

FEMALE SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS A DISCURSIVE STRUGGLE

Robert Jones: Swinburne University, Hawthorn, Australia
Michela Betta: Swinburne University, Hawthorn, Australia
James Latham: Swinburne University, Hawthorn, Australia
David Goss: Univeristy Of Surrey, Guildford, United Kingdom

~

Contact: Robert Jones, Swinburne University, PO Box 218, 3122 Hawthorn, Australia, Email: rjones@swin.edu.au

ABSTRACT

We analyse a process of female social entrepreneurship involving the establishment of a new enterprise within a cultural environment traditionally regarded as hostile towards this form of female endeavour. Our argument relates to the process of how social entrepreneurial endeavour can displace the strong bond of conventionality epitomised by a dominant discourse, driven by a bypassed shame reaction to the withdrawal of interactional deference. In doing this we adopt an overtly constructionist approach to analyse the process of entrepreneurship in terms of a discursive struggle that challenges the status quo and operates at the boundaries of convention and received wisdom.

INTRODUCTION

In this article we attempt to advance the theoretical integrity of the emerging field of social entrepreneurship. Jones, Latham, and Betta (2008) report that the rather sparse field of academic articles in peer-reviewed journals can be categorised in four distinct topic areas: the meaning and conceptualisation of social entrepreneurship; the difference between business entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship; the characteristics, motivations, and personal values of social entrepreneurs; and the activities of social entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurship has traditionally been regarded as different from business entrepreneurship by stressing the generation of social value, rather than private or shareholder profit, as its central driving mission (Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern, 2006). Hockerts (2006) states that social entrepreneurs can be individual citizens, community activists, or civil servants, stretching across the continuum from Mahatma Gandhi to Ben Cohen of Ben and Jerry's Ice Cream. But this still leaves wide discretion for the concept of social entrepreneurship. As a nascent field of academic inquiry, social entrepreneurship remains under-researched, extremely broad, and bedevilled by a plethora of definitions (Austin, 2006; Wei-Skillern, Austin, Leonard, and Stevenson, 2007). For example, the fifteen chapters that comprise the text reader edited by Mair, Robinson, and Hockerts (2006) contain ten different definitions of social entrepreneurship. Similar diversity is also found in text readers edited by Nicholls (2006), Perrini (2006), and Steyaert and Hjorth (2006). The vast majority of accounts of social entrepreneurship are contained in journalistic and professional sources, including internet websites (Johnson, 2000). As such, the entire field of social entrepreneurship remains under-theorised.

Our purpose in this article is to analyse the antecedents of the establishment of social entrepreneurial ventures. We are particularly interested in social entrepreneurial ventures that are established in hostile environments. Our inspiration for this research was provided by a case study of a pioneering social entrepreneur (Jasvinder Sanghera) who established the first community-based project in UK (Karma Nirvava) offering advocacy, support, and advice to female victims of forced marriage and family-honour shamings and violence. This case study involves a process of female social entrepreneurship involving the establishment of a new organisation within a cultural environment traditionally regarded as hostile towards this form of female endeavour. We advance two research questions: what factor(s) constitute the driving energy behind this form of social entrepreneurship; and what strategies can be employed to pave the way for the establishment of the venture? We argue that social entrepreneurial endeavour is rooted in the objective of challenging and displacing the strong

bond of the social status quo, epitomised by a dominant discourse. In particular, we focus on the strategic role played by 'discursive struggle' in the displacement of extant convention. One way to understand this driven energy is to frame it within the emotional consequence of a by-passed shame reaction to the withdrawal of interactional deference.

For the purpose of achieving the objective of this article we draw upon the micro-sociological theories of shame, pride, and deference-emotion (Goss, 2005; Scheff, 1990, 1997b; Collins, 2004); discourse (Foucault, 1972, 1981; Fairclough, 1992); and feminist theory (Mills, 1997; Smith, 1990). The article is presented in four sections. We intend to: (i) share our conception of the notion of social entrepreneurship with the help of a case study; (ii) propose a by-passed shame model of social entrepreneurship based on deference-emotion theory as providing the emotional motor for social entrepreneurial endeavour and relate this to the case of Jasvinder Sanghera and the formation of Karma Nirvana; (iii) employ the concept of 'discourse' as something that systematically frames ways of thinking, behaving, and relating, and relate this to the discourse of honour as the dominant discourse that Sanghera's endeavours are aimed at challenging and disrupting; (iv) employ several aspects of feminist theory that provide the space to theorise the transformational ability of agentic discursive struggle to challenge and disrupt the dominance of the discourse of honour. Figure 1 presents a diagrammatic summary of our processual analysis.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Jasvinder Sanghera and the Notion of Social Entrepreneurship

In order to narrow down this diversity and potential confusion we will adopt an approach to social entrepreneurship that gives equal weight to its two separate components – social value and entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship, as a form of social action rather than an identity marker, has always been conceived, in one form or another, as an activity that challenges the status quo (Schumpeter, 1934); that operates on the boundaries of convention and at the margins of received wisdom. Connecting entrepreneurship to social change and societal transformation (Steyaert and Hjorth, 2006) implies its incompatibility with social stability or settled practices. In its weaker forms it may challenge the micro-order of, say, an industrial sector; in its strongest forms it may take on the macro-order of a whole society. Entrepreneurship is more than small business. It goes beyond the replication of existing institutions, initiatives, ideas, processes, products, or services. It encompasses that which is new, innovative, fresh, or novel. To be called entrepreneurial, an activity must entail a discovery of new means-ends relationships that generate a different image of the future (Casson, 1982). This ability to break up deterministic frameworks and predictable paths (Bruyat and Julien, 2000) is the essence of entrepreneurship.

Applying our argument that the construct of social entrepreneurship should give equal weight to its two components – social issues and entrepreneurship – we can advance the view that only those innovators who are able to actively contribute to social change with creativity and innovation, typical of the classical entrepreneurial process, can be called social entrepreneurs (Perrini, 2006). Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector (Dees, 1998). They are the drivers of social progress (Leadbeater, 1997; Thompson, 2002). In this sense, social entrepreneurship is not just about helping people, or performing good deeds, or assisting in the short-term alleviation of the adverse consequences of social problems. This approach would serve only to confuse social entrepreneurship with the fields of social enterprise and non-profit management. Rather, social entrepreneurs possess a vision of something they want to *solve* in the social sector (Dearlove, 2004). They embrace social causes and are motivated by a discomfort with the status quo (Bornstein, 2004; Prabhu, 1999). They seek to give back to the community in the form of long-term social change. By focusing on entrepreneurial opportunities that deal with solving intractable social problems, social entrepreneurs envisage systematic change in the whole society (Perrini, 2006).

Amongst the many potential concerns of social entrepreneurs one of them relates to the emancipation of people or groups regarded as oppressed, marginalised, or underprivileged. Our analysis in this article refers to one such case. We analyse a case study of a female social entrepreneurial activist, Jasvinder Sanghera, the founder of the Karma Nirvana organisation in UK. Our theorising relies upon the material contained within her autobiographical text *Shame* (Sanghera, 2007). In this text we learn that Sanghera established Karma Nirvana as a pioneering community-based organisation to offer support, advocacy, advice, and, eventually, the prospect of emancipation to women who specifically experienced problems caused by language and cultural barriers. Although traditional women's refuges have for long existed in UK, Sanghera's initiative is regarded as entrepreneurial in the sense of establishing the first specialised refuge and counselling 'safe haven' centre in UK for female victims of 'family honour' shamings and honour-based crimes and violence, in

particular non-English-speaking brides brought to Britain through forced marriages, many of whom experienced domestic abuse.

Sanghera's objective was to initiate social change that no longer tolerated such practices. In forming Karma Nirvana, she was subject to substantial resistance and demonisation: ("that bitch that helps girls run away from home" p272). She had to withstand not only the hatred aimed at her from various communities in the form of abusive phone calls and death threats to herself and her children ("you'll be chopped up into little pieces" p282), but also faced the task of convincing the British police and social authorities that a problem did in fact exist. The British authorities ("caught up in a fog of ignorance and misplaced cultural and religious sensitivity" p280) had for decades ignored the issues within such honour-based communities, preferring to leave such issues to be sorted out within those communities' own cultural norms and institutions. Under an approach of tolerance towards cultural self-determination the authorities had been construed as hesitant to intervene. Brandon and Hafez (2008) report the practice of parents removing girls from school once they reach a certain age and (presumably) sending them abroad to be forcibly married. They accuse schools and teachers of being "reluctant to investigate for fear of being accused of racism or of stigmatising minorities" (p18). In the face of official inaction, the energy for social reform is left to emanate from within the ranks of those perceived as 'oppressed'.

Since the establishment of Karma Nirvana in 1994, Sanghera's campaign of advocacy and emancipation has forced the authorities to acknowledge and tackle the problems faced by women caught within such situations. A range of organisations have subsequently been formed in urban areas across UK replicating the work and objectives of Karma Nirvana. Other female authors have come forward by publishing accounts of their experiences of forced marriage and honour-based abuse, for example Ali (2008). Two recent legislative changes have criminalised female genital mutilation and allowed victims of forced marriage to pursue perpetrators through civil courts. Since 2007 the practice of forced marriage has been defined as a form of domestic violence and an abuse of human rights, inducing major social opposition to a practice that had traditionally formed a cornerstone of honour-based cultures. The age limit for overseas marriages has also been raised to twenty one. Additionally, the establishment of a specialised Forced Marriage Unit by the Home Office and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office now provides a single point of advice and direct assistance for those at risk of being coerced into marriage overseas against their will. Its aim is to intervene to stop forced marriages happening.

By-Passed Shame Model of Social Entrepreneurship

The entrepreneurial process of a social activist, especially one emanating from the ranks of the 'oppressed' who attempts to challenge and violate taken-for-granted norms, roles, and scripts, is invariably infused with emotion (Worline, Wrzesniewski, and Rafaeli, 2002). An emotion is a reaction to an event (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996) and subsequently, emotions invariably beget behaviour (Frijda, 1986; Levenson, 1994). More specifically, Fredrickson (1998; 2000) has suggested that certain emotions are associated with specific action repertoires, such as anger with attack and joy with playfulness. In this article we argue that a more fruitful approach towards theorising the motor of social entrepreneurship lies within the social dynamics of emotion rather than the conventional emphasis in the literature on individual personality types and traits such as courage, passion, and risk-taking. Baron (2008: 329) has recently commented that there exists "very little direct evidence" related to the role of emotions in the entrepreneurial process. We will build on this observation in this article by suggesting that the social dynamics of emotion can act as both a stabilising and a destabilising force in the boundary area between situationally circulating meanings and individual subjectivity. In this we conceive emotion as a 'borderland' concept: rather than its conventional psychological characterisation as an intrasubjective process, we understand emotion primarily intersubjectively (albeit with individual level effects). Emotions are generated and focused through social interaction – especially the giving and withholding of interactional deference; they are – at least in the case of the principal 'social' emotions of pride and shame – indicators of the state of social bonds (Scheff, 1997b; Nathanson, 1992; Katz, 1997). And it is, we will assert, precisely in this turbulent nexus of social emotions that entrepreneurial action is conceived. The felt emotion of shame encompasses the experience of:

"a fearful and chaotic sense of an irresistible and eerie revelation to self, of a vulnerability in one's nature that, by indicating one's moral incompetence, isolates and humbles one in the face of what one regards as a sacred community" (Katz, 1997: 232).

Strong bonds emerge from the establishment of stable deference relations and generate pride: both the giver and recipient of deference mutually confirm and celebrate their sense of 'location' and

experience a sense of pride in achieving 'belonging'. But where there is uncertainty or contestation around the giving and receiving of deference, the social bond is weak and both parties are at risk of being discredited or being identified as discreditable (Goffman, 1967; Down, 2006), resulting in shame – either at being discredited or from the self-doubt induced by fear of being discreditable. This is, however, a dynamic relationship: established deference patterns and strong bonds decay and weak bonds and uncertain deference relations can solidify with the flow of interaction. This movement can be gradual and almost imperceptible, or it can be sudden and dramatic. The shame-pride dynamic is inherently unstable and it is this that gives it its 'entrepreneurial' potential.

We suggest that one way to understand – and explain – the nature of this emotionally soaked borderland activity is to conceive interactional deference in terms of the tension between socially negotiated discourse(s). We argue that it is at the boundary between dominant and alternative discourses that entrepreneurialism develops as a form of action. Entrepreneurialism, as a process, is associated with the re-discoursing dynamics that occur in sites where power struggles are played out. In this article we chart the social entrepreneurial dynamics associated with the challenge to, and disruption of, a dominant discourse. Struggles over discourse formation and transformation embrace the unsettling and destabilisation of extant circuits of power. Through the use of the Karma Nirvana case study example we analyse how a process of re-discoursing can be employed to dislodge the dominant discourse. It is the area of emotionally-infused instability at the discourse boundaries that produces entrepreneurial change. The dynamic movements between pride and shame, and between dominant and alternative discourses, represent a dialectic of discombobulation, the motor of entrepreneurship.

The context of 'being with others' provides the social interactionist perspective that ties together the individual with the social – the self in situ. It is this part-whole morphology that begets 'the' master social emotion – shame (and its converse, pride) – that relates to the perception of negative (or positive) evaluations of the self, either by the self or by others (Nathanson, 1992). Shame is a part of, or is anticipated, in virtually all human contact. To be lowered in the eyes of our fellows breaks our striving for a 'social bond' (Scheff, 1997b). As a result, most perceptions of shame and pride are acknowledged and discharged. Deference-emotion theory (Goss, 2005; Scheff, 1990, 1997a) links the extent of deference displayed by others during social interactions to individual emotional responses of shame or pride. For example, withdrawal of deference by others can result in the feeling of shame by the self, thus severing our extant social bond. Accordingly, the individual could be expected to acknowledge and discharge this perception by displaying behaviours such as apologising, or exhibiting contrition or recompense behaviour designed to induce reintegration back into the group, that is, the restoration of social acceptance. Additionally, the giving of deference can generate feelings of pride which are acknowledged and discharged by expressions of modesty or bestowing credit on others.

However, such attempts to restore the social balance may not be experienced in all situations. For example, we can imagine a scenario wherein a withdrawal of deference, rather than being met with a display of self-correcting internalised shame behaviour is instead bypassed and externalised by the individual as being unwarranted and undeserved. Such 'bypassed shame' (Lewis, 1971) can be exhibited in various ways. Examples would include self-righteous displays of anger and fury, or be translated into highly combative forms of energy and hyperactivity. Feelings of hostility, wanting revenge, and the desire for superiority and domination may come to the fore in an attempt to put the self beyond criticism. Accordingly, the social bond, rather than being restored, is further damaged. Phenomena such as anger and rage may conceal underlying shame, in the sense that they can be considered defences against shame (Morrison, 1989) and in themselves reflect the power of shame to influence feelings and behaviour, and shape the nature of human interaction.

Shame is often the underpinning of narcissistic rage. When the feeling of shame is so intolerable that it must be expunged, the self may attempt to purge shame through attacks on objects that are perceived as the source of the shame (Morrison, 1989). The relationship between shame and rage is often related to the experience of need: the self experiences a feeling of humiliation, either through recognition that the other has failed to meet one's need for support, love, and affirmation, or is unaware of the self's need for such sustenance. With regard to perceived need, the self often expresses a series of normative 'shoulds' and 'should-nots'. "Thus, shame may be a response to need, with the defence of anger aimed at the needed object for making the individual feel insignificant, dependent, and unworthy" (Morrison, 1989: 125). Hence, turning shame into rage is a defensive process by which the source of shame is changed from inner failure to external defect – "it's not my failure, desire, or need, but your scorn or lack of reciprocal concern that makes me feel this way" (Morrison, 1989: 126). Shame can lead to rage in response to a felt unmet need from the offending object or environment.

This process illustrates the transition from passivity and helplessness to activity and power, the process of reversing the source of shame by turning one feeling into its opposite.

This reaction to deference withdrawal can lead such individuals to consciously seek out and surround themselves with others who are more likely to bestow rather than withdraw deference from the self. The resultant feeling of pride can easily become unbalanced as the individual seeks to surround him/herself with admiring 'yes-groups'. Such 'unbalanced pride' further damages the social bond and can easily become pathological if the individual subsequently flips into bypassed shame behaviour resulting from any perception of deference withdrawal from any of the inner circle of courtiers.

We therefore envisage a situation wherein the existence of settled deference relations co-exist with the (strong bond) of social inertia and the prevalence of a dominant discourse. In contrast, a situation of unsettled deference relations would co-exist with the (weak bond) of social disruption, characterised by attempts to seek a re-negotiation of established social relations and a challenge to the dominant discourse. It is the dynamics created by bypassed shame (injustice and humiliation) and unbalanced pride (excess deference) that engenders the push to re-order dominant norms through a search for new forms of (just) life and new excitements.

How can we apply this micro-sociological theorising to the formation of Karma Nirvana? Jasvinder Sanghera was born and raised in England, but enculturated within the norms and practices of her traditional honour-based immigrant family and local community. At the age of fourteen she ran away from home with her boyfriend after her parents arranged her marriage with an overseas distant relative. She was promptly disowned for shaming her family. As a sobbing teenager her parents prophesied "without us you'll be rolling around in the gutter". Sanghera was determined to prove them wrong. One of her elder sisters later committed suicide as a result of domestic abuse within a forced marriage. It is the emotional dynamics generated through bypassed shame that, we argue, provides the motor for Sanghera's social entrepreneurialism and her challenge to break the boundaries of convention.

'If [my sister] had only ignored the strictures of the community she relied on to protect her; if she could just have found the courage to reach out and embrace the culture of the country she was born in, she needn't have died. The tragedy of that possessed me. I could feel the sorrow and anger fermenting inside me, building an energy that propelled me towards action. I felt I owed it to [my sister] to do something constructive with my life, and more than that, I wanted to do something to change the world that had failed my family. A small part of me, fuelled by bitterness, also wanted to show [my family] that I didn't need them. I felt so totally alone...If they didn't want me I would prove to them that I could tread my own path and still make something of myself.' (p183).

This statement of bypassed shame shows how Sanghera externalises the attempt to shame her by throwing back the accusations onto her own family as unwarranted and undeserved, resulting in emotions of anger, bitterness, and revenge translated into a form of combative hyperactive energy. In an attempt to put the self beyond criticism Sanghera seeks to 'change the world', 'make something of myself', and prove her own independence and self-reliance. It is within this dynamic that we find the motivation and energy that subsequently results in the formation of Karma Nirvana.

Discourse of Honour: Its Creation and Reproduction

In this section we pay particular attention to the creation and reproduction of what we label as the 'discourse of honour'. The concept of *discourse* can be referred to as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972: 49). Regarded in this way, discourse is something that produces something else, an effect, reflected by certain ways of thinking and behaving and a systematic framing of ideas, opinions, and concepts. Discourse is seen as something which structures, constrains, and restricts our perception. The manner in which we think about, experience, apprehend, understand, interpret, and assign meaning to the material objects of the world around us is through discourse and the structures it imposes on our thinking. Foucault stresses that discourse is associated with relations of power. All knowledge we have is the result of power struggles over whose version of events is sanctioned. Knowledge is often the product of the subjugation of objects or perhaps it can be seen as the process through which subjects are constituted as subjugated. Truth is not something that is intrinsic within a discourse, nor is it an ideal abstract quality to which humans aspire. Rather, truth is something which societies have to work to produce, and not something which appears in a transcendental way (Mills, 1997). Accordingly, Foucault analyses the labour which people perform to exclude certain forms of knowledge from consideration as 'true'.

Stewart (1994: 107) asserts that in those societies where honour is important, “it tends to be mainly something for men”. Women either carry no honour at all or else it tends to be of a limited or secondary nature. Women are expected to display chaste behaviour and operate within a domestic environment, being wholly or largely excluded from public life. Male and female interaction in a public environment is discouraged. Inappropriate behaviour by women can have a detrimental effect upon men’s honour, to the effect, for example, that mixed-sex business contact, or female entrepreneurial endeavour, can be interpreted as dishonourable to men. We learn from Sanghera (2007) that within her community the concept of shame is tied to the concept of family honour. According to her mother, girls are only supposed to obey. A girl can derive her identity only with respect to some male member of her family. Thus, she can only be known as somebody’s daughter, sister, wife or mother. It is males who carry honour whilst females can only add to or subtract from such honour in terms of their meek and respectful behaviour: “diligent daughters, obedient wives, dutiful daughters-in-law”. Inappropriate female behaviour can bring shame to bear upon her immediate and extended family, for which the woman can be disowned by the family or, in extreme circumstances, killed. From her schooldays Sanghera began to display independent traits and behaviours which did not endear her to her family. She desired to display fashionable hair styles and wear Western clothes, attend college, and choose her own boyfriends, for which she received various punishments and shunnings from her family. Finally, she was disowned by her family and cut off from her local community when she attempted to avoid a forced marriage by running off with her self-chosen *chamar* (lower caste) boyfriend. But we learn from Sanghera that her brother was not treated to the same behaviour, even though he married a white girl.

Sanghera’s punishment was immediate and severe, not only from her immediate family (“you’ve shamed us; you are dead in our eyes”); but also from her extended family (“you married a *chamar*, you disgraced your family, you’re no better than a prostitute”); and the local community (“disapproval spread through the community...the curious stares, the reproving glances, the way women drew aside in huddles keeping their children close when I went in and out of shops”). The notion that ‘shame travels’ acts as an important interpersonal disciplinary element, having a significant impact on all forms of relationships. Sanghera’s mother was snubbed in her local place of worship; her father refused her permission to travel overseas to meet his relatives (“if you visited my family you would taint them with your disgrace; I will not be a party to that”); Sanghera was refused by her family to participate in the traditional washing of her mother’s body when she died (“if the hands of an outcast touch her she’ll be contaminated”); and no member of her family attended her university graduation ceremony, even though she had been chosen by the university to deliver the student vote of thanks.

Sanghera states that when women are forced into marriage they merely swap one form of abuse for another. According to her, in a forced marriage the wife is under constant scrutiny and control not only from her husband but also from her own family, her new family, and community leaders. The expectation is of respectful, quiet, and submissive behaviour that enforces female modesty and provides no threat to male possessive pride. Contraventions of this code can be met with abuse, both physical and mental. Sanghera provides plenty of examples both from her own personal experience and from her association with Karma Nirvana, especially in relation to brides imported into the country from overseas with no knowledge of English or the customs of the country who were often incarcerated in the mother-in-laws house, locked in their room when not working, and sometimes beaten. One such bride was disowned by her husband for allowing herself to be examined by a male doctor, and was only able to right the situation by going down on her knees to kiss his feet whilst begging his forgiveness in front of a gathering of the older community members in her mother-in-laws house.

We should regard any discourse, such as the discourse of honour, as existing because of a complex set of regulated rules and practices which lead to the distribution of certain utterances and statements (and which try to keep them in circulation) and other practices which try to fence them off from others and keep out of circulation those alternative statements and utterances (Foucault, 1981). Not everyone is able to make statements, or to have statements taken seriously by others. Some statements are more authorised than others because they are associated with those in positions of power, or with institutions. Speaking authoritatively is hedged around by rituals and takes place within particular prescribed rules (Mills, 2003). The notion of ‘exclusion’ is a key element in thinking about discourse. Discourse exercises control over what can be said through the practices of the way in which it is regulated. A Foucaultian analysis would focus on the way certain types of knowledge are excluded – a system of silencing. Discourse is constrained through three major exclusionary practices: taboos; the personal fear of being labelled ‘mad’ or incomprehensible; and the belief that only ‘experts’ can pronounce on the ‘truth’. In our analysis of the discourse of honour, based on Sanghera’s data, we argue that conventional behavioural codes are maintained through the interaction of three regulated

practices that discourage women from attempting to speak out about, or walk away from, their situations: the spectre of bringing shame upon their family; the imperative of ensuring family secrecy; and blaming the victim – which individually combine to enforce a system of silencing. Sanghera witnessed several of her older sisters begging for sympathy and support from their mother during their abusive marriages, only to be rejected (“stupid girl. Of course you can’t come home. Do you not think we have been shamed enough already?”). Her sisters’ pleas were corralled (“not a word of this to anyone. It’s a private matter for our family”), whilst implicitly condoning their husbands’ behaviour and blaming the women (“heavens girl, that’s what men are like, why all the fuss?”).

Awkward situations were often referred to the community leader, a man of stature who spoke for the family and the community, and whose dictates were virtually law: “what he said went”. According to Sanghera, the community leader merely reinforced the status quo: “he was into all the things which I think are wrong – caste, forced marriage, and the importance of honour”. The community leader effectively condoned the traditional male role and placed the onus on the wife to deal with the situation: “when men get angry you have to be calmer. When a pan of milk is boiling up, it’s a woman’s job to settle it down again”. The same system of silencing, based on similar practices of invoking shame, preserving family secrecy, and blaming the victim, is again enforced to maintain conventional codes of behaviour.

“Where would you sit without your husband? Stop snivelling and go back to him. You know what happened when your sister ran away from home. You saw how that nearly destroyed your parents...think about your family name. Do you want to bring more shame on your family?” (p142).

In effect, women who seek reassurance that they will be supported by their family and the community against abusive husbands have little alternative but to return back into the violent relationship. Conditioned by the discourse, lacking alternative remedies, and persuaded by the rhetoric of family and community (“how could she not listen?”), many women return, shamed and silenced, believing that the situation is their fault, blaming themselves for bringing their husband’s cruelty on themselves. An abusive relationship is considered better than the life of a disowned woman. According to Sanghera, a traditional upbringing in an honour-bound society leaves women so vulnerable and unprepared for real life that they are unable to cope if they do not conform. A woman who is rejected, outcast, banished, or disowned, finds herself exiled from her community, her family and its history, suffering a sense of displacement, feeling abandoned, isolated, alone, lonely, frightened, and ashamed, but, more pressingly, unable to survive within the structures and mores of a society designed not to support single women. At least within a conventional relationship they are able to survive, even at the expense of having to conform to uphold the family honour, with all its attributes of subservience, duty, and passivity. Sanghera likens the situation to that of a ‘whipped dog’, meek and cowed, suffering cruelty, denial, and prospective disownment.

The above analysis emphasises the constitutive nature of discursive practice in that it contributes to creating and reproducing social identities, social relationships, and systems of knowledge and belief. Foucault wants to “discover how this choice of truth, inside which we are caught...was made, but also how it was repeated [and] renewed” (1981: 70). He is not interested in which discourse is a true or accurate representation of the ‘real’ but rather the mechanics whereby one becomes produced as the dominant discourse. In the case of the discourse of honour our analysis emphasises that the reproduction of society as it is, is closely related to the hegemony of male power relations – males carry honour whilst women must obey; all conventional practices are enforced through the (male-dominated) family and the community leaders; and a code of silencing is practiced through three inter-related constraints: first, inappropriate female behaviour is minimised through the fear of violence or shaming; second, a bond of family secrecy is enforced to exclude external communication and preserve external ignorance; and third, women are conditioned to blame themselves in the face of a breakdown in conventional practices. Thus, the institutionalisation of discourse is closely related to the mapping of power relations, creating a complex system of multiple constraints that govern the production and reception of discourse.

Disrupting the Discourse of Honour: The Formation of Karma Nirvana as a Discursive Struggle

Yet we must be careful not to over-emphasise the one-way nature of this relationship. Discursive practice also contributes to transforming society (Fairclough, 1992), an observation that provides a space for us to theorise the social entrepreneurial process involved in forming and operating Karma Nirvana. We argue that the facilitation process which enables the establishment of Karma Nirvana to be achieved occurs through Sanghera’s engagement in a ‘discursive struggle’ wherein she acts to position and distribute her alternative discourse so that it provides a direct challenge to the

veracity of the prevalent discourse of honour. We argue that we can theorise the 'social entrepreneurial process as a discursive struggle' by locating it within the literature on feminist theory. The concept of 'femininity as discourse' (Smith, 1990) envisages discourse as working towards serving political ends, hence making the political potential of discourse more overt than Foucault did. For example, both Sara Mills (1997) and Dorothy Smith (1990) have been concerned to analyse power relations and the way that women as individuals and as group members negotiate relations of power.

In particular, Dorothy Smith (1990) sees discourse less as something to which one is subjected than as a vehicle which subjects can use to work out interpersonal relationships. Individual subjects should not be seen as simply adapting to roles mapped out for them by discourse. Rather than assuming that discourses force us to behave in certain ways, Smith emphasises the more social and context-bound view of discourse which is attentive to what individual subjects do within and through discursive structures. Her approach to discourse theory sees power as enacted within relationships and thus something which can be contested at every moment and in every interaction. So Smith's work on femininity as discourse sees women as actively working out their subject positions and roles in the process of negotiating discursive constraints. This textual/discursive nature of femininity makes it open to reinterpretation and rescripting. This process of actively constructing positions for themselves within discourse is never fully achieved but is rather one of constant evaluation and shifting reflecting the belief that discursive structures are sites where power struggles are continually played out.

For over four decades, feminists have insisted that 'the personal is political'. By reinscribing the 'political' into the private sphere feminists have been able to map out possible strategies for bringing about change within an increasingly complex system of power (Mills, 1997). By using discourse as an instrument of power it is possible to resist oppressive practices in everyday life and to see that resistance as a political act. It is the manner in which discourse is conceptualised that allows for this sense of the complexity of power relations. The idea of women using the resources available at hand in conversation to challenge inequalities in status has been very influential and has challenged the reified notion of power as a possession. Precisely because it is a discursive procedure it is open to revision and rewriting. Instead of seeing women cast merely as passive victims of an oppressive ideology, feminist theory recasts women as able to formulate ways of analysing power as it manifests itself and how it can be resisted in the relations of everyday life. Women can be viewed as agents who can challenge the notion that there is a form of language which is powerful and the preserve only of men. Thus they can accrue power to themselves by negotiating with the seemingly powerless positions which they have been allotted.

Moving forward within the context of this theoretical framing we now provide an analysis of Sanghera's discursive strategies aimed at challenging the discourse of honour and paving the way for the establishment of Karma Nirvana. Our analysis is presented within three separate strategies: first, positioning an oppositional discourse; second, distribution of the discourse; and third, breaching the code of silencing – identified in our previous analysis as being enforced by the practices of shaming, family secrecy, and self-blame. In so doing, we draw attention to two significant discursive tactics employed by Sanghera: 'invoking' and 're-wording'.

Sanghera acts to *position an oppositional discourse* to provide a direct challenge to the veracity of the prevalent discourse of honour. Although her own strong, self-contained honour-based community was difficult to breach from within ("what I thought didn't matter because I'd been disowned"), Sanghera relied upon the fact that its existence as a 'culture within a culture' laid it open to de-hegemonisation from outside, namely by drawing upon the norms of the majority British culture within which her own community was nested. Foucault (1981) reminds us that discourses do not exist in a vacuum but are in constant conflict with other discourses and other social practices which inform them over questions of truth and authority. In effect, Sanghera aimed to take advantage of the problematics and contradictions that occur at the intersection of the host and nested communities (Essers and Benschop, 2007) by *invoking* an alternative and hostile British discourse, one more attuned to the norms of gender equality and social justice. In this sense, '*invoking*' refers to the discursive strategy of calling upon other authoritative texts that promote particular meanings sympathetic to one's objectives (Maguire and Hardy, 2006). For Sanghera, an integral element in the process of social transformation involved first an attempt to 'strain' the nexus between the two discourses which had thus far survived an uneasy alliance, mainly through the British authorities' tolerance and/or ignorance of practices involved in the discourse of honour. In this pursuit, she relies upon a form of *re-wording* (Halliday, 1978; Edelman, 1974; Fairclough, 1992) that launches a de-formative attack upon the concepts of 'family honour' and 'discipline', instead re-labelling these as 'subjugation of women', 'abuse', 'honour-based violence', 'honour killings', 'bullying', 'imprisonment', and 'invisible torment behind closed doors', set against a constant threat of disownment. In this sense, '*re-wording*' refers to the discursive strategy of generating new wordings in a hostile and oppositional way which are

established as alternatives for conventional wordings; the process of employing different vocabularies to espouse different logics as the basis for establishing legitimacy (Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005). Her language is audacious, aimed at overwhelming and destroying established convention by knocking the stabilised discourse out of its orbit (Bate, 1994).

These emotive images had the ability to resonate within the host culture, energising and disturbing people, converting them to reject a previous tolerance, by expressing an idea in a new and symbolic way that enabled people to comprehend something that was previously not comprehended (Bate, 1994). By reaching out and employing the rhetoric of the host culture, Sanghera is able to reframe the concepts of honour and shame and turn this back on her own 'nested' community in an attempt to dislodge the discourse of honour. By invoking an alternative discourse, one based on social justice and gender equality, she is able to spark a social transformation process more willing to disown certain immigrant cultural practices and interfere directly in immigrant norms that British authorities had traditionally not only ignored due to cultural and religious sensitivity, but had sometimes actively encouraged under the practice of tolerance and allowing self-determination within such communities. In the newly re-configured field of acceptable discourse, British authorities have started to acknowledge the problems faced by women in certain cultural groups. In establishing the Forced Marriage Unit the rhetoric has now been adopted that regards forced marriage as a form of domestic violence and an abuse of human rights. A thought mode has been created which no longer accommodates existing orthodox forms and whose presence produces the tension that enables traditions and conventions to be challenged, contested, discredited, and replaced (Bate, 1994).

Sanghera's efforts to *distribute the discourse* (Fairclough, 1992) commenced in a modest way by spreading the word through her local exercise classes but soon involved communication across a range of grass-roots institutional domains - hospitals, health centres, general practitioners, police stations, social services, voluntary agencies, and primary care groups – making them aware of what Karma Nirvana did and forming links. Effective social entrepreneurship is predicated on the ability to act inter-sectorially by establishing and managing multiple relationships through networking and co-operation (Thompson, 2002; Prabhu, 1999). To launch the project she decided upon the focused idea of a women's health day, stressing that no men would be allowed to attend, so creating an unthreatening event that husbands would allow their wives to attend. The occasion attracted local political support: the local councillor agreed to give a talk and the local Member of Parliament officially opened the event, hence nurturing an alternative power base and *invoking* different and hostile norms. Sanghera's "whirlwind of ideas" was nourished by a growing band of female supporters who provided help, advice, encouragement, and mentoring, in particular a financial "genius" whose acumen uncovered numerous pockets of money, and a steady stream of grant money, including Lottery funding.

Sanghera's attempts to *breach the code of silencing* follow the framework we analysed earlier in the article, namely breaching the three constraints of shaming, family secrecy, and self-blame. We now analyse the strategies that set up this code for discursive challenge.

Re-assessing family secrecy: Breaking the taboo of the bond of family secrecy marked the first epiphany for Sanghera. Whilst attending a women's listening skills course she experienced for the first time a 'group of strangers' sharing their own intimate stories with one another, an openness that she found to be alien to her, to the point of resembling a 'foreign language'. Zietsma, Winn, Branzei, and Vertinsky (2002) argue that those who have direct exposure to people with other viewpoints are often stimulated into individual reflection and intuition. They label this concept 'attending', or the process of information seeking from the environment. Attending to external stimuli and alternate, divergent views is more likely to be practiced by open-minded individuals who are 'in readiness' for the experience, such as Sanghera. Inexorably she was drawn into sharing the story of herself and her sisters with the women.

"That session marked a turning point for me. It violated so many of the premises on which my whole life had been built. Mum's insistence on preserving the family's good name and presenting a good face meant anything unpleasant had always been buried within the confines of our family. The concept of trusting an 'outsider' to listen sympathetically and not to judge you was never even mooted. Secrecy was a cornerstone of my childhood. Now I'd cracked that cornerstone and, to my amazement, the world was still turning just the same" (p200).

Sanghera's epiphany revolved around the realisation that although she had revealed her truth about the frailties of her family, and exposed her deepest feelings, she was still accepted and valued by the women, rather than being judged and scorned.

“Those women’s empathy showed me that my experience wasn’t shameful or disgraceful. It was part of me and it made me who I was. I sat there that evening and it was as if my eyes had been opened. I looked back at my childhood and realised that the web of secrecy Mum spun around us had made me blind to so many good things in the world, things like truth and honesty, and compassion” (p200).

Sanghera subsequently went into counselling, thus breaking another childhood taboo, before reaching her conclusion that “secrecy is a stifling bond rather than a protective cloak” as she had been conditioned to believe within the discourse of honour.

Re-sourcing self-blame: By breaching the bond of family secrecy Sanghera had set herself up to deconstruct the nature of a compliant subject and commence the discursive process of breaking another silencing taboo - that women through their actions can bring shame upon their family and community, and must accept the blame for bringing such dishonour. We have seen how feminist theory has significantly modified the notion of discourse by setting it more clearly in its social context and by examining the possibilities of negotiating within these discursive structures. Using the notion of discourse has enabled feminists to construct scenarios for social change and subject positions for women as active agents. Additionally, we have argued that entrepreneurship as a form of social action can be regarded as an activity that challenges the status quo by operating at the boundaries of convention. It is not compatible with social stability or settled practices. We can argue that those women who display themselves as compliant subjects, in the process construct themselves as those compliant subjects (Foucault, 1981). Thus, women who submit to a relation of power may attribute to themselves any blame for problems that arise from that particular construction. Such an internalisation may not be in the woman’s best interests. Sanghera recalls the occasion when she told her father that she had been ‘flushed at’ by a man on her way home from school. Her father was furious and raged “you must avoid these situations; do you want to bring dishonour on yourself?” Similarly, the non-English-speaking bride disowned by her husband for allowing herself to be examined by a male doctor, accepted that she was at fault for bringing her husband’s cruelty on herself, even though she did not possess the English skills to tell the doctor to stop. However, this situation can be re-framed through re-location within a particular politicised context, setting ‘failure’ and ‘self-blame’ into contexts where those same ‘failings’ can be viewed as structural problems stemming from a discourse’s demands on women (Mills, 1997). Such a re-framing would then be able to construct a woman as being the victim rather than the perpetrator of a crime.

Re-constructing a shameful act: Through her discursive challenge to the meaning and consequences of the bond of family secrecy and the acceptance of female self-blame, Sanghera is able to substantively undermine the hegemony of ‘silencing’ within the discourse of honour. The third prong in the code of silencing, the fear of shaming, can now be set up for discursive challenge.

“My parents care more about honour than they do about me...How could anyone turn their back on their own child for the sake of a concept? How could that be considered honourable? To me it seems a cause of shame” (p261)

Thus, Sanghera discursively de-forms the notion of ‘honour’ by re-forming it into the notion of ‘shame’. What was previously construed to be an honourable act has now been re-constructed as a shameful act whenever it involves ‘turning your back on your own child’. By the introduction of a single contingency into her discursive struggle (abandoning your own child) she feels able to *re-word* the notion of ‘honour’ into that of ‘shame’, thus introducing an alternative hostile interpretation for a word that forms the foundation of the discourse of honour. For Sanghera, suffering rejection from those who are supposed to love and protect you is now re-constructed as the ultimate cause of shame. Within this interpretation, she struggles to reconcile why her mother failed to protect her daughters (“to ask for help and have your mother turn her back on you. Your mother!”), and always insisted that unhappiness was just a normal part of married life. Her rhetorical questions abound:

“How could you have told me I was dead in your eyes? How could you have turned [my sister] away? How could you not have been there for me when I had [my daughter]? (p155).

The implicit ‘shoulds’ and ‘should-nots’ inherent in these questions reveal how, for Sanghera, the self had been left with an unrequited need for love, support, and affirmation (Morrison, 1989). Her anger and hyperactive energy is turned outward towards the perceived source – her mother, and through her mother to the wider framing causations of her family and community. Those who have been responsible for her abandonment must be transformed in order for Sanghera to re-attain the nourishment she was denied. Her needful self must be re-constituted. Sanghera’s language is aimed at

discrediting the ruling truth, an attempt to make it passé or obsolescent. By 'making the political personal' she attempts to present a starkly different construction of reality, one that expresses a founding idea, one that has the power to capture people's attention and move them to experience situations in novel ways (Bate, 1994). Our argument relates to the process of how Sanghera's social entrepreneurial endeavour acts to displace the strong bond of conventionality through a bypassed shame reaction to the withdrawal of interactional deference. By using conversational resources immediately available at hand she is able to complexify the system of traditional power relations and so create a discursive space that allows her to challenge inequities in status. By this process of revision and rewriting she can cast away the notion of a passive oppressed victim and adopt the role of an active agent who lays claim to language previously the domain of men.

CONCLUSION

In this article we have theorised a process of female social entrepreneurship in terms of a discursive struggle that challenges the status quo and operates at the boundaries of convention and received wisdom. We have argued that the motor of entrepreneurship is fuelled by the emotional dynamics generated through a bypassed shame reaction to the withdrawal of interactional deference. By employing a case study of a social entrepreneurial activist we have presented a number of discursive strategies that locate this type of social entrepreneurship within the context of challenging, disrupting and displacing a dominant discourse, thus creating the space for the legitimising of an alternative and competing discourse.

We argue that this approach makes a strong contribution to the extant social entrepreneurship literature. We have earlier observed how the field has been relatively ignored by academic researchers, leaving the literature sparsely theorised. By placing an emphasis on the displacement of a dominant discourse as the essence of the social activist entrepreneurial process we challenge and broaden the prevalence of positivist epistemologies in the literature by introducing an overt constructionist approach. Discourse theory has the potential to further our theorising in this area, a challenge that can be taken up by other researchers. Social entrepreneurial activists are deeply enmeshed within their social context. The complex nature of this social involvement makes discourse theory particularly suitable as the theoretical backdrop for the study of social entrepreneurship. Discursive practice not only contributes to the reproduction of social identities, social relationships, and systems of knowledge and belief, but also contributes to their displacement and transformation. It is for this reason that we argue that the social entrepreneur is engaged in a discursive struggle at the intersection of competing discourses. A discursive approach offers a fruitful method of gaining insight into how the social entrepreneur plots, reflects on, and makes sense of, the contingencies that are located within the dynamic, unstable, and complex forces at play. By framing the social entrepreneurial process within temporal and spatial discursively-created interpretations and reinterpretations, we defy the ability of conventional objectivist cause-effect linkages to adequately capture the richness and complexity of the relationships between life, ideology, family, community, and social context that characterise the life-world of the social entrepreneur.

We argue that our research also makes a strong case for furthering the role of 'emotion' as a central element in the processes of both entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship. Whereas the extant literature emphasises notions related to personality types such as passion, courage, and risk-taking as drivers within the entrepreneurial process, we have stressed an emotional dynamic that is not individually situated but rather socially derived, and expressed in the form of bypassed shame generated through a reaction to the withdrawal of interactional deference. By harnessing the emotional anger and hyperactive energy inherent in this process with the concept of a 'motor of entrepreneurship', we argue the process can be combined with the notion of 'discursive struggle' at the intersection of discourse boundaries thus enabling us to theorise the dynamic movements of emotionally-infused instability that produces entrepreneurial change as occurring in sites where power struggles are played out.

A significant practical implication of our paper is to stress the importance of including 'critical literacy' in our tertiary and vocational educational curricula if we as a society wish to ensure the adequate production and preparation of social entrepreneurs. We do, of course, realise that one of the limitations of this paper is that we have confined our analysis to one case study of a female social entrepreneur operating in hostile circumstances. Further research is now required across other types of social entrepreneurial endeavour. Several research questions can be posed. What role does the emotional dynamic of bypassed shame play in other scenarios of social entrepreneurship? What is its contingent variability? What other discursive strategies, other than those already identified in this paper, can be usefully employed as a means of unsettling and undermining a dominant discourse? In what situations is the notion of discursive struggle less applicable as a theoretical framing for social

entrepreneurial endeavour, and why? Further research into these questions will contribute to more complex theorising in the field of social entrepreneurship.

REFERENCES

- Ali, S (2008) *Belonging*, London: John Murray
- Austin, J (2006) "Three avenues for social entrepreneurial research", chapter 3 in Mair, J. Robinson, J. and Hockerts, K. (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 22-33
- Austin, J. Stevenson, H. and Wei-Skillern, J (2006) "Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both?" *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1-22
- Baron, R (2008) "The role of affect in the entrepreneurial process", *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 328-340
- Bate, P (1994) *Strategies for cultural change*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann
- Bornstein, D (2004) *How to change the world: social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Brandon, J and Hafez, S (2008) *Crimes of the community: honour-based violence in the UK*, London: Centre for Social Cohesion
- Bruyat, C and Julien, P (2000) "Defining the field of research in entrepreneurship" *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 165-180
- Casson, M (1982) *The entrepreneur: an economic theory*, Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble
- Collins, R (2004) *Interaction ritual chains*, Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Dearlove, D (2004) "Interview: Jeff Skoll", *Business Strategy Review*, 15(2), 51-53
- Dees, J (1998) "Enterprising nonprofits", *Harvard Business Review*, 76(1), 54-66
- Down, S (2006) *Narratives of enterprise: crafting entrepreneurial self-identity in a small firm*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Edelman, M (1974) "The political language of the helping professions", *Politics and Society*, 4, 295-310
- Essers, C and Benschop, Y (2007) "Enterprising identities: female entrepreneurs of Moroccan or Turkish origin in the Netherlands", *Organization Studies*, 28(1), 49-69
- Fairclough, N (1992) *Discourse and social change*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Foucault, M (1972) *The archaeology of knowledge*, London: Routledge
- Foucault, M (1981) "The order of discourse", chapter 3 in Young, R (Ed), *Untying the text: a post-structuralist reader*, Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 48-78
- Fredrickson, B (1998) "What good are positive emotions?" *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 300-319
- Fredrickson, B (2000) "Why positive emotions matter in organizations: lessons from the broaden-and-build model", *Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 4, 131-142
- Frijda, N (1986) *The emotions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Goffman, E (1967) *Interaction ritual*, New York: Doubleday

- Goss, D (2005) "Entrepreneurship and 'the social': towards a deference-emotion theory", *Human Relations*, 58(5), 617-636
- Halliday, M (1978) *Language as social semiotic*, London: Edward Arnold
- Hockerts, K (2006) "Entrepreneurial opportunity in social purpose business ventures" chapter 10 in Mair, J. Robinson, J. and Hockerts, K. (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 142-154
- Johnson, S (2000) "Literature review on social entrepreneurship", Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, accessed 12 October 2006, <http://www.bus.ualberta.ca/ccse/Publications/Publications/Lit.%20Review%20SE%20November%202000.rtf>
- Jones, R, Latham, J, and Betta, M (2008) "Narrative construction of the social entrepreneurial identity", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 14(5), 330-345
- Katz, J (1997) "The elements of shame" chapter 9 in Lansky, M and Morrison, A (Eds), *The widening scope of shame*, London: Analytical Press, 231-260
- Leadbeater, C (1997) *The rise of the social entrepreneur*, London: Demos
- Levenson, R (1994) "Human emotions: a functional view", in Ekman, P and Davidson, R (Eds), *The nature of emotion: fundamental questions*, New York: Oxford University Press, 123-126
- Lewis, H (1971) *Shame and guilt in neurosis*, New York: International Universities Press
- Maguire, S and Hardy, C (2006) "The emergence of new global institutions: a discursive perspective", *Organization Studies*, 27(1), 7-29
- Mair, J, Robinson, J, and Hockerts, K (2006) *Social entrepreneurship*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan
- Mills, S (1997) *Discourse*, Abingdon: Routledge
- Mills, S (2003) *Michel Foucault*, Abingdon: Routledge
- Morrison, A (1989) *Shame: the underside of narcissism*, Hillsdale: Analytic Press
- Nathanson, D (1992) *Shame and pride: affect, sex and the birth of the self*, W W Norton
- Nicholls, A (2006) *Social entrepreneurship*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Perrini, F (2006) "Social entrepreneurship domain: setting boundaries" chapter 1 in Perrini, F (Ed), *The new social entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1-25
- Prabhu, G (1999) "Social entrepreneurial leadership", *Career Development International*, 4(3), 140-145
- Sanghera, J (2007) *Shame*, London: Hodder and Stoughton
- Scheff, T (1990) *Micro-sociology*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Scheff, T (1997a) "Shame in social theory" chapter 8 in Lansky, M and Morrison, A (Eds), *The widening scope of shame*, London: Analytical Press, 205-230
- Scheff, T (1997b) *Emotions, the social bond and human reality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Schumpeter, J (1934) *The theory of economic development*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

- Smith, D (1990) *Texts, facts and femininity: exploring the relations of ruling*, London: Routledge
- Stewart, F (1994) *Honor*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Steyaert, C and Hjorth, D (2006) "What is social in social entrepreneurship?" Introduction in Steyaert, C and Hjorth, D (Eds), *Entrepreneurship as social change*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1-18
- Suddaby, R and Greenwood, R (2005) "Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50, 35-67
- Thompson, J (2002) "The world of the social entrepreneur", *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 15(5), 412-432
- Wei-Skillern, J, Austin, J, Leonard, H, and Stevenson, H (2007) *Entrepreneurship in the social sector*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Weiss, H and Cropanzano, R (1996) "Affective events theory: a theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work", in Staw, B and Cummings, L (Eds), *Research in organizational behavior*, Vol 18, Stamford: Jai Press, 1-74
- Worline, M, Wrzesniewski, A, and Rafaeli, A (2002) "Courage and work: breaking routines to improve performance" chapter 9 in Lord, R, Klimoski, R, and Kanfer, R (Eds), *Emotions in the workplace*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 295-330
- Zietsma, C, Winn, M, Branzei, O, and Vertinsky, I (2002) "The war of the woods: facilitators and impediments of organizational learning processes", *British Journal of Management*, 13, S61-S74

Figure 1: Challenging and Disrupting the Status Quo through Discursive Struggle: A Bypassed Shame Reaction

