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Abstract: Social Entrepreneurship is undoubtedly a very promising avenue for effecting social change. But the very efficiency that is its hallmark is also a critical cause for concern. The most common way as Prahalad defined the motive behind Social Entrepreneurs included the desire to change society and discomfort with the status quo as the main stimuli for SEs to innovate. This makes them more sensitive to entrepreneurial opportunities that deal with social problems and unsatisfied social needs. Social Entrepreneurs create value by building portfolios of resources to address unmet social needs.

To a large extent from the literature available it can be said that certain factors guide and direct the working, functioning and sustainability of SE like background of the social entrepreneur and his aptitude and experience, orientation, understanding, collaborative skills and leadership and their background, the problem that is to be solved which decides the opportunity, the form of organization they are planning to shape, the possible barriers like economic, public, social, institutional etc. and how far the problem and the resulting opportunity is inter-sectorial in nature which helps in assessing the social outcome and resource planning and leveraging as well.

Because of its inter-sectorial nature, SE needs a strong ability to establish and manage multiple relationships, stand out for focusing their attention on a different set of possibilities, innovative ways to create or sustain social change by bringing two different cultures - business and nonprofit.

Given the shifting and deeply contested nature of the ‘social’ good, attention to politics and values will be critical if SE is to fulfill its potential as a driving force for positive social change. The three major issues that are of concern and are actually the starting points for any Social Entrepreneur includes defining the opportunity, launching the organization and its effective functioning and financial resource allocation and leveraging. Thus, the success of any SE will depend on right identification of opportunity, evaluating the opportunity and pursuit of that opportunity. Thus it is important for any entrepreneur before venturing in any social venture to first cognitively assess the market before it enters the market, and strategic navigation while entering and designing thus executing the market strategy.

Thus, the objectives of this paper are as follows:

a) To understand the nature, skills and scope of social entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship (how they are different from other business /entrepreneurs) and factors promoting their growth
b) To understand their contribution in building a skill based socially oriented sustainability model and their global access
c) To understand the approach and the process for building an Social entrepreneurial model-The basic elements
d) To understand the role of SE in advancing an innovative insight to organization thus building sustainability.
From the discussion it is made clear that before venturing for any SE venture it is important for the entrepreneur himself to understand the distinctiveness that a SE possess in contrast to any other business apart from understanding the area, function, needed business model, orientation towards it of self and of the team, type of structure and form of organization, the model to be developed to float the venture and the possible constraints/barriers in the process.
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**Introduction**

**Understanding the foundation of Social Entrepreneurship and drivers of Growth**

We are all witnessing that Indian business environment today is marked by opportunities and challenges. It is because of the unleashing efforts of the Indian Economy in the early nineties, the economy, at this juncture, appears to be apombl for a big growth. Our great global success stories, stemming from the value proposition, have created the 'India brand’ in the global arena. According to a report by Goldman Sachs titled ‘Dreaming with BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India and China): The Path to 2050’ predicts that India’s economy could be larger than Japan’s by 2032, effectively. Companies and nonprofits, regardless of the sector they belong to, their dimension or their geographical location, are increasingly asked to provide innovative solutions to manage complex social problems: from community development to social exclusion and poverty reduction (Margolis and Walsh, 2003). Social entrepreneurship (SE), an unusual contact point among entrepreneurship, innovation and social change, has been increasingly catalyzing the interest of academics, companies, and the business debate for about a decade. Attention is expanding exponentially with a multiplicity of publications, MBA core and elective courses and academic research centers explicitly focused on deep analysis of the SE phenomenon. There are also numerous innovative and supportive factors such as specialized consulting groups, social venture capitalists, and social angels and so on.

It is commonly said that Entrepreneurship research can be broadly placed into three categories: that which examines the **people** (entrepreneurs); that which examines the **process** and that which examines the entrepreneurial or business **opportunities**. For this it is important to understand how social entrepreneurship is different from other business, a very popular definition of SE goes like, “Social entrepreneurship is a process (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000) that includes: the identification of a specific social problem and a specific solution (or set of solutions) to address it; the evaluation of the social impact, the business model and the sustainability of the venture; and the creation of a social mission-oriented for-profit or a business-oriented nonprofit entity that pursues the double (or triple) bottom line. This approach to defining SE allows for future research directions and for clearer distinctions from ‘traditional entrepreneurship.

**Key Drivers of Social Entrepreneurship**

SE is a uniting concept that demonstrates the usefulness of business principles in achieving social goals. The term SE is an umbrella term that includes social enterprises, social venture capital, and social purpose organizations. It is a term that is being used all around the world to describe the people, the ventures and the activities that innovate for
social good. Social entrepreneurs who span these sartorial boundaries are particularly adept at innovation.

Thus, SE can be understood as, “any novel and useful solution to a social need or problem, that is better than existing approaches (i.e., more effective, cop efficient, sustainable, or just) and for which the value created (benefits) accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals”.

Social entrepreneurship is innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, and public sectors. (Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern, 2006). Social sector markets have two defining characteristics. First, they are social in nature: in other words, the context of these markets has a significant impact on greater society. Second, they are highly influenced by both formal – and informal – social and institutional factors.

The concept of social entrepreneurship (SE) is, in practice, recognized as encompassing a wide range of activities: enterprising individuals devoted to making a difference; social purpose business ventures dedicated to adding for profit motivations to the nonprofit sector; new types of philanthropists supporting venture capital-like ‘investment’ portfolios; and nonprofit organizations that are reinventing themselves by drawing on lessons learned from the business world. It is an innovative way for social value creation.

Austin creates a working definition of SE around three key elements – innovation, social value creation, and loci. Comparative analysis along five possible dimensions of time, place form, actor, and practice, points towards issues for understanding S.E and these factors as the primary factors behind growth of Social Entrepreneurship.

The key shifts that one observed during early 2000 was the growth in management and leadership skills. Many business leaders voluntarily expressed keenness to understand, explore and develop leadership orientations. This was a dramatic shift with Business Unit leaders proactively owning the leadership development charter. Focused interventions to groom and develop “Hi Potential leaders” gained prominence. With the advent of the Next gen or “millennial” in the workforce along with social media playing a visible role, new dimensions to people development would become imperative to explore and catapulting India into the top three economies of the world. Driven by technological, social, political and economic factors, the Indian growth story is robust and sustainable.

The concept and researches on social entrepreneurship re vivid and interpret different outcomes, this is so because each SE has a different perspective, inclination orientation, aptitude, leadership skill and understanding towards selection for right opportunity and executing the right social cause.

Thus based on the above diversity a social entrepreneurship matrix developed by (Schoderbeck, Schoderbek, and Kefalas, 1985; Taylor, 2001), is a useful next step in the process of understanding how factors relevant to social entrepreneurship might interact.
It can be clearly seen the social entrepreneur can exist in any of the four resulting quadrants. Each offers a different approach to business and can serve as a guide to the social entrepreneur as he or she attempts to develop and grow his or her business. Moreover, the matrix can help investors, analysts and other interested stakeholders more fully consider the nature of social commerce in relation to all potential business form options.

Figure 1.Social entrepreneurship matrix developed by (Schoderbeck, Schoderbek, and Kefalas, 1985; Taylor, 2001).

The International Labor Organization (ILO) estimates that 160 million women and men are officially counted as unemployed and another billion or more people are underemployed or working poor. Social entrepreneurs help to reinvigorate local economies and maintain healthy productive labor forces in ways which stimulate self-sustainability rather than create aid dependency.

Furthermore, social entrepreneurs are building resources in the form of human and social capital and intangible assets such as trust and credibility that may put them in a prime position to become the partners of corporations to develop new markets and new types of service offerings (Seelos and Mair, 2005b), and to contribute directly to large-scale economic development as well.

Moreover, 500 million new entrants to over the next ten years, mostly women and youth. The ILO emphasizes the critical role that entrepreneurs play in creating employment. It carries out significant promotional and technical activities to assist governments,
employers’ and workers’ organizations create more and better jobs in countries around the world. Enterprise is at the heart of employment creation. Social entrepreneurs invent service provision models that cater to the very basic needs of individuals and they also change and institutionalize behavior, norms and rules that enable communities and societies to allocate resources more fairly and formalize individual rights.

The four important components that decides largely the success of SE includes: mission, vision and organizational values; (II) entrepreneurial opportunities and innovation; (III) entrepreneurial model; and (IV) social welfare impact.

Thus, it can be said that conceptual development in social entrepreneurship may provide a unique context for integrating strategy and entrepreneurship research by enhancing understanding of how organizations simultaneously create social value and achieve competitive advantages. For example, the strategic management literature has examined the role that firm, strategic group, and industry levels play in determining differences in firm performance (Short et al, 2007).

Previous studies based on development of social Entrepreneurship
Irrespective of so much of research and studies drawing a clear and single definition of SE is a herculean task as there are multiple variables guiding its growth and development for example in academic and popular circles, many people now combine notions of innovation, catalyzing change, seizing opportunity and demonstrating resourcefulness into the definition. Often people ascribe a particular ‘mind-set’ to entrepreneurs that exhibit common traits such as single-mindedness, drive, ambition, creative, problem solving, practical, and goal oriented.

Despite increased interest in social entrepreneurship, scholarly research has been challenging. Because definitions of social entrepreneurship have been developed in a number of different domains, such as not-for-profits, for-profits, the public sector, and combinations of all three, a unified definition has yet to emerge (Christie and Honig, 2006; Weerawardena and Mort, 2006). For example, some definitions limit social entrepreneurship to non profit organizations (Lasprogata and Cotton, 2003) while others describe social entrepreneurship as for profit companies operated by nonprofit organizations.

Still others equate social entrepreneurship to philanthropy (Ostrander, 2007) existing social entrepreneurship research and propose a model that delineates its conceptual boundaries. Ireland and Webb (2007), who examined the diverse nature of disciplines contributing to entrepreneurship research and reported the linkages of a variety of disciplines, such as accounting, anthropology, economics, finance, management, marketing, operations management, political science, psychology, and sociology.

With the generalized slowdown of national economic growth rates and increases in unemployment, the first phenomenon has been accompanied by a deep rethink of social strategies at every level with specific regard to the supply of social services. Those waves...
of privatizations and decentralizations so common in the public policies of the 1980s are the main effect of this trend. As a result, a progressively increasing number of social needs has been left unsatisfied thus giving rise to a growing demand for private providers of social services able to match socially relevant goals with efficient and effective management practices (Dees, 1998b).

Different scholars have contributed in different manner and with different perspectives in context to development of SE for example a major contribution is by Peredo and Chrisman’s (2006) in *Academy of Management Review* present the unique work for future theoretical developments extending the concept of social entrepreneurship.

They extend research in social entrepreneurship to develop the concept of community-based enterprise, combining elements from commercial entrepreneurship, anthropology, and social network theory to show how community-based enterprises may differ from the standard notion of entrepreneurship. In their model, economic factors are integrated with natural and social capital to transform a community into both an entrepreneur and an enterprise. Their model suggests that social and economic stress, incremental learning, the level of social capital or resources, and community size are key determinants of the emergence of community-based enterprises.

Another study by Mair and Marti (2006: 37), who note, ‘First, we view social entrepreneurship as a process of creating value by combining resources in new ways. Second, these resource combinations are intended primarily to explore and exploit opportunities to create social value by stimulating social change or meeting social needs. And third, when viewed as a process, social entrepreneurship involves the offering of services and products but can also refer to the creation of new organizations.

Austin et al. (2006) suggest that a harsh economic context increases the demand for social services; at the same time, philanthropic donations are more difficult to procure in economically challenging times.

Thus, efforts to understand the degree to which industry matters for the performance of social entrepreneurial ventures could provide a contribution to both strategic management and entrepreneurship literatures (cf. Short et al., 2009).

The first, opportunity creation theory, asserts that opportunities do not exist independent of the entrepreneur, but rather are created by the actions, reactions, and enactment of entrepreneurs as they explore new ways to generate new products or services (e.g., Eckhardt and Shane, 2003). According to this view, entrepreneurs cannot *search* for opportunities, but rather act and observe the effects of their actions. In discovery theory, entrepreneurs are assumed to be quite different from non entrepreneurs and, as a result, are able to detect an opportunity where others would not (Alvarez and Barney, 2007).
Recent work incorporates both perspectives and suggests that social entrepreneurs use satisfying, rather than profit maximization, to recognize social opportunities because the value of these opportunities is difficult to quantify (Zahra et al., 2008).

Thompson (2002) provides a point of departure in his description of organizations that fall within the category of the ‘social’: Organizations are ‘social’ when they are not owned by identifiable shareholders and profit is not the driving objective. Moreover, they ‘belong’ to society, rather than, say, to the state.

Thompson’s definition raises several important distinctions. Initially, it establishes the ‘social’ as a domain purposively separate from the world of private ownership. Second, the definition distinguishes ‘society’ from the ‘state’, establishing the ‘social’ as a domain separate from the formal apparatus of public authority. Social organizations are therefore neither fully private nor fully public; they operate somewhere in the space between state and market.

SE concept can be explained as a sort of ‘recent innovation’ in the field of social enterprise functioning (Dart, 2004) and then substantiated in the shift towards managerial competencies and market-based attitudes of nonprofit actors in order to improve their operational efficiency and effectiveness. In this sense, social enterprise and SE are viewed as a kind of ‘encompassing set of strategic responses to many of the varieties of environmental turbulence and situational challenges that nonprofit organizations face today.

Venkataraman (1997) considers that traditional entrepreneurs generate social value as a byproduct of economic value, whereas for social entrepreneurs (and therefore other mission-driven individuals such as ecopreneurs) the reverse is true. Balancing the often competing demands of the wide variety of stakeholders (Hall and Vredenburg, 2003) representing the triptych of economic, social and environmental concerns is a key skill for the social ecopreneur.

Current literature is also in agreement in recognizing three main steps which, although typical of business entrepreneurship, take on a new value and therefore become useful in the overall comprehension of the SE phenomenon. They are: (i) Opportunity definition—Instead of focusing only on external drivers, an entrepreneur’s previous personal experience combines with social needs, ‘gaps between socially desirable conditions and the existing reality’, social assets, and change to stimulate entrepreneurial ideas or innovations for social impact. (ii) Organizational launch and functioning (iii) Financial resource collection and leveraging.

Innovation is a key theme in social entrepreneurship research, but more effort is needed to build social entrepreneurship- related innovation theory. Disruptive innovation theory explains how expensive, complicated products and services are often supplanted by inexpensive, simple ones when capabilities of cutting edge innovations overshoot the demands of existing customers (Christensen, 1997)
Contributive aspects and Global reach of Social Entrepreneurship: A growth indicator for future

It is now seen that new social players differentiate themselves from their business counterparts in terms of the final objective toward which the entrepreneurial process is addressed. This is an explicit social objective – for example, the creation of social welfare, the enhancement of social inclusion and cohesion, wide access to knowledge and information, community development.

After understanding conceptually/theoretically what SE stands for a specific understanding can be developed about the concept, but irrespective of the research and findings in this field an exact understanding of what SE stands for and how does it benefit and is distinct from a routine business perspective is difficult to understand this is so because the concept is inherently complex and being in infant stage and surmounted by so many thoughts and circumstances a common definition and understanding across border is difficult to understand.

It is first important to have a common definition of who SE are their vision, mission, perspective, aptitude, skills and expertise and the social idea, target beneficiary, relevance and scope and the applicability of idea that they hold and above all the social outcome, which will emerge as a result of their project.

As Schuyler (1998) describes social entrepreneurs as ‘individuals who have a vision for social change and who have the financial resources to support their ideas’. Thompson, Alvy and Lees (2000) describe social entrepreneurs as ‘people who realize where there is an opportunity to satisfy some unmet need that the state welfare system will not or cannot meet, and who gather together the necessary resources (generally people, often volunteers, money and premises) and use these to “make a difference”.

One of the most frequently cited definitions of SE comes from J. Gregory Dees who defines social entrepreneurs as, “people who play the role of change agents in the social sector, by-
• Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value
• Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission
• Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning
• Acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand, and
• Exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created. (Dees, 2001: 4)

These definitions clearly are oriented towards the underlying principles, agenda, traits and expected outcome as a result of SE. It is important to emphasize these important elements because if beginning these points and concepts are not understood right from the beginning the basic motive and approach behind being a SE cannot be fulfilled.
The basic perspective of social entrepreneurs is that they are the change promoters in society who pioneer innovation within the social sector through the entrepreneurial quality of a breaking idea, their capacity building aptitude, and their ability to concretely demonstrate the quality of the idea and to measure social impacts. The most distinctive trait of SE are that they are not limited by the initial lack or scarcity of resources, instead they look for more innovative sources (McLeod, 1997); at the same time they also present a certain risk tolerance and a strong desire to control the surrounding environment (Prabhu, 1999).

As it is also seen through earlier studies that the desire to change society and discomfort with the status quo are the main stimuli for SEVs to innovate (Prabhu, 1999). This makes them more sensitive to entrepreneurial opportunities that deal with social problems and unsatisfied social needs (Mair and Noboa, 2003a): they create value by building portfolios of resources to address unmet social needs.

**The basic contribution that SE provide to the society includes:**

- **They serve as change agents in the social sector:** Social entrepreneurs are the reformers and revolutionaries described by Schumpeter, but with a social mission. They make fundamental changes in the way things are done in the social sector.

- **Their basic focus is on understanding the symptoms and resolving the problems rather than simply observing. Their basic purpose is to promote sustainable development in the required area.**

- **Social value centric mission and approach:** For a social entrepreneur, the social mission is fundamental. This is a mission of social improvement that cannot be reduced to creating private benefits for individuals. Making a profit, creating wealth, or serving the desires of customers may be part of the model, but these are means to a social end, not the end in itself. Social entrepreneurs look for a long-term social return on investment. They think about long term sustainable benefit rather than shorter gains.

- **Innovative approach for sustainability building:** Social entrepreneurs are not simply driven by the perception of a social need or by their compassion, rather they have a vision of how to achieve improvement and they are determined to make their vision work. This may require changing persistently the ideas or approaches while they work but they do not give up and remain consistent in their performance and objective.

- **Consistent learning and accommodative approach thus building creativity:** SE look for contemporary approaches and workability through execution in long term. They do not every time get involved in inventing something new rather even take hint/idea form what others have developed and apply it for the social benefit by fitting in the business model. The Social entrepreneurs need not be inventors. They simply need to be creative in applying what others have invented. Their innovations may appear in how they structure their core programs or in how they assemble the resources and fund their
work. It is a continuous process of exploring, learning, and improving. They even are proactive in building risk avoidance and being resilient if situation demands.

**Appropriate resource utilization**- The initiatives and the mission of Social entrepreneurs is not limited by the scarcity or arrangement of resources. They are skilled at doing more with less and at attracting resources from others with their networking and collaborative skills. They explore all resource options, from pure philanthropy to the commercial methods of the business sector. They are not bound by sector norms or traditions. They develop resource strategies that are likely to support and reinforce their social missions. They generally take calculated risk keeping special focus on the bottom level so as to sustain the project.

**Global access of Social Entrepreneurs**

Certain examples will clarify the global scope of social entrepreneurs

**a) ApproTEC (KickStart)**
ApproTEC (KickStart since 2005) identifies, develops and distributes low-cost technologies such as irrigation pumps and oilseed presses for small scale industries where capital investments can be recovered within six months. It was founded in Kenya in 1991 and has since opened offices in Tanzania and, more recently, Mali (both listed by the UN as LDCs). ApproTEC also distributes products in surrounding countries including Sudan, Uganda, Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and Senegal. It has a direct impact on three of the MDGs: eradicating poverty and hunger by providing appropriate technologies to create sustainable incomes in the region; empowering women who represent, a majority of recipients; and disseminating technology to developing countries. ApproTEC focuses on agricultural technologies to fight poverty. It began by penetrating deeply in one area (Kenya, Tanzania) and is now expanding into targeted areas where it can have a high impact as it gains capacity.

**b) BRAC**
Since it was founded in 1972, BRAC’s mission has been to empower and uplift the poor through a combination of microfinance with health, education, social development and environmental programs. Its holistic approach enables it to impact six of the MDGs which it perceives as interconnected. BRAC tackles: poverty and hunger with microfinance using an innovative village organization model; lack of education by providing non formal schooling programs; health problems through facility-based services, community volunteers and partnerships; and environmental issues through its social development programs. It has achieved deep penetration in one LDC, Bangladesh, and is one of the largest self-sustaining NGOs in the world.

**c) Riders for Health**
Riders for Health overcomes the problems of delivery and distribution for health services in developing countries by operating and maintaining a fleet of motorcycles and other vehicles, and by offering training in maintenance and driving skills, in regions where vehicles are normally used until they break down and left to decay by the roadside. This enables health workers in rural Africa to visit large numbers of people spread over huge territories more often and to deliver services more efficiently. Founded in 1998 in the UK, it operates in Gambia, Nigeria and Zimbabwe with a pilot program underway for Uganda. Riders for Health impacts three of the MDGs associated with health: reducing child mortality, reducing maternal mortality and combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other deadly diseases.

**High sense of accountability and social outcome approach** - Understanding the problems and limitations that ineffective social ventures at times display the SE take special care and exhibit high sense of accountability in creating social value.

This means that they seek a sound understanding of the constituencies they are serving. They make sure they have correctly assessed the needs and values of the people they intend to serve and the communities in which they operate. In some cases, this requires close connections with those communities. They understand the expectations and values of their “investors,” including anyone who invests money, time, and/or expertise to help them. They seek to provide real social improvements to their beneficiaries and their communities, as well as attractive (social and/or financial) return to their investors. They thus help in connecting a real value between the investor and the beneficiary.

Thus based on the framed objective which aimed at exploring the scope and global reach of social entrepreneurs it can be said that for social entrepreneurs, the social mission is explicit and central. This obviously affects how social entrepreneurs perceive and assess opportunities. Mission-related impact becomes the central criterion, not wealth creation. Wealth is just a means to an end for social entrepreneurs. With business entrepreneurs, wealth creation is a way of measuring value creation. This is because business entrepreneurs are subject to market discipline, which determines in large part whether they are creating value. If they do not shift resources to more economically productive uses, they tend to be driven out of business.

The entrepreneurs those who can pay the most for resources are typically the ones who can put the resources to higher valued uses, as determined in the marketplace and the profit at that a venture generates is a reasonably good indicator of the value it has created. If an entrepreneur cannot convince a sufficient number of customers to pay an adequate price to generate a profit, this is a strong indication that insufficient value is being created to justify this use of resources. Firms that create the most economic value have the cash to attract the resources needed to grow.

**Understanding the base for Social Entrepreneurship Model and approach** -
One of the most important factors that decide the success of SE understands the foundation on whose basis a socially oriented entrepreneurial model can be developed. It
is important because the SE models or approaches are little different from the other approaches, like traditional nonprofits, it was the funding organizations that had to be satisfied first, then the executive director then the employees and volunteers, and, only in the end, the people whose satisfaction was directly tied.

But the SE approach is a little different, the SE first look for the community of reference, understand their community of reference and choose such business that matches their target population needs. For example, microcredit’s and community venture capital are two examples of what knowledge of the consumer base means for SE.

Unlike the other groups or ventures the SE start the entrepreneurial process from an explicit, combined evaluation of social and economic potential and accordingly choose their target population. The basic trait and quality they remember is self sustenance and aptitude of own that will help them in sustaining for long and providing a set direction to their venture. This they maintain by keeping the cost low and focusing on quality, efficiency and profitability.

**Further the success of the stated growth depends on three important factors**-

**Networking** – This is one of the finest tool on which the SE depend and rely on as this helps un growing partnership with nonprofit agencies, public sector and other partners. This helps in reducing the cost, enhancing capacity building, shared resources and wonderful outcomes.

**Flexibility**: The other important factor that decides the approach and beginning for a SE is that the structure of the SE models are very flexible in the sense they inculcate participatory transparent and mutually exchanging approach thus makings seamless flow of information in the structure and timely action. This also helps in enriching he structure through a lot of information and alternative plan to benefit the end-users.

**Balancing and integrating the local and global dimension for growth**-This is one of the most creative parameter that any SE initiates and based on this sustains and develops the community making it independent. They add new sites through a targeted new site development plan, often helping communities to independently replicate a community-built model. This can be understood as an attempt to maintain a constant level of personality in the provision of social services and avoid the proved ineffectiveness of improving social conditions through standardized services (Borzaga and Defourny, 2004).

Thus, based on the above three important factors the SE try to benefit and grow the communities/areas for development in either of these areas/functions.-

- Health and Environmental issues
- Development of art and Humanities
- Youth and child development
 Relief from Natural disasters
 Community development
 Rehabilitation Poverty alleviation
 Curbing and assisting the Homeless
 Employment
 Skill development
 Research and Education

One of the recent areas which in common SE can work as agreed and suggested by Prahalad is access to information with technology support especially encouraged by those SEVs that work at the bottom of the pyramid, gaining access to information through technological progress is the main driver to enhance democracy and reduce overall asymmetry (Prahalad, 2004). The SE through this also help in capacity building, social cohesion through participation, personalization and interactive approaches.

This has also been supported by earlier studies that SE by contributing to solving or to alleviating the problems of specific groups, and by favoring the integration of disadvantaged people into the labor market with higher wages than those paid by sheltered employment workshops and sometimes for-profit companies, social enterprises also contribute to improving life conditions, the well-being of communities and the level of social integration (Borzaga and Defourny, 2004: 360). This objective is often supported by technology with a process of progressive dissemination and adaptation of technological progress to the different communities.

Thus it can be clearly understood from the above discussion that Social entrepreneurs find what’s not working, spread the solution, change the system from within, and persuade whole societies to change for the better.

To understand better this approach the model and the concept as defined by Francesco Perrini and Clodia Vurro can be explained, they defined the SE in a wholistic way as,” as a dynamic process created and managed by an individual or team (the innovative social entrepreneur), which strives to exploit social innovation with an entrepreneurial mindset and a strong need for achievement in order to create new social value in the market and community at large.

SEVs are at the nexus of profit strengths and nonprofit culture, constantly looking for a precarious equilibrium between management profitability and the ability to pursue a social mission both super ordinate to and sustained by the maximization of profits”.

Based on this they explain the process of social innovation in the following six steps-

1) Identifying a clear, “socially entrepreneurial” mission and the identification of a viable entrepreneurial opportunity stemming from vision-oriented and crisis-oriented factors. The mission summarizes the three key elements – innovation, entrepreneurship and tension towards specific social change – this makes
organizations consistent. All of the SE have a mission statement and a value chart, both of which are distinctly displayed on a specific section of their websites, and SE principles are clearly visible from the verbal formulas.

2) Setting a mission and a direction to identify highly unmet needs and developing a business model by converting it into an innovation based on important perspectives like a strong networking orientation, organizational flexibility, a wise trade-off between local and global dimensions and a participatory management philosophy.

3) Planning a social outcome It is important as it will lead to general social transformation in the long run, in terms of direct and indirect employment creation, access to information and knowledge and social cohesion.

4) Understanding closely the critical element of each step so as to find which process or factor needs to be focused more like globally integrating, balancing, networking, generating flexibility or any other.

5) Developing a correlation between different identified factors so as to establish a right mechanism and model to figure out the benefit, problems and outcomes. This will help in understanding and developing the concept that what social change is expected and how it is coming.

6) Observing the social outcome – It is important then to see the functional outcome that each element is bringing so as to understand the associated benefits, need for change and addition from environmental change leading to change in enterprising teams, innovative mindsets, mode of organization and overall context of dynamic environment.

Thus, as per the stated objective and from discussion it can be understood that social entrepreneurs are very different in their aptitude, orientation, networking, resource allocation, mission and values and overall outcomes. As also stated by earlier researches, social entrepreneurs are not limited by the initial lack or scarcity of resources, instead they look for more innovative sources (McLeod, 1997); at the same time they also present a certain risk tolerance and a strong desire to control the surrounding environment (Prabhu, 1999). But social entrepreneurs also represent a breaking point in the entrepreneurship panorama, possessing specific aptitudes and qualities and above all, a founding orientation. Even when an SEV is established within the for-profit sector, profit is considered as an instrumental tool for achieving social change.

Moreover, the desire to change society and discomfort with the status quo are the main stimuli for SE to innovate (Prabhu, 1999). This makes them more sensitive to entrepreneurial opportunities that deal with social problems and unsatisfied social needs (Mair and Noboa, 2003a): they create value by building portfolios of resources to address unmet social needs. Equally important is the aptitude for networking and cooperation. Because of its inter-sectorial nature, SE needs a strong ability to establish and manage multiple relationships. The ability to build external relations is also critical to establishing legitimacy with different constituencies (Prabhu, 1999).
Thus, the stated objective which focused on understanding the base of social entrepreneurship lies in the fact that a strong bridging capacity has been demonstrated to be directly linked to the success of SE initiatives (Alvord, Brown and Letts, 2002). Furthermore social entrepreneurs demonstrate less fear of failure and often avoid marketing tactics to embrace a quality-oriented entrepreneurial process.
The next objective of this study is to understand how social entrepreneurship acts as a platform for reinvigorating innovation and sustaining it in long run and which factors are important to develop this mission and fitting it in business model thus benefitting the target population.

**Social Entrepreneurship as a medium for developing an innovation vision for organization**

Based on the set objectives and the above discussion it can be safely said that social entrepreneurship has a broader social value perspective when applied in an organization perspective. The required social entrepreneurial objective can be identified and based on that the future approach to develop, allot resources, execute and reap social benefits can be made possible. As also quoted and confirmed by Drucker (1985) that opportunities represent the core of entrepreneurship and provide one of the major commonalities between business and social entrepreneurialism. In fact in both cases, starting from a balanced mingling of past, personal experience, changes at every level, and available social assets (Guclu, Dees and Battle Anderson, 2002), opportunities can be recognized where unmet needs exist (Mair and Marti, 2004).

This actually becomes the foundation and the starting point where any organization can begin realizing the need and relevance of venturing out with a social entrepreneurial initiative. This will largely depend on the past experiences and the paradigm learning and transformation witnessed by both the organization and the industry as a whole that will decide its success, but envisioning this is primarily more important.

For example this can be conceptually explained with one of the *organizational growth models developed by Larry E. Greiner* who originally proposed the Greiner model in 1972 with five phases of growth. Later, a sixth phase was added (Harvard Business Review, May 1998). This model describes phases that organizations evolve as they grow, reflecting also the crisis at the end of each such phase. The same is applicable even for the growth of social entrepreneurship a in its budding phase that will help in giving a strategic perspective to the entrepreneur/ firm / function. This has five important phases viz –

**Creativity:** This being an early phase the need of a strong leader who is clear in his perspective and understands how to take the venture float in a right manner is desired. This can be based on the earlier experience, skills or expertise in a particular field/ function / area that will help in giving a kick start and also will help in creating a cohesiveness among the group members, by developing a vision and a clear understanding on the objective and approach of any such venture. This will also help in
channelizing the energy and resources as people will start thinking and understanding on the set topic thus enriching the associated social benefit.

2 Direction: Once a leader has defined the perspective the next step is to give a direction based on people participation, interaction with stakeholders, environment assessment, need and relevance of such area in which venturing is needed and the possible functional outcomes that will help in gaining a socially competent advantage.

3 Delegation: Once a vision and direction is been set next important step is to delegate the task, responsibilities and the expected outcome by keen monitoring, feedback and reporting mechanism and continuous environment surveillance thus maximizing the success ratio. This will help in making members more aware, accountable, involved and responsive.

4 Co-ordination: One of the key step is keeping coordination active between all those who are actively involved in the function, it is important to assess, train, monitor, interact and check if the understanding of the members for the set project and that of the overall objective is in line or not. It will help in keeping an alert eye on resource utilization, effective application of the social benefit, more involvement of members and thus overall success.

5 Collaboration: One the complementary or associative dependence between different functions, task, structure, and environment is defined with customer/beneficiary in centre it is important to keep all these efforts collaborated. This will help in timely execution and effective delivery. Since it is crucial and critical to execute any social oriented initiative with a single or segmented perspective, involvement of multiple opinions, checking the feasibility, application, possible constraints, internal growth factors all such factors have to be assessed.

6 Alliances: Further, to retain the continuity and sustenance of any such venture it is very important for any entrepreneur to keep a check with a wider vision on the networking. This is one such skill that ensures the long term association and continuity in the related region/market thus benefitting for a longer run. Thus streamlining the commonality, associating and planning a consolidated action plan thus benefitting large mass through resource optimization will lead to better sustainability and development.

Thus, from the above model it can be understood that social entrepreneurship being a unique approach in itself needs an entirely different set of tone, vision, application, assessment, execution, control and expansion. Treated alike with the fast growing and radically changing environment the same rules of economy and large mass benefit should be the founding parameters for its success. This will help in developing a better innovative outlook and a defined pathway for consistent innovation and growth, as the intensity and pace of innovation will largely depend on leader, members, resources, agenda, beneficiaries etc.
Thus, based on the set objective it can be said that social entrepreneurship helps in setting a defined vision for growing innovative and multiple growths that have manifold benefits.

The other essentials that can help in building this SE model more result centric and effective can be-

1) Training leader and team (enterprising members) on the management of Transition and Change

2) SE being a unique approach individual and Family assistance programs by making available trained counselor can also help in providing a psychological support and supportive familial environment.

3) Program explaining new roles and expectations that might emerge and new challenges that may occur in the selected business.

4) Team building interventions at an appropriate leadership/team level so that a collaborated effort can be build

5) Assessing the environmental challenges and categorizing the priority area where improvement is required.

6) Consistently evaluating the social outcome and its benefits

The only fact that will be important will be that in order to advance ‘social’ objectives more effectively, social entrepreneurs will need to grapple with fundamentally political questions about the normative content of their objectives and their relationship to broader social and deliberative processes that will help in bringing more clarity and direction.

**Scope for further research**

Thus, based on the above discussion it can be said that research in social entrepreneurship has generally focused on the founding entrepreneur, while ignoring entrepreneurial teams or others supporting the founder who is necessary for the success of the organization (Light, 2006). Examining how increased social performance across organizational types can be increased could provide a valuable theoretical contribution to research in strategic entrepreneurship. Opportunities stem from imagination and creativity, leading to inventions and innovations (Amabile, 1988).

**Conclusion**

Thus, based on the stated objectives and the above discussion on conceptual growth of Social entrepreneurship it can be said that SE basically describes a set of behaviors that are exceptional. This type of work is not everyone’s perspective thus this behavior should be encouraged and rewarded in those who have the capabilities and orientation for work
like these. Not every social sector leader is well suited to being entrepreneurial. It is important to understand that the motive, mission, agenda, the enterprising team, the clarity in objective setting, communication, networking and collaboration, the geographic spread, assessing and monitoring the progress the type of organization structure and the type of suiting business model and above these the basic social outcome that is expected from such venture is important to be understood.

With rising technological interventions, growing millennial population, diverse workforce, changing work culture aspirations, customers expectation, changing leadership style and competitive outlook, IT supported tools for networking and collaboration, global outreach and awareness and reference on quality, changing economic conditions the only factor that will ensure the future of employability, skill building and meeting aspirations for better social outcome is by promoting social entrepreneurship. It is important to make the clear understanding of what actually it stands for, its scope, applications, multiple context and the associated social benefits.

There is a need for different disciplines to engage in the study of SE for us to learn from one another through these different perspectives. More ambitiously, we could engage in interdisciplinary research which is explicitly integrative. Comparative analysis can be productively pursued internationally through inter-institutional research partnerships, such as the Social Enterprise Knowledge Network (SEKN). SE offers rich opportunities for researching collaboratively. The more we learn together, the faster and more robustly the field will develop. Moreover advantage of collaboration should be taken through partnerships and networks that include affected stakeholders in the articulation and assessment of needs, as well as in relevant deliberative processes. Partnerships and networks help organizations expand the scope of their inquiries and provide a discursive forum for social entrepreneurs to test hypotheses about their interpretations of social needs.

The true SE should right from beginning should be able to identify the basic important factors i.e. mission, vision and values, the opportunities, the business model and social outcome. Apart from this they should be able to combat all barriers right form cultural, institutional, economic, social or public so that a real benefit and future sustainability can be building.
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