

Strategic Management

Competitiveness and Globalization

Editors

**Vijila Kennedy
Joji Chandran**



**RVS Institute of Management Studies and Research
Sulur, Coimbatore-641402**

First Impression: 2010

© RVS Institute of Management Studies and Research, Coimbatore

Strategic Management—Competitiveness and Globalization

ISBN: 978-93-80697-30-7

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright owners.

DISCLAIMER

The authors are solely responsible for the contents of the papers compiled in this volume. The publishers or editors do not take any responsibility for the same in any manner. Errors, if any, are purely unintentional and readers are requested to communicate such errors to the editors or publishers to avoid discrepancies in future.

Published by

EXCEL INDIA PUBLISHERS

61/28, Dalpat Singh Building, Pratik Market, Munirka, New Delhi-110067

Tel: +91-11-2671 1755/ 2755/ 5755 ● Fax: +91-11-2671 6755

E-mail: publishing@excelpublish.com

Website: www.excelpublish.com

Typeset by

Excel Publishing Services, New Delhi - 110067

E-mail: prepress@excelpublish.com

Printed by

Excel Printing Universe, New Delhi - 110067

E-mail: printing@excelpublish.com

List of Contributors

A. Bala Shanmugam

P.G. Student, Department of Management, Karunya University, Coimbatore

A. Grace Antony Rose

Faculty, RVS Institute of Management Studies and Research, Sulur, Coimbatore

A. Pankajam

*Associate Professor, Avinashilingam School of Management Technology,
Avinashilingam University for Women, Coimbatore*

C. Dharmaraj

Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Karunya University, Coimbatore

C. Gopalkrishnan

Faculty, Karpagam College of Engineering, Coimbatore

Caroline Flora L.

*P.G. Student, Department of management Studies,
Maharaja Institute of Technology, Coimbatore*

D. Ravindran

Faculty, JSN School of Management and Services, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu

Devi Premnath

*Lecturer, Sree Narayana Guru Institute of Management Studies, Coimbatore
e-mail: devishakhith@gmail.com*

E. Kennedy

Director, RVS Institute of Management Studies and Research, Coimbatore

G. Ravindran

Associate Professor, Karunya School of Management, Karunya University, Coimbatore

G. Suresh Kumar

Senior Lecturer, Erode Builders Educational Trust Group of Institutions, Kangeyam

J. Arthi

*Faculty, Avinashilingam School of Management Technology,
Avinashilingam University for Women, Coimbatore*

J. Juliet Gladies

Faculty, RVS Institute of Management Studies and Research, Sulur, Coimbatore

Janani P.

Research Scholar, RVS Institute of Management Studies and Research, Coimbatore

Jobi Mathai

P.G. Student, Sree Narayana Pillai Institute of Management and Technology

Strategic Issues of Social Entrepreneurs— A Bird's Eye View

A. Pankajam

*Associate Professor, Avinashilingam School of Management Technology,
Avinashilingam University for Women, Coimbatore*

Abstract—*Entrepreneurship by new and established companies is a major source of wealth and job creation, economic and technological growth, and social transformation (Bhide, 2000). This transformation is made possible by the powerful forces entrepreneurship unleashes, where ordinary people conceive innovative ideas, organize production, assume risk, and engage customers to accumulate wealth or address pressing social causes, often across national borders.*

'Social entrepreneurship encompasses the activities and processes undertaken to discover, define, and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner.' Social wealth is defined broadly to include economic, societal, health, and environmental aspects of human welfare. Social entrepreneurs may discover or create opportunities and launch ventures to make profits, create wealth, or balance social and economic imperatives.

Social entrepreneurs are ambitious, mission driven, strategic, resourceful, result oriented.

Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector. In this situation this paper analyses the issues related to social entrepreneurship, the need for the social entrepreneurs and the steps to be taken by the government for improving social entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurship.

Keywords: *Entrepreneur, Social Entrepreneur, Social Entrepreneurship, Change Agents.*

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurs are essential drivers of innovation and progress. In the business world, they act as engines of growth, harnessing opportunity and innovation to fuel economic advancement. Social entrepreneurs act similarly, tapping inspiration and creativity, courage and fortitude, to seize opportunities that challenge and forever change established, but fundamentally inequitable systems.

Distinct from a business entrepreneur who sees value in the creation of new markets, the social entrepreneur aims for value in the form of transformational change that will benefit disadvantaged communities and, ultimately, society at large. Social entrepreneurs pioneer innovative and systemic approaches for meeting the needs of the marginalized, the disadvantaged and the disenfranchised – populations that lack the financial means or political clout to achieve lasting benefit on their own.

Throughout history, such individuals have introduced solutions to seemingly intractable social problems, fundamentally improving the lives of countless individuals by

changing the way critical systems operate. Florence Nightingale and Maria Montessori offer two prominent historical examples. Muhammad Yunus, recipient of the 2006 Nobel Peace Prize, is a more recent example. He began offering micro-loans to impoverished people in Bangladesh in 1976, thereby empowering them to become economically self-sufficient and proving the micro-credit model that has now been replicated around the world. While social entrepreneurship isn't a new concept, it has gained renewed currency in a world characterized by a growing divide between the haves and the have-nots. With this heightened visibility, social entrepreneurs at the forefront of the movement are distinguishing themselves from other social venture players in terms of ultimate impact. One example is social entrepreneur Bunker Roy, who created the Barefoot College in rural communities in India to train illiterate and semi-literate men and women, whose lack of educational qualifications keeps them mired in poverty. Today Barefoot College graduates include teachers, health workers and architects who are improving communities across India, including hundreds of 'barefoot' engineers who have installed and maintain solar-electrification systems in over 500 villages, reaching over 100,000 people.

Another example is Ann Cotton, who launched the Campaign for Female Education (Camfed) in 1993 to ensure an education for young girls in Africa whose families cannot afford school fees. By establishing a sustainable model that provides community support for girls to go to school, start businesses and return to their communities as leaders, Camfed has broken the cycle of poverty for hundreds of thousands of young women in Zimbabwe, Ghana, Zambia and Tanzania. Since 1993, nearly 700,000 children have benefited from Camfed's program across a network of some 3000 schools. Over 5,000 young women have received business training and start-up grants to establish their own rural enterprises. These and other social entrepreneurs are solution-minded pragmatists who are not afraid to tackle some of the world's biggest problems. They recognize the extraordinary potential in the billions of poor people who inhabit the planet, and they are absolutely committed to helping them use their talents and abilities to achieve their potential. Social entrepreneurs use inspiration, creativity, courage, fortitude and, most importantly, direct action, to create a new reality – a new equilibrium – that results in enduring social benefit and a better future for everyone.

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS

Ambitious

Social entrepreneurs tackle major social issues, from increasing the college enrollment rate of low-income students to fighting poverty in developing countries. These entrepreneurial leaders operate in all kinds of organizations: innovative nonprofits, social purpose ventures such as for-profit community development banks, and hybrid organizations that mix elements of nonprofit and for-profit organizations.

Mission driven

Generating social value-not wealth-is the central criterion of a successful social entrepreneur. While wealth creation may be part of the process, it is not an end in itself. Promoting systemic social change is the real objective.

Strategic

Like business entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs see and act upon what others miss: opportunities to improve systems, create solutions and invent new approaches that create social value. And like the best business entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs are intensely focused and hard-driving-even relentless-in their pursuit of a social vision.

Resourceful

Because social entrepreneurs operate within a social context rather than the business world, they have limited access to capital and traditional market support systems. As a result, social entrepreneurs must be exceptionally skilled at mustering and mobilizing human, financial and political resources.

Results oriented

Ultimately, social entrepreneurs are driven to produce measurable returns. These results transform existing realities, open up new pathways for the marginalized and disadvantaged, and unlock society's potential to effect social change.

Today, social entrepreneurs are working in many countries to create avenues for independence and opportunity for those who otherwise would be locked into lives without hope. They range from Jim Fruchterman of Benetech, who uses technology to address pressing social problems such as the reporting of human rights violations, to John Wood of Room to Read, who helps underprivileged children gain control of their lives through literacy. They include Marie Teresa Leal, whose sewing cooperative in Brazil respects the environment and fair labor practices, and Inderjit Khurana, who teaches homeless children in India at the train stations where they beg from passengers.

Whether they are working on a local or international scale, social entrepreneurs share a commitment to pioneering innovation that reshape society and benefit humanity. Quite simply, they are solution-minded pragmatists who are not afraid to tackle some of the world's biggest problems.

The reasons behind the popularity of social entrepreneurship are many. On the most basic level, there's something inherently interesting and appealing about entrepreneurs and the stories of why and how they do what they do. People are attracted to social entrepreneurs like last year's Nobel Peace Prize laureate Muhammad Yunus for many of

the same reasons that they find business entrepreneurs like Steve Jobs so compelling – these extraordinary people come up with brilliant ideas and against all the odds succeed at creating new products and services that dramatically improve people's lives.

BOUNDARIES OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

There are two primary forms of socially valuable activity that we believe need to be distinguished from social entrepreneurship. The first type of social venture is **social service provision**. In this case, a courageous and committed individual identifies an unfortunate stable equilibrium – AIDS orphans in Africa, for example – and sets up a program to address it – for example, a school for the children to ensure that they are cared for and educated. The new school would certainly help the children it serves and may very well enable some of them to break free from poverty and transform their lives. But unless it is designed to achieve large scale or is so compelling as to launch legions of imitators and replicators, it is not likely to lead to a new superior equilibrium. These types of social service ventures never break out of their limited frame: Their impact remains constrained, their service area stays confined to a local population, and their scope is determined by whatever resources they are able to attract. These ventures are inherently vulnerable, which may mean disruption or loss of service to the populations they serve. Millions of such organizations exist around the world – well intended, noble in purpose, and frequently exemplary in execution – but they should not be confused with social entrepreneurship. It would be possible to reformulate a school for AIDS orphans as social entrepreneurship. But that would require a plan by which the school itself would spawn an entire network of schools and secure the basis for its ongoing support. The outcome would be a stable new equilibrium whereby even if one school closed, there would be a robust system in place through which AIDS orphans would routinely receive an education.

The difference between the two types of ventures – one social entrepreneurship and the other social service – isn't in the initial entrepreneurial contexts or in many of the personal characteristics of the founders, but rather in the outcomes. Imagine that Andrew Carnegie had built only one library rather than conceiving the public library system that today serves untold millions of American citizens. Carnegie's single library would have clearly benefited the community it served. But it was his vision of an entire system of libraries creating a permanent new equilibrium – one ensuring access to information and knowledge for all the nation's citizens – that anchors his reputation as a social entrepreneur.

A second class of social venture is **social activism**. In this case, the motivator of the activity is the same – an unfortunate and stable equilibrium. And several aspects of the

actor's characteristics are the same – inspiration, creativity, courage, and fortitude. What is different is the nature of the actor's action orientation. Instead of taking direct action, as the social entrepreneur would, the social activist attempts to create change through indirect action, by influencing others – governments, NGOs, consumers, workers, etc. – to take action. Social activists may or may not create ventures or organizations to advance the changes they seek. Successful activism can yield substantial improvements to existing systems and even result in a new equilibrium, but the strategic nature of the action is distinct in its emphasis on influence rather than on direct action.

Why not call these people social entrepreneurs? It wouldn't be a tragedy. But such people have long had a name and an exalted tradition: the tradition of Martin Luther King, Mahatma Gandhi, and Vaclav Havel. They are social activists. Calling them something entirely new – i.e., social entrepreneurs – and thereby confusing the general public, who already know what a social activist is, would not be helpful to the cause of either social activists or social entrepreneurs.

Strategies Associated with Social Entrepreneurship

Having created a definition of social entrepreneurship and distinguished it from social service provision and social activism, we should recognize that in practice, many social factors incorporate strategies associated with these pure forms or create hybrid models.

In the pure form, the successful social entrepreneur takes direct action and generates a new and sustained equilibrium; the social activist influences others to generate a new and sustained equilibrium; and the social service provider takes direct action to improve the outcomes of the current equilibrium. It is important to distinguish between these types of social ventures in their pure forms, but in the real world there are probably more hybrid models than pure forms. It is arguable that Yunus, for example, used social activism to accelerate and amplify the impact of Grameen Bank, a classic example of social entrepreneurship. By using a sequential hybrid – social entrepreneurship followed by social activism – Yunus turned micro-credit into a global force for change.

Other organizations are hybrids using both social entrepreneurship and social activism at the same time. Standards setting of certification organizations are an example of this. Although the actions of the standards-setting organization itself do not create societal change – those who are encouraged or forced to abide by the standards take the actions that produce the actual societal change – the organization can demonstrate social entrepreneurship in creating a compelling approach to standards-setting and in marketing the standards to regulators and market participants. Fair-trade product certification and marketing is a familiar example of this, with organizations like Cafédirect in the United Kingdom and TransFair USA in the U.S. creating growing niche markets for coffee and

other commodities sold at a premium price that guarantees more equitable remuneration for small-scale producers. Kailash Satyarthi's RugMark campaign provides a particularly striking example of a hybrid model. Recognizing the inherent limitations of his work to rescue children enslaved in India's rug-weaving trade, Satyarthi set his sights on the carpet-weaving industry. By creating the RugMark certification program and a public relations campaign designed to educate consumers who unwittingly perpetuate an unjust equilibrium, Satyarthi leveraged his effectiveness as a service provider by embracing the indirect strategy of the activist. Purchasing a carpet that has the RugMark label assures buyers that their carpet has been created without child slavery and under fair labor conditions. Educate enough of those prospective buyers, he reasoned, and one has a shot at transforming the entire carpet-weaving industry. Satyarthi's action in creating RugMark lies at the crossroads of entrepreneurship and activism: In itself, the RugMark label represented a creative solution and required direct action, but it is a device meant to educate and influence others, with the ultimate goal of establishing and securing a new and far more satisfactory market-production equilibrium. Social service provision combined with social activism at a more tactical level can also produce an outcome equivalent to that of social entrepreneurship. Take, for example, a social service provider running a single school for an underprivileged group that creates great outcomes for that small group of students. If the organization uses those outcomes to create a social activist movement that campaigns for broad government support for the wide adoption of similar programs, then the social service provider can produce an overall equilibrium change and have the same effect as a social entrepreneur. Bill Strickland's Manchester Bidwell Corporation, a nationally renowned inner-city arts education and job-training program, has launched the National Center for Arts & Technology to advance systematically the replication of his Pittsburgh-based model in other cities. Strickland is spearheading an advocacy campaign designed to leverage federal support to scale up his model. So far, four new centers are operating across the U.S. and several more are in the pipeline. With a sustainable system of centers in cities across the country, Strickland will have succeeded in establishing a new equilibrium.

It is because of that campaign that the Skoll Foundation and others are investing in Strickland's efforts.

Social entrepreneurship is about applying practical, innovative and sustainable approaches to benefit society in general, with an emphasis on those who are marginalized and poor.

A term that captures a **unique** approach to economic and social problems, an approach that cuts across sectors and disciplines. Grounded in certain **values and processes** that are common to each social entrepreneur, independent of whether his/ her area of focus has

been education, health, welfare reform, human rights, workers' rights, environment, economic development, agriculture, etc., or whether the organizations they set up are non-profit or for-profit entities.

It is this approach that sets the social entrepreneur apart from the rest of the crowd of well-meaning people and organizations who dedicate their lives to social improvement.

Social Entrepreneurs Share Common Traits Such as

- An unwavering belief in the innate capacity of all people to contribute meaningfully to economic and social development
- A driving passion to make that happen.
- A practical but innovative stance to a social problem, often using market principles and forces, coupled with dogged determination, that allows them to break away from constraints imposed by ideology or field of discipline, and pushes them to take risks that others wouldn't dare.
- A zeal to measure and monitor their impact. Entrepreneurs have high standards, particularly in relation to their own organization's efforts and in response to the communities with which they engage. Data, both quantitative and qualitative, are their key tools, guiding continuous feedback and improvement.
- A healthy impatience. Social entrepreneurs don't do well in bureaucracies. They cannot sit back and wait for change to happen – they are the change drivers.

Social Entrepreneurs Play the Role of Change Agents in the Social Sector, by

- Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private 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.

ISSUES RELATED TO SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Several issues related to the social entrepreneurship, include support for social entrepreneurs; capacity-building and training; implementation issues; and gaps in the literature.

Support for Social Entrepreneurs

One of the issues is the need to support the rare and exceptional individuals with the talent and drive to become innovative social entrepreneurs. Given the demands on funding and the need for radical new approaches that social problem solving demands,

social entrepreneurs emerge as a dynamic group with a viable and highly sustainable approach. As the concept of social entrepreneurship (in its current incarnation) is relatively new, there are few institutional mechanisms in place to support this work.

The danger in not supporting social entrepreneurship is obvious to Reis (1999) who calls for systematic intervention to accelerate and improve philanthropic efforts. Without this he argues that substantial numbers of potential donors and social entrepreneurs could be discouraged, turned-off, and lost from philanthropy and social change work. Catford (1998) argues that social entrepreneurship will only flourish if social entrepreneurs are supported by the right environment, which will be created largely by governments together with the private sector. For example, greater flexibility in the use of public resources to respond to innovative community proposals, and venture investments from foundations and the private sector could be used to stimulate innovation in areas thought to be too risky for government as the sole investor (Catford, 1998).

Training and Capacity Building for Social Entrepreneurship

Related to the issue of support for social entrepreneurs is the issue of training and capacity building for social entrepreneurship. If social entrepreneurship is defined as principally bringing business and management skills to the non-profit sector, the skills of the entrepreneur are fairly replicable. If a social entrepreneur is defined as an 'exceptionally creative and innovative individual,' replication will be much more difficult to achieve, and the focus should then be on creating conditions in which latent entrepreneurial talent can be harnessed for social purposes. The latter is obviously the more difficult of the two situations, as it is far easier to develop skills to help people translate ideas into realized opportunities than it is to teach them to spot the opportunities in the first place (Thompson et al., 2000).

However, Cannon argues that ordinary people do not triumph as social entrepreneurs because they are not organized for success. They lack the tools, training, finances and resources they need to reach their full potential. To that end, a multitude of supports have been recommended to help ease the transition from start-up to sustainability for social entrepreneurs, including: leadership and management training; educational scholarships and fellowships; mentoring schemes; twinning arrangements at local, national and international levels; development of information systems; and models of good practice (Catford, 1998; Zadek and Thake, 1997). However, it should be noted that those entering social entrepreneurship from the private sector will likely have different capacity-building needs than those entering from the non-profit sector (Thompson et al., 2000). Providing training for individuals also raises the issue of institutional support(s) for social entrepreneurship.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

The majority of social entrepreneurship activities are premised on inter-sectoral collaboration. While there is a lot of support in principle for this, the implementation of collaborative partnerships is much more difficult to achieve. Little has been written on this topic explicitly, but the following threads have emerged in the research literature.

A common implementation issue is that of the clash of cultures between for-profit and not-for-profit organizations. This clash can emerge in various ways. In some cases, it will manifest itself in the 'distrust of money-making activities' felt by many in the non-profit sector (McLeod, 1996).

Cultural differences between the for-profit and non-profit sector emerge in other ways as well. Cannon (2000) notes the lack of non-profit investment in their own organizations (e.g., in training or providing extra benefits to attract the best staff) and the non-use of basic business management tools within non-profits. He cites the case of a meeting with a room full of non-profit directors who were asked if they could define objectively the size and share of their particular market group they were trying to reach. Only a few hands went up and the lack of response underscored (the) point that before non-profits try to run a small business, most of them need to master basic business principles and practices. Reis (1999) echoes the same sentiments by commenting that most small and medium-sized non-profit organizations are missing useful financial expertise, above and beyond basic bookkeeping skills.

Inter-sectoral collaborations require not only agreement about basic procedures, but also harmonization of evaluation measures for organizational 'success.' Finding appropriate performance evaluation measures is critical. Thompson et al. (2000) recommend a combination of qualitative and quantitative measures, noting that qualitative evaluation can generate a volume of useful data while quantitative measures are ideal for benchmarking purposes (e.g., number of clients served, jobs created, money raised). For many organizations undertaking social entrepreneurial activities there are really two bottom lines to meet - one for economic profit and one for social mission (Cannon, 2000) and the difficulty of meeting these simultaneously should not be underestimated.

These cultural differences, while significant in themselves, reflect a much deeper problem for inter-sectoral collaborations—the lack of a common discursive framework among the public, private and non-profit sectors. As such, the challenges of collaboration among these sectors should not be underestimated, and those advocating inter-sectoral collaboration will be most likely to succeed if these challenges are understood and accounted for early in the planning processes. At the end of the day the art of integration

is to marry developmental agendas with market priorities and then manage them properly so they are synergistic, not draining. The lack of operational guidelines for inter-sectoral partnerships and/or collaborative ventures makes this a challenging task, albeit one with potentially high rewards as well.

What do Social Entrepreneurs Still Need?

Integrating these insights into the work of social entrepreneurs will kick the ball toward the goal of sustainable development. Similarly, the positive feedback of success and attention will naturally encourage new entrants, driving more and more effective social entrepreneurial initiatives. But there are nevertheless tremendous hurdles and challenges that many social entrepreneurs face that dampen the effectiveness of their efforts. So, what do social entrepreneurs still need for success in their initiative?

Investment

More fuel is needed for social entrepreneurship to drive sustainable development on the ground. Many institutions- private & public- provide funding for a small number of leading social entrepreneurs at an early stage, but the need is much more broad and deep than what these institutions can satisfy. Thus, these institutions should allocate more resources (both financial and non-financial) for social entrepreneurs, as they will deliver tremendous bang for the sustainable development buck and spur innovations that may lead to exponential returns on investment. As Mexican Fellow Pati Ruiz, a former music teacher now leading a GEF-funded grassroots environmental education and sustainable development program in the Sierra Gorda, says: "The greatest idea without sustained operating resources may never have the chance to leap from a small and successful local project, to one of national or international significance."

Policy Environment

Social entrepreneurs will see their efforts buttressed and will find more promising opportunities to exploit as the rules of the game tilt in their favor. Perverse incentives in policy and regulatory structures that encourage environmental harms and do not encourage environmental benefits must be addressed. At the most macro level, steps must be taken toward a global agreement on climate change with key players signing and ratifying such an agreement. At the national level, subsidies to environmentally harmful industries and processes must be phased out and incentives for environmentally positive innovations phased in-the costs to the environment and the benefits from environmental protection must be hardwired into policy frameworks. Finally, at the most micro level, ensuring that communities have clear rights over their natural resources is a vital starting point for the type of just and lasting change implicit in sustainable development.

Better Information

Better environmental data and the capacity to use this data intelligently at the community level are both essential. Social entrepreneurs, like business entrepreneurs, need the best information to make smart strategic and operational choices. Leading social entrepreneurs across the globe are working directly on these issues. More often, however, the technological and capital hurdles are too high for grassroots social entrepreneurs to clear. Anil Singh, a veteran of many community development projects, says: "access to information creates decision making power, a fundamental livelihood right." Thus, commitments from governments, businesses, and NGOs to empower communities with good data and the capacity to understand this information are vital pieces of the puzzle.

Better Cooperation and Coordination

Along with better information, social entrepreneurs also need to establish better synapses with other sectors and other social entrepreneurs.

Recognition and Visibility

Social entrepreneurs need recognition and visibility. For the best ideas coming from social entrepreneurs to be replicated, for the best people to enter this profession, and for the most pressing challenges in sustainable development to attract new social entrepreneurial entrants, profile for this profession and confidence in their abilities is essential. Too often, social entrepreneurs are dismissed for having wacky ideas or insufficient experience on a given issue. This is especially the case with social entrepreneurs from communities and doubly so for those working in developing countries like India. A healthy dose of skepticism is probably a good thing, but as Zimbabwean Social Entrepreneur Esinet Mapondera says, "poverty doesn't mean a lack of ideas or capability. In our work with the poor we often get brilliant ideas and unearth remarkable capability."

STRATEGIC SUPPORT OF GOVERNMENT FOR SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

While government currently lacks a comprehensive and strategic approach for collaborating with social entrepreneurs, isolated incidents do exist of local, state, and central employees working with social entrepreneurs through five primary methods. By embracing these methods more strategically, government leaders can help to dramatically move the dial on crucial social issues:

Encourage Social Innovation

For any entrepreneur, the start-up period of an organization is critical. Public innovators can encourage social innovation and help spur the testing of promising new approaches to solving social problems.

Create an Enabling Environment for Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship

The very nature of innovation means that social entrepreneurs will be heading into new territory, and they often encounter unexpected barriers along the way. Public innovators can lift such barriers for social entrepreneurs. In addition, merely by lending credibility and drawing attention to a given issue or initiatives, they can help social entrepreneurs gather momentum.

Reward Social-Entrepreneurial Initiatives for Exceptional Performance

Access to reliable sources of funding is essential to the growth and sustainability of solutions that work. By tying decisions about funding and purchasing to performance, government can help ensure that solutions that work will sustain and grow their impact.

Scale Successful Approaches

Expanding the reach of a proven solution is often critical if the solution is to become truly transformative. Yet acquiring the recognition, support for dissemination, or funding to scale a successful initiative is notoriously difficult. Government can play a crucial role in expanding the reach of solutions that work by seeking out what works and enabling solutions to scale.

Produce Knowledge

Government already serves as a critical source of data and standards that help entrepreneurs. Public innovators can play a critical role in ensuring that knowledge is produced, more clear standards are set, and data is easily accessible.

CONCLUSION: FUTURE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Future and Significance of Social Entrepreneurship Social entrepreneurship serves multiple functions. By helping diversify the funding base of an organization, social entrepreneurship helps build a more sustainable organization. Social entrepreneurship also helps the non-profit organisation clarify its core functions and concentrate on those it can best and most economically deliver. This can lead to substantial savings through eliminating less essential money losing programs and/or investigating the potential for fee for services. The non-profit must, however, be careful to guard its core mission by retaining core programs even if they are revenue negative. Social entrepreneurship provides employment for hard to serve, lower skilled employees through "affirmative" social enterprises. "Supported employment" another term for a type of social enterprise, allows lower skilled employees the opportunity to develop both job-related and daily life skills. Supported employment requires greater patience and a greater level of counseling and supervision than found in "market economy" jobs. Social entrepreneurship helps

unbankable disadvantaged people become self-employed through small loans and training. Social enterprises which utilise the peer-lending model of the Grameen Bank, and Small Business Development Centers keying on women and minorities are two mechanisms, which expedite this.

Social entrepreneurship economically strengthens the local community. It is locally based enterprise employing local people, encouraging self-employment, and forming economic alliances with local organizations both for profit and nonprofit. An example is One Northwest, which performs Technology Assessments for environmental nonprofits and then works with for profit consultants who develop the networks and websites for these groups. Social entrepreneurship benefits from and serves the desire of local business people who want to assist their community both as, individuals using their own expertise and resources, and as leaders of public spirited organizations funding and/or developing joint ventures, such as cause related purchasing and marketing, with social entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurship is the antithesis of the militaristic principles that have been introduced into commerce resulting in “leveraged buy-outs”, “corporate takeovers”, “poison pills”, “greenmail” etc., and have resulted in the crippling and/or destruction of some local economies. Successful entrepreneurship is founded on innovation, cooperation, collaboration, fair-trading, good customer service, honest and ethical dealings, and reliability. Social entrepreneurship adds to these concerns social change and community social equity. Social entrepreneurship therefore serves as a model for corporate social responsibility. The future of social entrepreneurship lies in making common cause with all of its wings of supporters and close relations: venture philanthropists, intermediaries, local economy initiatives, housing advocates, technology initiatives, nonprofit capacity building initiatives, micro finance organizations, academic entrepreneurship programs and etc. These agencies working together with social entrepreneurs in advocacy for supportive legislation and increased funding from foundations, individuals, and government agencies will drive the social entrepreneurship movement forward.

REFERENCES

- [1] en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_entrepreneurship
- [2] www.ashoka.org/content
- [3] managementhelp.org/soc_entr/soc_entr.htm
- [4] www.skollfoundation.org/aboutsocialentrepreneurship/whatis.asp
- [5] www.beyondgreypinstripes.org/pdf/sereport.pdf
- [6] bx.businessweek.com/social-entrepreneurship/