

Social Entrepreneurship in Rural Odisha: Situational Factors Motivating People of Balasore District to Start Social Entrepreneurship

¹Mr. Bharata Bhusan Sahoo, ²Dr. Deba Bijaya Mishra

¹Doctoral Research Scholar, PG. Department of Commerce, Fakir Mohan University,
Vyasa Vihar, Balasore, Odisha, 756089, India

²Lecturer & Head, Department of Commerce, Remuna Degree College, Remuna, Balasore, Odisha, 756019, India
Email: ¹bharatabhusan@gmail.com, ²debabijaya@gmail.com

Abstract: Social entrepreneurs are primarily concerned with social problems. They are innovators. They mobilize resources to create social arrangements to address social problems. Many believe that Social Entrepreneurship is not only a powerful catalyst for society but also a change agent in the social sector. They are driven to create and sustain social value by recognizing new opportunities and following them rigidly. They are bold and not constrained by their resources, and they have greater accountability to their constituencies. Social Entrepreneurs are modern heroes, regardless of their approach or thinking. They take on the challenge of turning an unfavorable environment into a positive one. Social Entrepreneurs are not discouragers of competitors or imitators. They show others how to follow their lead and act as role models. The research gap of this paper is that there are many literatures on the role of entrepreneurship in rural development but a few are found on social entrepreneurship. The objective of the study is to analyze the situational factors motivating people to start social entrepreneurship in rural Odisha of Balasore District. The data collected from the secondary sources. It is purely a review article. The economy system of the state like Odisha has been well natured on the factors like Employment Generation and Income, Addressing Social Issues, Individual Aspirations and Needs, Support from Institutions and Government, Cultural and Social Context, Dissatisfaction with Current Employment, Social Value Creation, Need for Achievement, Empowerment of Women.

Key Words: Social Entrepreneurship, Social Entrepreneur, Motivational Factors

1. INTRODUCTION:

The roots of social entrepreneurship lie in the evolution of the private sector. Though for a long time, the symbiosis of government, business, and non-profit organisations addressed the social needs, yet inequalities and loopholes still existed, particularly in the under-developed nations. One such country is Bangladesh where the concept of present day's social entrepreneurship first developed (Bornstein and Davis 2010). Mohammed Yunus, a banker, and a professor brought forward the idea of micro-loans for the poor helping them to turn into entrepreneurs (Yunus et al. 2006). Based on his notion of efficient service to the downtrodden, Yunus founded the Grameen Bank. This institution earns through the interest paid by the creditors, thus giving a new definition to 'non-profit' service. Social enterprises offer an innovative approach to bringing the desired change through reconceptualising the mission of the enterprise and rethinking of value creating logic (Brown and Wyatt 2015). Social entrepreneurship starts on comprehending a social opportunity, then passes it on into an enterprise model, amasses the necessary resources for execution, gives life to and nurtures the enterprise and eventually reaches the intended destination (Doherty et al. 2014). Despite the increasing attention paid to the sector through the availability of capital, a maturing government support system and development of micro-finance model yet a corresponding body of academic work has not emerged to assess or inform practice (Dichter et al. 2013). From the research perception, social entrepreneurship is at present undoubtedly enjoying an "emerging excitement" (Hirsch and Levin 1999), however, as an academic area of research, it faces two major challenges. Firstly, social entrepreneurship is considered as a by-product of bigger concepts of social innovation and entrepreneurship, hence there is a lack of theoretical literature related to social entrepreneurship and a lack of consensus

regarding how to define social entrepreneurship has not been achieved. Secondly, social entrepreneurship research is caught in between seemingly contradictory demands for significance and intractability (Mair and Marti 2006). One of the most prominent questions that cannot be adequately answered is ‘how to define social entrepreneurship’? As several researchers have pointed out that all business is social in the sense that it creates value (Spear 2005). Dees (Dees 1998) defined the role of the social entrepreneur in the development of society. In brief, this definition can be stated as follows: 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 a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created. Thus on the basis of literature, “social entrepreneurship is a process that begins with perceived social opportunity, transfers it into an enterprise model, determines and achieves the wealth essential to execute the enterprise, initiates and grows the enterprise and yields the future upon goal achievement of the enterprise’s goal”. It can take many forms, from starting a business to expanding an organization to partnering with another firm (Short et al. 2009). Researchers identified that social entrepreneurship is a process that can create value by utilizing resources in innovative ways (Shaw and Carter 2007). For fulfilling their primary motives, social enterprises explore and exploit opportunities that can create social value by facilitating social change or meeting social needs (Prieto 2014).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW:

Korosec, R.L & Berman, E.M. (2006), Studying the role of government in promoting social entrepreneurship states that one of the reasons why communities and societies stagnate is the lack of social entrepreneurship. Mair& Marti, (2006) views Social Entrepreneurship as a process involving the innovative use and combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyse social change. The rise of Social Entrepreneurship as a practice as well as a theoretical endeavour provides a special opportunity for research. Martin, L & Osberg (2007) believes that Social Entrepreneurship’s potential payoff is the social change that it can drive, with its lasting and transformative benefit to society. It tries to serve an underserved, neglected or disadvantaged population. Phillips James A Jr; Deiglmeier, Kriss; & Miller Dale T. (2008) notes that Social Entrepreneurship focuses its attention on the personal qualities of persons who are behind the organizations and ventures and celebrates the traits that make them special. Light, Paul C (2008) views the field of social entrepreneurship as one that offers the excitement of breakthrough thinking, compelling life stories, and potentially dramatic progress against daunting global problems such as hunger, poverty, and disease. Paul C Light(2009) writes that like business entrepreneurship, Social Entrepreneurship involves a wave of creative destruction that remakes society. It focuses on changing the underlying dynamics in the society that create disease, distress, hunger, poverty and other evils that leave persons in want of services. There are special sets of attitudes, skills and practice that make the social entrepreneurship distinct. They are driven by a persistent, almost unshakable optimism which sometimes borders on overconfidence. Jeff Scholl(2009) articulates two kinds of power to the Social Entrepreneurs. One is the power to bring specific change through the work that they do. The second is the power to inspire—to bring other people and organizations to work together, to scale solutions through their networking, and to find new ways to solve problems. Elkinton, J(2009) argues that there is no one solution to the challenges of the world; the world needs more entrepreneurial thinking and approaches big and small, initiated by citizen sector, public or private sector, across the human activity spectrum. Dacin M T et al(2011) Social Entrepreneurship constitutes a field of study that intersects a number of domains including entrepreneurship, innovation, nonprofit management. Catalina Crisan-Mitra (2012) states that social entrepreneurship can be sustained by the companies through CSR (partnership, collaboration, founding an organization with a social mission). Corporate social responsibility and social entrepreneurship have distinct conceptual approach, but interferes in the area of recovery of social opportunities. Irina Kostetskaya & Ivanna Berezyak (2014) writes that social entrepreneurship is a real mechanism of solving social problems of society, which aims at maintaining economic and social well-being of a certain territorial community and country in general. Embracing various socio vulnerable segments of the population, social entrepreneurship may state as the aim occupational therapy, social rehabilitation, introduction of new mechanisms of solving the current social problems, but overall his feature is the social innovativeness.

3. RESEARCH GAP:

There are many literatures on the role of entrepreneurship in rural development but a few are found on social entrepreneurship.

4. OBJECTIVES:

The objective of the study is to analyze the situational factors motivating people to start social entrepreneurship in rural Odisha of Balasore District.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The secondary sources of data collection include the articles in different journals and magazines, books, published and unpublished thesis. The public websites, reports and articles were also referred by the researcher for the secondary data collection.

6. DISCUSSION:

In rural Odisha, factors like the desire to generate employment, address gender inequality, and create social value motivate individuals to engage in social entrepreneurship. Additionally, dissatisfaction with existing jobs, dependency situations, and encouragement from elders can also fuel entrepreneurial ventures. Financial assistance from institutions and support from government programs also play a crucial role.

Situational Factors Motivating People to Start Social Entrepreneurship in Rural Odisha:

Here's a more detailed look at the situational factors motivating people to start social entrepreneurship in Balasore district Odisha-

- **Employment Generation and Income:**
Creating jobs and generating income within local communities is a major driver for social entrepreneurship. This helps improve living standards, reduce poverty, and address the issue of rural migration to urban areas in search of work.
- **Addressing Social Issues:**
Many social entrepreneurs are motivated by the desire to address social problems and meet unmet needs within their communities. This includes tackling issues like gender inequality, poverty, lack of access to education, healthcare, and clean water.
- **Individual Aspirations and Needs:**
Some individuals are motivated by a desire for independence, recognition, or to achieve specific goals in life. Others may be driven by a need for financial security or to improve their quality of life.
- **Support from Institutions and Government:**
Financial assistance from banks and other institutions can provide the capital needed to start and grow a business. Government programs that support entrepreneurs can offer guidance, training, and other resources.
- **Cultural and Social Context:**
The overall socio-economic background, cultural values, and political structure can influence entrepreneurial activities. For example, in a region where self-help groups (SHGs) are prevalent, individuals may be more inclined to start businesses within the framework of SHGs.
- **Dissatisfaction with Current Employment:**
Individuals who are dissatisfied with their current jobs or working conditions may be more inclined to explore entrepreneurial opportunities. This can be a strong motivating factor for those seeking greater autonomy, control, and a better work-life balance.
- **Social Value Creation:**
Social entrepreneurs often prioritize the creation of social value alongside financial gains. This may involve developing businesses that address specific social needs or improve the lives of marginalized communities.
- **Empowerment of Women:**
In Odisha, women entrepreneurs are often motivated by a desire to achieve financial independence and gain more agency within their communities. Government initiatives and support programs can help empower women to start and grow their own businesses.
- **Need for Achievement:**
Some individuals are driven by a strong need to achieve and excel in their endeavors. This can lead them to pursue entrepreneurial opportunities that allow them to take risks, innovate, and create a positive impact.

7. CONCLUSION:

Practitioners, academics, as well as policymakers, are increasingly interested in social entrepreneurship. This paper provides an overview of the concept of Social Entrepreneurship and some examples of Social Entrepreneurship across India. This paper also explains the reasons behind a shift to Social Entrepreneurship, and the path it will take.

Some Indian entrepreneurs like Ela Bhatt, Bunker Roy, Parag Gupta, Rajesh Sinha, Harish Hande etc. They have risen to the challenge and are continuing to do so. These Social Entrepreneurs are committed to improving the quality of life for all people. Social Entrepreneurship is an interesting topic. This article will help us to inspire Social Entrepreneurship in order to create economic and social value as well as as a field for research. It is also important to determine whether Social Entrepreneurship can be considered an independent field or a sub-category within entrepreneurship. Social impact assessment is no longer an option to an organizational tool for assessment but an integral and essential part of any product analysis or service analysis. Social entrepreneurs are change-makers in society, who influence others to help develop mankind.

REFERENCES:

1. Alvord, S. H., Brown, D. & Letts, C. W. (2004) Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation-An Exploratory Study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(3), 260-282. doi: 10.1177/10021886304266847.
2. Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. (2005) Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 329.
3. Bosma, N., & Levie, J. (2010) Global Entrepreneurship Consortium. *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor*; 2009 Executive Report.
4. Bulsara, H., Chandwani, J., & Gandhi, S. (2014). Women Entrepreneurship and Innovations in India: An Exploratory Study. *International Journal Of Innovation - IJI*, 2(1), 32-44. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5585/iji.v2i1.2>
5. Bulsara, H., Gandhi, S., & Porey, P. (2013). Grassroots Innovations to Techno-Entrepreneurship through GIAN – Technology Business Incubator in India: A Case Study of Nature Technocrats. *International Journal Of Innovation - IJI*, 1(1), 19-70. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5585/iji.v1i1.1>
6. Chakraborty, S. K. (1987) *Managerial Effectiveness and Quality of Work life: Indian Insights*. New Delhi, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. Limited.
7. Dees, G. J. (2001). *The meaning of Social Entrepreneurship*. Durham, NC: Duke University. http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees_sedef.pdf.
8. Dey, P., & Steyaert, C. (2010) The Politics of Narrating Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People & Places in the Global Economy*, 4(1), 85-108. doi 10.1108/17506201011029528
9. DiMaggio, P. J. (1988) Interest and Agency in Institutional Theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment*, 3-22.
10. Dr. Jyotsna Sethi. —Entrepreneurs and Entrepreneurship. Retrieved from www.smallindustry.com.
11. Gartner, W. B. (1989) Who is an entrepreneur? Is the wrong question. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 13(4), 47-68. <http://entpracticereview.org/what-is-entrepreneurship/>
12. Giddens, A. (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
13. Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
14. Hjalager, A. M. (1989) Why No Entrepreneurs? Life modes, Everyday Life, and Unemployment Strategies in an Underdeveloped Region. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 1(1), 85-97.
15. Khanapuri, V., & Khandelwal, M. (2011) Scope for Fair Trade and Social Entrepreneurship in India, *Business Strategy Series*, 12(4), 209-215.
16. Mair, Johanna & Marti, Ignasi. (2006) Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight, *Journal of World Business*, 41, 36-44. doi: 10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002
17. Makhoul, H. (2011) Social Entrepreneurship: Generating Solutions to Global Challenges. *International Journal of Management and Information Systems*, 15(1), 1.
18. McAdam, D., Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C. (2001) *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge University Press.
19. Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998) *Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage*.
20. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211 [http://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](http://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T).
21. Ajzen, I. (1996). The social psychology of decision making. In E. T. H. (Ed.), *Social psychology: A handbook of basic principles* (pp. 297–325). New York: Guilford Press.
22. Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, Self-Efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned Behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(4), 665–683.
23. Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1970). The prediction of behavior from attitudinal and normative variables. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 6(4), 466–487 [http://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(70\)90057-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(70)90057-0).
24. Ajzen, I., Fishbein, M., Atomic, I., Agency, E., Federal, T., & Commission, T. (1980). *Theory of reasoned action / theory of planned behavior*.

25. Ajzen, I., & Thomas, M. J. (1986). Prediction of goal-directed Behavior : Attitudes, intentions, and perceived behavioural control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22(5), 453–474 [http://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(86\)90045-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(86)90045-4).
26. Anderson, R. B., Dana, L. P., & Dana, T. E. (2006). Indigenous land rights, entrepreneurship, and economic development in Canada: “opting-in” to the global economy. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 45–55.
27. Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended twostep approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411.
28. Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned Behaviour: A meta-analytic review. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(4), 471–499 <http://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164939>.
29. Autio, E. H., Keeley, R., Klofsten, M., GC Parker, G., & Hay, M. (2001). Entrepreneurial intent among students in Scandinavia and in the USA. *Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies*, 2(2), 145–160.
30. Bandura, A., & Bandura, A. (1997). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales (pp. 307–337).
31. Baron, R. A., & Ward, T. B. (2004). Expanding entrepreneurial cognition's toolbox: Potential contributions from the field of cognitive science. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(6), 553–573.
32. Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88(3), 588–606 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588>.
33. Beugré, C. (2016). *Social Entrepreneurship: Managing the Creation of Social Value*. Routledge.
34. Bird, B. (1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case for intention. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 442–453.
35. Bird, B. (1998). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case for intention. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 442–453. Böhm, D., & Nichol, L. (1998). On creativity.
36. Boren, A. E. (2010). Emotional Intelligence : The secret of successful entrepreneurship ? *Leadership in Agriculture*, 2, 54–61.
37. Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship what everyone needs to know*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
38. Boschee, J. (1995). Social entrepreneurship: Some nonprofits are not only thinking about the unthinkable, they’re doing it – Running a profit. *Across the Board, The Conference Board Meeting*, 32(3), 1–25.
39. Boyd, N. G., & Vozikis, G. S. (1994). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 18, 63–63.
40. Brown, T., & Wyatt, J. (2015). Design thinking for social innovation. *Annual Review of Policy Design*, 3(1), 1–10.
41. Bryant, P. (2009). Self-regulation and moral awareness among entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 505–518 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.005>.
42. Bureau, P. (2015). *Population Bulletin* (Vol. 70).
43. Chell, E. (2007). Social Enterprise and entrepreneurship: Towards a convergent theory of the entrepreneurial process. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(1), 5–26 <http://doi.org/10.1177/0266242607071779>.
44. Cheung, W. G., & Rensvold, B. R. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of- fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 9(2), 233–255 <http://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902>.
45. Chowdhury, I., & Santos, F. M. (2010). Scaling Social Innovations: The Case of Gram Vikas. *Director*, 0–35. <http://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1553070>
46. Datta, P. B., & Gailey, R. (2012). Empowering women through social entrepreneurship: Case study of a Women’s cooperative in India. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 36(3), 569–587 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00505.x>.
47. Davidsson, P. (1995). Determinants of entrepreneurial intentions (pp. 1–31).
48. Dees, J. G. (1998). The meaning of “social entrepreneurship” (pp. 1–6).
49. Dichter, S., Katz, R., Koh, H., & Karamchandani, A. (2013). Closing the pioneer gap. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 11(1), 36–43.
50. Doherty, B., Haugh, H., & Lyon, F. (2014). Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16(4), 417–436.