participants. To prevent such degeneration within Mondragon, in the 1980s all industrial cooperatives located within Spain established a target of at least 85 percent member employment, and currently 89 percent of industrial cooperative employees are also full fledged members. Outside the Spanish industrial cooperatives, Mondragon still faces hurdles in achieving its membership goals and preventing its transformation to a conventional form of businesses organization. The largest numbers of nonmember Mondragon employees are found in the Eroski retail group and in Mondragon-owned Chinese subsidiaries. Expanding the cooperative form of ownership to 30, new employees would have been too cumbersome to accomplish quickly, and the more flexible conventional labor contract was adopted instead to facilitate rapid growth. In the meantime, a voluntary partial

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

ownership program has been established and extended to some 5, additional employees on top of the 9, that are already full employee-owners, and a plan is now in place to bring all 50, Eroski employees under the full cooperative ownership umbrella. Mondragon, like conventional businesses around the world, had little choice but to meet the challenges economic globalization, and it did so by creating overseas subsidiaries to gain access to foreign markets and to meet the challenge of competitors moving plants to countries with low labor costs. Mondragon currently employes about 12, non-owning workers in its Chinese subsidiaries serving both domestic and export markets. The ultimate goal of overseas expansion is less to expand cooperative ownership abroad than it is to sustain employment in cooperatives at home in complementary activities. Whether Mondragon can extend its cooperative model overseas remains an open question. The Chinese, despite their collective economic experiences of the past, lack familiarity with the ideas of employee ownership, profit sharing, and democratic participation in management. Nonetheless, Mondragon plans to begin introducing such ideas to its Chinese employees and experimenting with partial ownership plans. Whether these efforts can succeed remains an open question. Creating a cooperative economy subscribing to those principles followed by Mondragon remains a substantial challenge, but doing so would better serve post-materialist values than the capitalist alternative, as we have already argued. The essential dynamic for creating a capitalist enterprise is the ability for a founding entrepreneur to lay claim to present and future profits generated by the business. In creating a cooperative enterprise, the founders will own an equal share of the business along with all other employee-members, and perhaps win access to somewhat higher paid managerial positions, but even that is not assured given the democratic process underlying the selection of managers. Social motives will need to stand beside economic drives for the establishment of cooperatives. Once a cooperative system on the order of Mondragon comes into being, the risk of founding new enterprises can be substantially reduced through a support system offering venture finance, technical assistance, and trained employees, but strong social motive will still be required for the founding of the system itself. Creating employee-owned enterprises in the first place is the essential challenge, but it just may be overcome by the emergence of post-materialist values driving a global expansion in social entrepreneurship as we will now argue. Only those economic innovations that bring significant profits will be of interest to materialistic capitalists. In a post-materialist world, the motivation for innovation broadens. Profitability continues to be important, but innovation takes on a social dimension as well. Post-materialist innovators possess a broader array of social goals in the work that they do than profit alone. They went into business because they wanted to create the best possible internet search engine. Of course they made an incredible amount of money along the way making the attainment of their social ends a whole lot easier and more pleasant. Both the founders of Google and Facebook have publicly expressed social goals for their organizations alongside achieving a threshold of profitability. Survey researchers work to identify concretely the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship with a question that takes the following form: Across an adult population survey sample of from 49 countries at different stages of economic development, the incidence of early stage social entrepreneurialism an organization that is 3. The rate for the U. The global average is 1. The incidence of total early state entrepreneurialism by country, including both social and pure commercial, averages Given what we know about post-materialist and materialist human motivations, we would expect post-materialists to be attracted with greater frequency than materialists to socially oriented entrepreneurship. Cross-country survey research on commercial entrepreneurialism finds that it correlates negatively with post-materialism, inferring that a reduced desire for economic achievement dampens profit-oriented business formation. Where post-materialism is relatively strong, so is social entrepreneurship. Everywhere in Cairo, Egypt someone is trying to sell something. Nonetheless, social enterprises exist in Egypt and other low income countries. Remember, the incidence of early stage social entrepreneurs in poor countries average a non-trivial 1. Social entrepreneurship indeed occurs in low income countries, and its incidence rises as development takes place along with growth in post-materialism. One would think that Egypt, with its history of political oppression and military and oligarchical domination of key business sectors, would be the last place for substantial social

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

entrepreneurialism. Along the way we can also discover a compatibility between a liberal post-materialism and a traditional Islamic philosophical orientation. Modern liberal Islamic scholars argue that one can accept such post-materialist values as environmentalism and still be a Muslim. The theological justification for this view we leave to others and focus instead on its real world manifestation. If social entrepreneurship can flourish alongside Islam and under the political radar in Egypt, then there must be something to it. He attended university in Austria where he obtained a medical degree as well as training in research chemistry. After completing his studies, he carved out a successful career in pharmacological research in Austria, married an Austrian, and started a family. Abouleish has enjoyed and admired European culture throughout his life but remains a committed Muslim to this day, and, unlike many other Egyptians, expressed opposition to war with Israel in the s. Although he returned to Egypt frequently to visit his family, Dr. Abouleish did not travel extensively in the country until when he took an eye-opening trip with an Austrian friend. He was shocked by the catastrophic degradation of agriculture in the Nile Valley and the physical decline of Cairo and its living conditions. Construction of the Aswan High Dam in his eyes was an unmitigated disaster by halting the age-old annual flooding of the Nile that covered fields with life-giving fertile mud.

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

Chapter 2 : Post-Material Economics

Sustainability in Poland - Contents The internet and social actions Social entrepreneurship, postmaterial values and creativity.

Its not about ethics. Plus, this kind of thinking strikes me as a bit wrong-headed. Lets not try to be ethical, because bad people wrap what they say is good in the language of the ethical. You double down on being Mother Teresa. Jesus lived a life of love, kindness, compassion, honesty, service, self-sacrifice, and forgiveness. The historical role of these values in fostering positive relationships is hard to ignore. They would dissolve as the emotionally rooted problems they are. That same detachment from reality and empathy is what results in draconian final solutions. Contrarily, when we apply the Golden Rule to such situations, we have a tool that has an ethical coreâ€”one in which the humanity of the other person is taken seriously. The Golden Rule is the bridge from where we are to a better world relationally and civilizationally. When we neither punish nor reproach evildoers, we are not simply protecting their trivial old age, we are thereby ripping the foundations of justice from beneath new generations. Beyond that I think looking at the heart of the message provides illuminance in the face of darkness. The cross reveals a God who is so committed to justice that the cross was necessary. Sin and evil cannot be overlookedâ€”they must be judged. Yet at the same time it shows us a God who longing that he was willing to bear the cost and take the judgement himself. He refuses to chose between truth and loveâ€”he will have both, and the only way for that to happen is if he pays the price for forgiveness himself. Through faith in the cross we get a new foundation for an identity that both humbles us out of our egotism yet it so infallibly secure in love that we are enabled to embrace rather than exclude those who are different. You have to pick one. Best of luck in your search for answers, my friend. Its worth noting that elsewhere that AS highlighted this theme of humility: Do not pursue what is illusionary -property and position: Rub your eyes and purify your heart -and prize above all else in the world those who love you and who wish you well. Do not hurt them or scold them, and never part from any of them in anger; after all, you simply do not know: It was only when I lay there on rotting prison straw that I sensed within myself the first stirrings of good. Gradually it was disclosed to me that the line separating good and evil passes not through states, nor between classes, nor between political parties either, but right through every human heart, and through all human hearts. Inside us, it oscillates with the years. Even within hearts overwhelmed by evil, one small bridgehead of good is retained; and even in the best of all hearts, there remains a small corner of evil. If only there were evil people somewhere insidiously committing evil deeds, and it were necessary only to separate them from the rest of us and destroy them. But the line dividing good and evil cuts through the heart of every human being. And who is willing to destroy a piece of his own heart? I think the other quotes I point to including the one above point out the larger purpose, message, and context that Alexander Solzhenitzyn is speaking into and about. Its only when you de-contextualize the original quote that the message is ultimately lost or rather distorted.

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

Chapter 3 : Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both?

Finally, social involvement in solving environmental and social problems is also necessary and to make it possible, social consultations should more often be used to ensure that citizens take part in the decision making process.

This article has been cited by other articles in PMC. Abstract A detailed case study from the field of social entrepreneurship is used to illustrate the network approach, which does not require more resources but rather makes better use of existing resources. Leaders in public health can use networks to overcome some of the barriers that inhibit the widespread adoption of a population health approach to community health. Public health leaders who embrace social entrepreneurship may be better able to accomplish their missions by building their networks rather than just their organizations. The term is generally conceptualized as innovative activity within or across the nonprofit, government, or business sectors to generate social impact e.g., improvements in public health, environmental conservation, economic development 1. Social entrepreneurship builds on the definition of entrepreneurship as "the pursuit of opportunity beyond the resources that you currently control" 2. Conceptualizations of social entrepreneurship 3 are based on the drive to create social impact rather than personal or shareholder wealth. Social entrepreneurship is often characterized by some of the virtues of commercial entrepreneurship, such as efficiency, dynamism, innovativeness, high performance, and economic sustainability. Examples of such social entrepreneurship include nonprofits operating revenue-generating enterprises 4 - 6 or pursuing organizational growth 7 to increase the quantity or quality of programs or services. Undoubtedly, many social-sector organizations, following in the footsteps of their commercial counterparts, have achieved substantial impact by attracting more resources, developing their organizational infrastructure, and increasing the scale of their operations. Yet, the process of organizational growth also poses tremendous challenges, particularly in the social sector those organizations whose primary goal is serving the public interest where human and financial capital is often scarce. Even organizations that overcome obstacles to growth and achieve appreciable scale seldom achieve substantial social impact on their own. Some researchers and practitioners have argued that the opportunities and challenges in the social sector require not only the creative use of commercial approaches but also the development of new conceptual frameworks and strategies tailored specifically to generating social impact. A prime example of this conceptualization of social entrepreneurship is a network approach. In a network approach, leaders not only focus on management challenges and opportunities at an organizational or institutional level but also try to mobilize resources more broadly within and outside traditional boundaries to generate maximum social impact. Although social impact can be generated through traditional means by bringing resources into an organization and delivering programs or services directly, organizations can often achieve greater social impact by leveraging the resources and expertise of complementary, or even competing, organizations. By forming networks, leaders can mobilize resources and activities across unit, organizational, and sector boundaries to achieve maximum social impact. I conclude by describing how networks can be used by leaders in public health to overcome some of the barriers to adoption of a population health approach to community health. A Network Case Study Organizations that have consistently achieved and sustained substantial social impact despite limited resources have done so by working through networks 8 - In , the chief executive officer, Geraldine Peacock, realized that the public sector that was supposed to deliver services to visually impaired people was not working efficiently or effectively. GDBA was providing guide dogs to just 5, clients, despite its year history and considerable organizational scale: At the same time, the organization was losing millions of pounds per year because it had expanded its programs into noncore areas such as operating hotels for the visually impaired. Second, to improve services overall, GDBA partnered with local governments, which had responsibility for providing services such as mobility training, independent living skills, and communication skills. In the latter case, GDBA also offered to provide technical assistance to support its former "competitors" in providing services to visually impaired people. According to Peacock, it was less

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

important who provided the services than whether they were being provided at a high quality. Peacock deliberately pursued a strategy that supported building capacity in the field and facilitating collaborations among providers that had historically been competitive with each other. Finally, Peacock sought to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the charities serving the visually impaired by creating an umbrella organization that would offer a unified voice and a shared advocacy agenda. The individual organizations maintained their own brands and operations, but the umbrella facilitated more frequent communication and ongoing collaborations among organizations in the field. Within 5 years of creating these partnerships, GDBA more than doubled the number of clients who received mobility training without increasing its own operations. At GDBA and other organizations using this approach, common factors for effective networks emerge. These networks depend on a willingness among all participants to shift their focus from maximizing organizational- and institutional-level benefits to maximizing social impact. Thus, network participants must be willing to 1 invest substantial resources financial being just one , 2 share or relinquish control, and 3 share rewards and recognition with their partners. The network approach also benefits organizations that use it. The network approach enabled GDBA, for example, to change its own culture and reputation from that of an independent, and at times domineering, organization to one that government and other nonprofits consider a trusted partner.

The Need for Social Entrepreneurship in Population Health Although the term social entrepreneurship has emerged recently in the field of public health, the concept itself is nothing new in public health practice. Partnerships are becoming more common between the medical and public health communities to coordinate vaccination, case reporting, and education on such issues as childhood diseases and sexually transmitted diseases, among others. In addition, a joint medical and public health professional association was created. The notion that involvement of communities is necessary for developing effective and sustainable public health interventions has become widely accepted 15 , Research has documented the effectiveness of approaches that draw on local, national, and global knowledge-sharing and support across issues such as reducing cesarean rates, hospital delays and wait times, and hospital admissions for asthma 17 , Research on patient safety has documented the importance of system-level approaches to improving population health. The emergence of the field of population health, which emphasizes a holistic and system-level understanding of "health outcomes, patterns of health determinants, and policies and interventions that link these two" 20 , tempers the rising dominance of the perception that health care is the primary determinant of health outcomes. Many other nonmedical determinants, such as the social and physical environment, individual behavior, and genetics, are factors in population health. Just as pay-for-performance might improve the quality of medical care, similar pay-for-population health performance systems should be developed. Financial and nonfinancial incentives are a positive and necessary step to motivate system-level thinking and action toward population health goals. However, achieving the objectives of any pay-for-population health system also requires a fundamental change in the culture and mindset of the leaders and actors in the health fields, both medical and nonmedical. As illustrated in the GDBA example, leaders must let go of traditional notions of their organizations and agencies as hubs and potential partners as mere spokes. Instead, leaders must view their organizations and their work as nodes among many others in a larger constellation of actors that must coordinate their efforts to achieve a shared vision. To lead their organizations to greater efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability, they need to creatively mobilize resources beyond their control in the name of improved population health outcomes. The work of any single agency or organization, while important, can contribute in substantial ways to population health improvements only to the extent that it is linked and supported by other system-level efforts. The sector of population health shares many of the characteristics of other social sectors, which makes it amenable to social entrepreneurship and, specifically, to network approaches: Organizations seek to address large, complex issues that cannot be addressed by any single entity. Organizations seek to create social impact, not just organizational impact. Organizations often have dispersed governance and accountability. Organizations create value that is not readily measured. Organizations rely heavily on tacit knowledge and expertise as well as trust and relationships to achieve social impact. Although

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

large-scale health challenges require solutions that no single agency or institution can tackle, virtually all incentive systems in public health preclude such system-level solutions. Funders, governing boards, donors, and organizational and institutional leaders often seek organizational growth and revenue increases rather than impact as primary goals. Many donors encourage collaboration among grantees, but they often assume that because they bring the financial resources they can also dictate solutions when in fact the keys to solving the problem are dispersed across individuals and entities throughout the community. Furthermore, donors often restrict funding to specific programs rather than granting discretion to the grantees. Dictating programs and how they should be delivered severely limits the creativity and flexibility that local experts and leaders need to build network solutions. Yet, recent research in the field of social entrepreneurship suggests that a network mindset may offer a promising tool to overcome the barriers to achieving population health. Applying Networks to Overcome Barriers to Pay-for-Population Health Networked organizations are different from traditional organizations in that they look outward rather than inward. They put their vision and mission first and their organizations second. They govern through trust rather than top-down controls. They cooperate as equal nodes in a broad network of actors rather than strive to become a central hub that dictates the agenda. A shift from the organizational to the networked mindset offers solutions to some of the barriers to pay-for-population health systems identified by public health experts. No consensus on how to measure population health. The network approach suggests that it may not be necessary for the field of population health to come to consensus on a single metric at the outset. The goal is to get leaders in the field to focus on population health outcomes, allowing flexibility around what the outcomes might be and the means for achieving them. As self-organizing clusters of networks around shared metrics begin to emerge, the actors themselves may begin to gravitate toward the metrics that have the greatest merit. Financial incentives and unintended consequences. Financial incentives should reward organizations that show an enduring commitment to population health goals through their actions. Trust is fundamental to enabling networks to thrive. If participants fear that they will be exploited by their network partners, the focus reverts to self-interest. Effective network builders seek out peers with similar values to build systemic solutions; ineffective network participants will remain isolated at the margins. Funders can reward the former and limit funding for the latter. A network approach introduces a shift in thinking about coordination not only by breaking down silos through vertical integration but also by investing heavily to foster the development of lateral relationships among various organizations and sectors. Donors might host meetings, provide venues for health care and public health leaders and providers to discuss specific population health issues, and offer resources to support innovative forms of collaboration. This approach is particularly promising because it does not require cumbersome large-scale acquisitions or mergers. Coordination can start small in multiple arenas and expand as the partners build trust and see the fruits of their partnership. As organizations experience the mutual benefits of collaboration, they may also identify more substantive areas of work. For example, they may mobilize around a holistic approach to disease treatment and management, such as for diabetes, through which patients could benefit substantially from coordinated interventions, such as nutrition, exercise, and medical care. Not all partnerships are destined to flourish, and not all partners are trustworthy, but facilitating peer-to-peer relationship-building and cooperation may catalyze relationships that ultimately contribute to better population health. Resistance to reallocation of resources. Leaders must realize that maximizing their own organizational resources is not a true measure of success; instead, health outcomes should be the measure. More efficiency can be achieved through collaboration, thereby reducing costs and attracting more funding from donors that go out of their way to fund effective network builders rather than organization builders. Any pay-for-population health system must seek to reward leaders and organizations that build networks to deliver system-level solutions rather than investing in their own sustainability. Few leaders seek to drive their organizations out of business, yet in the social sector, that is precisely what the goal should be. Career paths that span the field and sector must be developed to replace career paths tied to specific organizations. Although no silver bullet can magically answer the population health challenge, a social entrepreneurial

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

approach using networks expands the horizon for innovative solutions. The network approach is particularly powerful because it does not require more resources but instead makes better use of existing resources. Use of trade names is for identification only and does not imply endorsement by any of the groups named above. URLs for nonfederal organizations are provided solely as a service to our users. URLs do not constitute an endorsement of any organization by CDC or the federal government, and none should be inferred. Suggested citation for this article: Networks as a type of social entrepreneurship to advance population health. *Prev Chronic Dis* ;7 6 http://www.cdc.gov/nczod/oddsr/pdfs/vol7/vol7_06.pdf, Berkeley, CA , Email: Entrepreneurship in the social secto.

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

Chapter 4 : Peer Reviewed: Networks as a Type of Social Entrepreneurship to Advance Population Health

Introduction. Through the generation of new, disruptive models for organising business activity, social entrepreneurs are emerging as increasingly common actors solving social and economic problems (Townsend and Hart Townsend, D. M. and Hart, T. A.

ABSTRACT Entrepreneurship has been the engine propelling much of the growth of the business sector as well as a driving force behind the rapid expansion of the social sector. This article offers a comparative analysis of commercial and social entrepreneurship using a prevailing analytical model from commercial entrepreneurship. The analysis highlights key similarities and differences between these two forms of entrepreneurship and presents a framework on how to approach the social entrepreneurial process more systematically and effectively. We explore the implications of this analysis of social entrepreneurship for both practitioners and researchers. However, the dynamic is even more robust, as other forms of social entrepreneurship, beyond that occurring within the nonprofit sector, have also flourished in recent years. The recent boom in social entrepreneurial activity makes a comparative analysis between commercial and social entrepreneurship timely. Social entrepreneurship is still emerging as an area for academic inquiry. Its theoretical underpinnings have not been adequately explored, and the need for contributions to theory and practice are pressing. This article aims to open up some avenues of exploration for social entrepreneurship theory development and practice by presenting an exploratory comparative analysis of the extent to which elements applicable to business entrepreneurship, which has been more extensively studied, are transferable to social entrepreneurship. To a lesser degree, we will also explore the reverse applicability or the ways in which insights from social entrepreneurship can contribute to a deeper understanding of business entrepreneurship. We offer a comparative that identifies common and differentiating features between commercial and social entrepreneurship. This exploration develops new insights about social entrepreneurship and points to opportunities for further elaboration by researchers, as well as to practical implications for social entrepreneurs and funders on how to approach social entrepreneurship more systematically and effectively. In the next section, we discuss some of the key distinctions between social and commercial entrepreneurship as a modest step toward the development of a body of theory on social entrepreneurship. To analyze these theoretical propositions in depth and to draw out lessons for managers, we will then set forth one prevailing model used to examine commercial entrepreneurship and to explore new ideas that emerge when it is applied to social entrepreneurship. The article concludes by presenting implications for social entrepreneurial practice and research. In the former, social entrepreneurship refers to innovative activity with a social objective in either the for-profit sector, such as in social-purpose commercial ventures e. Under the narrow definition, social entrepreneurship typically refers to the phenomenon of applying business expertise and market-based skills in the nonprofit sector such as when nonprofit organizations develop innovative approaches to earn income Reis, ; Thompson, Common across all definitions of social entrepreneurship is the fact that the underlying drive for social entrepreneurship is to create social value, rather than personal and shareholder wealth e. The central driver for social entrepreneurship is the social problem being addressed, and the particular organizational form a social enterprise takes should be a decision based on which format would most effectively mobilize the resources needed to address that problem. Thus, social entrepreneurship is not defined by legal form, as it can be pursued through various vehicles. Indeed, examples of social entrepreneurship can be found within or can span the nonprofit, business, or governmental sectors. We will use this broader conceptualization of social entrepreneurship here to offer a comparative analysis with commercial entrepreneurship. We define social entrepreneurship as innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, or government sectors. However, most definitions of social entrepreneurship in popular discourse, as well as in the academic literature, focus primarily on social entrepreneurship within and across the nonprofit and business sectors. To build on previous work and for the purposes of this article, we will limit our

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

discussion to these two sectors as well. To approach the comparative analysis more specifically, we offer the following series of theoretical propositions focusing on four different variables to guide the comparison: One theory behind the existence of social-purpose organizations is that they emerge when there is social-market failure, i. This is often due to the inability of those needing the services to pay for them 1. A problem for the commercial entrepreneur is an opportunity for the social entrepreneur. Our proposition here is: Market failure will create differing entrepreneurial opportunities for social and commercial entrepreneurship. The fundamental purpose of social entrepreneurship is creating social value for the public good, whereas commercial entrepreneurship aims at creating profitable operations resulting in private gain. This contrast is, of course, overstated. Commercial entrepreneurship does benefit society in the form of new and valuable goods, services, and jobs, and can have transformative social impacts. Such transformations can even be a driving motivation for some commercial entrepreneurs. Nonetheless, the differences in purpose and reward are useful for our comparative analysis. Differences in mission will be a fundamental distinguishing feature between social and commercial entrepreneurship that will manifest itself in multiple areas of enterprise management and personnel motivation. Commercial and social dimensions within the enterprise may be a source of tension. The nondistributive restriction on surpluses generated by nonprofit organizations and the embedded social purpose of for-profit or hybrid forms of social enterprise limits social entrepreneurs from tapping into the same capital markets as commercial entrepreneurs. Additionally, the economics of a social entrepreneurial venture often make it difficult to compensate staff as competitively as in commercial markets. In fact, many employees in social entrepreneurial organizations place considerable value on nonpecuniary compensation from their work. Human and financial resource mobilization will be a prevailing difference and will lead to fundamentally different approaches in managing financial and human resources. The social purpose of the social entrepreneur creates greater challenges for measuring performance than the commercial entrepreneur who can rely on relatively tangible and quantifiable measures of performance such as financial indicators, market share, customer satisfaction, and quality. The challenge of measuring social change is great due to nonquantifiability, multicausality, temporal dimensions, and perceptive differences of the social impact created. Performance measurement of social impact will remain a fundamental differentiator, complicating accountability and stakeholder relations. Note that the distinction between social and commercial entrepreneurship is not dichotomous, but rather more accurately conceptualized as a continuum ranging from purely social to purely economic. Even at the extremes, however, there are still elements of both. That is, charitable activity must still reflect economic realities, while economic activity must still generate social value. Although social entrepreneurship is distinguished primarily by its social purpose and occurs through multiple and varied organizational forms, there is still significant heterogeneity in the types of activity that can fall under the social entrepreneurship rubric. Thus, while these four propositions can be distinguishing factors between commercial and social entrepreneurship, the degree to which they delineate the differences can vary. For example, a social-purpose commercial enterprise may differ less on these dimensions from its commercial counterparts than a social enterprise that does not have any commercial aspect to its operations. The four propositions are not meant to be definitive, nor exhaustive, but rather provide us with a theoretical frame with which to engage in the subsequent comparative analysis. The practice of entrepreneurship is, of course, as old as trading between tribes and villages. Many different and useful approaches have been used to describe and to analyze entrepreneurship. In the first stream of research, economists have explored the impacts and results of entrepreneurship. For example, Schumpeter , in his seminal article, examined entrepreneurship as a key process through which the economy as a whole is advanced. The second stream of research has focused on the entrepreneurs themselves. Research in this stream examines entrepreneurship from a psychological and sociological perspective e. Finally, the third stream has focused on the entrepreneurial management process. This diverse literature includes research on how to foster innovation within established corporations e. Clearly from these three streams of research, earlier conceptualizations of entrepreneurship have often focused on either the economic function of entrepreneurship or on the nature of the individual who is "the entrepreneur,"

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

whereas in recent years, significant research has focused on the search of the "how" of entrepreneurship. Among the many engaged in this area, Stevenson defined entrepreneurship as "The pursuit of opportunity beyond the tangible resources that you currently control. The entrepreneurial organization focuses on opportunity, not resources. Entrepreneurs must commit quickly, but tentatively, to be able to readjust as new information arises. The process of commitment becomes multistaged, limiting the commitment of resources at each stage to an amount sufficient to generate new information and success before more resources are sought. The entrepreneurial organization uses the resources that lie within the hierarchical control of others and, therefore, must manage the network as well as the hierarchy. Given our aim in this article of developing a framework on how to approach the social entrepreneurial process more systematically and effectively, we draw on the literature focusing on the "how" of entrepreneurship. This model stresses the creation of a dynamic fit among four interrelated components: Because these elements are interdependent and are situationally determined, the entrepreneur must manage the fit and must adapt continuously to new circumstances over time. People is defined as those who actively participate in the venture or who bring resources to the venture. They include both those within the organization and those outside who must be involved for the venture to succeed. The presumption that economic selfinterest drives most economic activity in organizations can lead to dangerous and expensive mistakes. Whether in nonprofit or in for-profit organizations, the whole person with multiple motivations and capacities creates the energy and determines the nature of the outcome. Context is defined as those elements outside the control of the entrepreneur that will influence success or failure. Contextual factors include the macroeconomy, tax and regulatory structure, and sociopolitical environment. Economic environment, tax policies, employment levels, technological advances, and social movements such as those involving labor, religion and politics are examples of specific contextual factors that can frame the opportunities and the risks that a new venture faces. With this definition, it is clear that one of the critical elements for success is defining those elements that must be consciously dealt with, and those that can simply play out as they will. Attention to everything can mean attention to nothing. On the other hand, leaving out a single critical element of context can be the precursor of failure. Deal is the substance of the bargain that defines who in a venture gives what, who gets what, and when those deliveries and receipts will take place. Each transaction delivers a bundle of values. They include economic benefits, social recognition, autonomy and decision rights, satisfaction of deep personal needs, social interactions, fulfillment of generative and legacy desires, and delivery on altruistic goals. Opportunity is defined as "any activity requiring the investment of scarce resources in hopes of a future return" Sahlman, , p. Change is motivated by the vision of the future that is better for the decision maker, and by the credibility of the path presented to that desired future state. One of the historic difficulties in the study of entrepreneurship is that the definition of opportunity is not necessarily shared by the multiple constituencies who must work together to create change. Often change affects power relationships, economic interests, personal networks, and even self-image. A critical factor that creates motivation for joint action arises out of the ability to create a common definition of opportunity that can be shared. Even slight perturbation in one of these PCDO domains can have tremendous implications for the others. Changing people often requires a different deal. Different opportunities are perceived in differing contexts, and amending a deal may attract new players and drive away the old. Entrepreneurs must consciously manage the dynamic fit among these elements see Figure 1 [Sahlman,]. The comparative analysis of the two forms of entrepreneurship for each of the PCDO elements highlights key similarities first, and then identifies significant differences. Linkages to our initial theoretical propositions about differences are highlighted in boldface type. This analysis also provides the basis for drawing out lessons that can be useful for social entrepreneurs and researchers. In the following analysis, we will first examine opportunity and context, which together determine the scope of the opportunity. Then, we will turn to a discussion of the people and deal dimensions of the venture. The key differences in these factors for social and commercial entrepreneurship will be illustrated by case examples. While such examples can only provide limited supporting empirical evidence for grounded theory building, they can be helpful in capturing

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

illumination from practice that can signal promising paths for further investigation. Opportunity Opportunity is defined as the desired future state that is different from the present and the belief that the achievement of that state is possible.

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

Chapter 5 : 5 Steps To Become A Social Entrepreneur And Change The World – YFS Magazine

Abstract. Social entrepreneurship (SE) has many champions and a notable lack of detractors. Governments have embraced it, business schools have committed millions of dollars to study it, nonprofit organizations have been founded to incubate it, and creative individuals are rapidly evolving it into new and innovative forms.

In addressing these questions the authors focus on an initiative arising from current research being undertaken jointly between the Department of Social Work at the University of Newcastle and the Newcastle and Hunter Chamber of Business. The research explores the nature of business and social sector relationships at the local level. As social work educators contributing to social entrepreneurship education programs in partnership with business educators, our challenge is to ensure that the social mission of social entrepreneurship remains central and its implications are fully understood and explored. These questions have arisen through involvement in a social work research project in the Newcastle and Hunter Region of New South Wales, Australia. The notion of social entrepreneurship embraces the idea that business acumen can be applied to community causes in an empowering way such that there is a real transfer of economic power to significantly disadvantaged groups and individuals. It represents a drastic paradigm shift away from welfarist models and traditional community development that is best encapsulated in the slogan a hand up not a handout. It is neither top down nor bottom up. Rather, it is inside out. Social entrepreneurship is critical of welfare models that create dependency and do not achieve any real shifts in economic and social power to welfare recipients, most of whom are marginalised and oppressed people. Social work is intricately linked with government welfare provision. A social entrepreneurship perspective is consistent with critiques from within social work relating to its governmentality and allegiance to the status quo. Rossiter, Social entrepreneurship is equally scathing of all those, like policy-makers, researchers and academics, who study social issues rather than act to make change happen. In keeping with its think local, act local philosophy it represents a hands-on approach to community economic development and stands in strong contrast to social development, which essentially concerns the creation of a social policy context or framework within which multilevel, multisectoral and multidisciplinary development can be carried out. Gray, ; Midgley, Since it is almost impossible to create the ideal social conditions for such grand scheme change, the social entrepreneurship model appears far more grounded and feasible in light of the less than ideal context in which change must happen. They point out that real economic empowerment means the creation of adequate and sustainable jobs for the unemployed, or, in the absence of jobs, an adequate social wage. There is also criticism from those who interpret social entrepreneurship to mean that welfare and services agencies have to be run more like businesses and be tied to outcome rather than need. Insofar as social entrepreneurship promotes notions of mutual obligation and individual responsibility, it is seen to have the potential to be aligned with the interests of conservative politics. For example, a key proponent of social entrepreneurship in Australia, Peter Botsman, in an address to the Australian Council of Social Service Congress, noted: At the moment, by being primarily an advocate to an increased social wage, ACOSS puts itself on the side of the health care professionals who insist on having absolute control of the health problems they cannot solve; and the silos of the social wage bureaucracies in police, social security departments, education departments, housing departments who want to see social inadequacy solely in terms of what they have the capacity or responsibility to deliver. But none of this is attacking inequality. The concept of social entrepreneurship thus raises significant questions of relevance to social work practitioners and educators regarding social service provision. It challenges current ideological thinking about welfare provision. Does it represent a conservative push to exonerate government from current cutbacks in services and their abdication of social responsibility? Or does it challenge academics and practitioners to rethink models of welfare provision and their real outcomes in terms of empowering disadvantaged groups cut off from the economic mainstream? These 4 questions have arisen from involvement in a social work research project being undertaken through the University of Newcastle, which is exploring the relationship between

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

business and the non-government community services sectors in a regional community in NSW, Australia. While there is initiative at the national level to foster business social investment, little research has been done at a regional level to establish the current role and contribution of the business sector to social and community issues and programs. Regional development has traditionally been dominated by economic considerations without due regard for related social processes Cheers, Similarly social planning and human services provision is often conducted in isolation from economic forces. Cheers argues that this separation retards regional development. This social work research project thus set out to establish the current activities and potential interest, demands, needs, restraints, and capacities of the business community for social investment at a regional level. It was believed that by using the Newcastle and Hunter Region as a case study, we could explore the possibilities for a developmental approach to business social investment at a regional level. As well as gaining an understanding of current patterns of contribution from business, through a developmental approach the research aimed to explore the scope for business to embrace corporate social investment as a planned initiative strategically directed towards the integration of economic and social goals, which would lead to well distributed gains in economic and social wellbeing Midgley, In other words, it questioned whether business involved itself in corporate social investment to achieve social justice goals. The Regional Economic Strategy HRDO, incorporates a strengthening of the social fabric of the region as an important element in a philosophy of sustainable regional development. The Hunter Region thus provided an ideal context for the study. Core Concepts Business Social Investment and Citizenship Business social investment or corporate citizenship are terms used to describe the range of social support strategies undertaken by business in association with social and community service organizations. Research has also identified the need for business to examine the local environment to anticipate social problems that can damage economic infrastructure and performance and to develop partnerships to address the causes and consequences of, for example, violent crime Vidaver-Cohen, There is thus a growing interest in the capacity for business social investment to deliver returns directly in terms of business performance and indirectly in terms of producing social environments conducive for the operation of business. This perspective is informed by the theory of social capital. Social Capital Social investment by business is thought to be one means by which the social capital of a region may be enhanced through the development of ties and networks across economic and social systems. The main elements of social capital for Putnam are trust and cooperation, developed through networks, and norms which foster collaborative effort to achieve shared objectives. Putnam concluded that regional differences in economic and social wellbeing could, in part, be attributed to the presence or absence of social capital. The research seeks to explore whether business social investment 7 activities in the Newcastle and Hunter Region of NSW are currently or potentially able to contribute to enhanced levels of social capital. This objective is being addressed in specific questions about the nature, experience and outcomes of business and social and community sector relationships and networks. Social Development A theory of social development has emerged within social work literature to provide guidance as to how social and economic development can, do and should inter-relate. Within this theory, social development is viewed as an approach to social policy that brings together insights from economics, sociology specifically development studies and political science Midgley, It proposes comprehensive solutions to social problems involving all social sectors including health, housing, work, welfare, education, and in this case, business. It recognises the relationship between these sectors in providing for the wellbeing of people and societies. Midgley points out that broad, comprehensive definitions of social development such as this used in development studies best approximate the political economy approach and transcend disciplinary boundaries. Of particular relevance to the present study is the inextricable link between social and economic development: The study aims to add to this body of knowledge by examining ways in which the interests of the business and community sectors can be harnessed to address social problems and issues in the area under study. It also aims to use a developmental research model to facilitate dialogue and joint problem solving by these two sectors. Developmental research differs from traditional social science research in its goal of generating interventions

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

as opposed to generating knowledge per se. The significance of the developmental research model thus lies in its emphasis on the application of data collection and analysis to new forms of practice, in this case, business investment in social issues and programs. Business social investment in social programs requires assessment of proposals, development of relationships, and potentially, an organisational framework by which social investment can be harnessed to address strategic and developmental goals. These components of business social investment can be classified as types of social technology. The phases of the research model have been adapted and are identified here as analysis, development and evaluation. The objectives for each stage are outlined in Table 1. Underlying the study are the assumptions that: In order to progress the study and to involve key stakeholders in the research process, regional organisations for each sector were invited to establish reference groups for the first stage. The Chamber has a membership of business organisations ranging in scale from sole trader up to 5 employees, small business up to 25 employees, medium business up to 50 employees, to large companies up to 75 employees. The only organisation structured on a regional basis that represents the interests of the social and community services sector is the Hunter Region Organisation of Councils Social and Community Services Planning Group. The membership of this Group comprises people employed in local government who coordinate and plan for the delivery of social and community services in the local government areas that constitute the Hunter Region. The membership thus has a planning and development function with the sector and represents its interests at both local and regional levels. It is through local government that organisations involved in the delivery of social and community service programmes are identifiable on a geographic and functional basis. The social and community services sector is difficult to define given its breadth and diversity. For the purposes of this study, the sector is defined in accordance with its not-for-profit and non-government status; the categories of service delivery, such as personal care of older people in nursing homes, hostel and community settings, services for people with disabilities, community, individual and family support, and employment; and organisational size in terms of income levels and staffing.

Preliminary findings of Stage 1: The following preliminary results are thus based on a response rate of 100%. The classification system uses a large number of categories and hence numbers in each are quite small. Appendix 1 provides an initial indication of the diversity of the business respondents. It is interesting to note that the highest number of respondents were in the field of professional services and consultancies.

Analysis

Identify the What is the nature of Establish advisory committee through Data on the current extent and types current contributions Chamber level and types of contributions financial, labour, policy, Develop survey tool social contribution businesses are expertise, board Mail survey of membership of of business in the currently membership, advice, skill Regional Business Chamber Newcastle and making to the development, etc?

Interviews with major business Hunter Region not-for-profit, Are demands increasing? Monitoring of local media to identify business community What are the key social the range and nature of social issues welfare sector issues business wants to that draw attention from the business see addressed? Hunter Region Explore the What is the need for Establish advisory committee through Data on level and experience and private sector the Hunter Regional Organisation of types of not-for- issues for the contributions and has this Councils profit, non- not-for-profit, changed? Develop an Is a developmental As above Draft principles action strategy approach appropriate and Possibly a forum that workshops and model for a to address issues feasible? What are the significant features that should be accounted for in a model for social development? Evaluation Review the What are responses of Survey of participants in Stage 2 re: Over two thirds The dominance of small business in survey respondents is consistent with overall trends in the structure of the Hunter economy. Respondents were able to identify more than one category. The most common forms of contributions were donations of money Contributions involving ongoing inter- organisational relationships were less frequently reported. Results to these questions are provided in Table 3. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were engaged in any ongoing partnerships with not-for-profit organisations aimed at both social benefits and business reputation in the longer term. Just on a third This figure suggests that the respondents to the survey take an active interest in community affairs.

Community Participation	Number of Yes	No	No response	Total
-------------------------	---------------	----	-------------	-------

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

Respondents Involvement in ongoing partnerships 95 4 with not-for-profit organisations Respondents were asked to indicate whether a designated person was responsible for the management of requests for contributions to community causes. Respondents were also asked to indicate whether the business quantified the financial contribution to community causes. Nearly two-thirds or Table 5 indicates the proportion of respondents who agreed with a range of statements relating to the management of contributions. The results suggest that the majority of respondents did not integrate contribution to community causes with overall business planning in terms of budgets, guidelines, review, promotion, or 15 strategic alliances. For nearly half of the respondents Approach to Contributions Agree Disagree No Statement response Our business supports causes where we have personal networks. The wording of this question proved problematic as it required respondents to rank a number of factors in order of significance with one 1 being the most significant factor and ten 10 being the least significant. A large number of the survey participants rated but did not rank the factors or failed to respond to the question. The results presented in Table 6 show the respondents who rated each item in the top three 16 of limiting factors.

DOWNLOAD PDF 15.5. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, POSTMATERIAL VALUES AND CREATIVITY

Chapter 6 : Social entrepreneurship and its implications for social work | Mel Gray - calendrierdelascience.

The roots of social entrepreneurship lie in the evolution of the private sector. Though for a long time, the symbiosis of government, business, and non-profit organisations addressed the social needs, yet inequalities and loopholes still existed, particularly in the under-developed nations.

But while the number of social entrepreneurs has grown rapidly in the past decade, their efforts are scattered and often fail to reach critical mass. Right away, I was able to connect with people who are experienced in solving problems on a global scale. But more than that, I was exposed to its unique model, where people are driven by their commitment to action – a focused, defined assignment that they develop strategies around. As a social entrepreneur, you have to define your goals so you can realistically implement them. In my experience, good intentions great intentions, in fact that could change communities for the better are always there. An action plan needs to be more than just a rubber stamp. You need rounds of analysis of the geographic region and its regulations to find the optimal solution. The issue should be prevalent, the scope of the project should fall within your budget and energy level, and the community should be truly interested. My work has shown me that the Internet and the availability of information can often accomplish a large part of the mission. Does the problem lack a business or procedure to deliver the solution? Assessing where the problem stems from will uncover fitting solutions. How has the problem been addressed before? Sometimes, opportunities are time dependent. Creating a new system requires a strong alliance of talented individuals and businesses. The organization broadened my global vision and helped me understand how I could play a major role as a philanthropist. Bring those along on your journey to foster a better planet. The ways you can make a difference are as numerous as the problems that need solutions. This article has been edited and condensed. Kevin Xu is the CEO of MEBO-International , a California and Beijing based intellectual property management company that focuses on the exploitation and management of the intangible assets regarding in situ regeneration in applied medical and health promotion systems human body regenerative restoration science. They operate in over 73 countries and hospital networks worldwide, and are opening a whole new era of bio-economy. All material is protected by U. Unauthorized reproduction or distribution of this material is prohibited.