

Social Entrepreneurship as a Model for Development of Rural Odisha: Barriers of the Social Entrepreneurship in its Application of Rural Development.

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 Entrepreneurship is assumed to be the job of progress specialists in the social area by embracing a strategic make and support social worth, by perceiving and steadily seeking after new chances to serve that crucial, taking part in a procedure of persistent advancement, adjustment and learning, by acting intensely without being constrained by assets at present close by and by displaying elevated responsibility to the voting public served and for the results made. In the process of Social Entrepreneurship, the Entrepreneurs have to face certain problems. The present study is aimed at finding the challenges faced by Social Entrepreneurship in rural Odisha and it was found that there are various challenges which are being faced by the Social Entrepreneurship in rural Odisha such as lack of Infrastructure and innovativeness etc. To cope up with these challenges, various suggestions have been suggested in the study. 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 barriers of the social entrepreneurship in its application of rural development in Odisha. The data collected from the secondary sources. It is purely a review article.

Key Words: Social Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurship, Social Challenges.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Social entrepreneurs act as role models to motivate the youth to initiate action to bring positive social change in the society. The social entrepreneurs address global problems such as poverty, unemployment, gender inequality, inadequate education and health facilities and policies, inefficient governance and so on. Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector by adopting a mission to create and sustain social value, by recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission, by engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning, by acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand and by exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created. Social entrepreneurs are reformers and revolutionaries, as described by Schumpeter, but with a social mission. Social entrepreneurship phenomenon has definitely not reached a mature state of development. Social entrepreneurship is a new form of entrepreneurship that exhibits characteristics of nonprofits, governments and businesses. It applies traditional (private-sector) entrepreneurship's focus on innovation, risk taking and large-scale transformation to social problem solving. The social entrepreneurship process begins with a perceived social opportunity is translated into an enterprise concept; resources are then ascertained and acquired to execute the enterprise's goals. Social entrepreneurs sometimes are referred to as "public entrepreneurs," "civic entrepreneurs," or "social innovators". They are change agents; they create large-scale change using pattern breaking ideas, they address the root causes of social problems, and they possess the ambition to create systemic change by introducing a new idea and persuading others to adopt it. These types of transformative changes can be national or global. They can also be highly localized in their impact. Social entrepreneurs who create

transformative changes combine innovative practices, and deep knowledge of their social issue area and research to achieve their goals. For entrepreneurs working in the social realm, innovation is not a one-time event; rather it is a lifetime pursuit.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW:

Singh (2012) studied the concept of Social Entrepreneurship in Indian context and it was found that social and environmental problems of the country are increasing year after year which may open new doors for the extensive application of multidisciplinary approaches and entrepreneurial energy in the social and environmental sectors. Further, it was found that India is experiencing an increase in social entrepreneurship and attempts by social entrepreneurs to find affordable solutions to various social problems of society. Moreover, with the modern technology and increased competition, social entrepreneurs have to become more dynamic. It was suggested that Social entrepreneurs should help higher education institutes in India in developing curriculum that create social entrepreneurship habits in their students so that high quality managers and promoters can be produced and Social ventures should educate the consumer and set market standards by following network approach. It was also suggested that regional disparities or imbalance should be removed by the growth of social entrepreneurship in the country. As per the study, balancing the growth of social entrepreneurship in the country can solve the social problem of large population and health of the country. Bulshara et. al. (2015) conducted a study on the growing trends of Social Entrepreneurship in India and the new initiatives taken by various Social Entrepreneurs. Further, the theories of Theories of Social Entrepreneurship were also briefly. As per the study, some Indian entrepreneurs like Ela Bhatt, Bunker Roy, Parag Gupta, Rajesh Sinha, Harish Hande etc. have come forward and successfully tackled and continue to tackle some of the globe's most complex challenges in India. As per the results of the study, the Indian entrepreneurs are made aware of their social responsibility as an important business segment but CSR in India has yet to receive widespread recognition. Satar (2016) conducted a study on the prevailing state of relevant policies & recent S-ENT policy developments within India. The study was aimed to analyze the system necessities & develops a conceptual framework of Social Entrepreneurship policy in India. It was observed that significant increase is there in the policy development efforts from Governments of certain developed countries. However, there are little or no concerns for Social Entrepreneurship policy framework in majority of developing countries including India. Hence, the paper lays the foundation for development of the policy framework for Social Entrepreneurship in India. Rawal (2018) studied the variety of topics related to social entrepreneurship, including the conceptual framework and process of social entrepreneurship and various challenges faced by social entrepreneurs and puts forwards its recommendations to improve the overall situation of social entrepreneurship/entrepreneurs in India were also discussed in the study. Further, similarity and contrast between social and economic entrepreneurship along with explaining the traits for a social entrepreneur were studied. In the findings, Social entrepreneurship was found having its increased scope and importance in recent years in India. Singh and Sharma (2019) made an attempt to define the term of social entrepreneurship with the help of information from several research papers. The study was aimed to shed light on the theme of challenges and opportunities facing the social entrepreneurship scene in India. It was found in the results that social entrepreneurship has emerged to a greater extent and is well appreciated in India. Conveying the business idea, working remotely, getting fund, government approval, competition from others, acquiring technologies, promoting awareness and getting skilled workers were found to be the major challenges for the Indian entrepreneurs. It was also found that India has experienced an increase in social entrepreneurship and attempts by social entrepreneurs to find affordable solutions to various social problems of society. 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. Phills 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 Kostetskai&Ivanna Berezyak2 (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 barriers of entrepreneurship in its application of rural development but a few are found on social entrepreneurship.

4. OBJECTIVES:

The objective of the study is to analyze the barriers of the social entrepreneurship in its application of rural development in Odisha.

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:

Social entrepreneurship faces several barriers when applied to rural development, including limited access to funding, skills, and connectivity, as well as issues related to infrastructure, societal pressures, and resistance to change. Lack of skilled labor and government support can also hinder the development of successful social enterprises.

A. Detailed of the barriers:

Funding and Resources:

- **Limited Access to Funding:**
Securing financial resources is a major hurdle for social entrepreneurs in rural areas, impacting their ability to scale and sustain their ventures.
- **Lack of Government Support:**
Insufficient government policies and programs can further impede the growth of social enterprises in rural regions, according to a study in Nigeria.

Skills and Talent:

- **Lack of Skilled Labor:**
Finding skilled workers in rural areas can be challenging, limiting the talent pool for social enterprises.
- **Inadequate Skills:**
Rural entrepreneurs may lack the necessary entrepreneurial skills and business knowledge to effectively manage and grow their ventures.

Infrastructure and Connectivity:

- **Poor Infrastructure:**
Rural areas often suffer from inadequate infrastructure, including unreliable water and electricity supplies, and poor transportation, which can limit access to basic services and hinder business development.
- **Poor Connectivity:**
Limited internet access and communication networks can create barriers to connecting with clients, suppliers, and accessing support resources.

Societal and Cultural Barriers:

- **Resistance to Social Change:**
Traditional societal norms and values can create resistance to innovative social entrepreneurship ideas and approaches.
- **Lack of Awareness:**
There may be limited awareness and understanding of the concept of social entrepreneurship in rural areas, making it harder to gain support and buy-in.

Other Barriers:

- **Competition:**
Existing businesses and traditional practices may create competition for social enterprises, making it difficult to gain market share.
- **Regulatory Complexities:**
Navigating complex regulations and bureaucratic processes can be a significant challenge for social entrepreneurs.

B. Addressing the Barriers:

- **Targeted Support:**
Government initiatives and NGOs can play a crucial role in providing financial assistance, training, mentorship, and access to resources for social entrepreneurs.
- **Collaboration and Partnerships:**
Building strong partnerships between social entrepreneurs, local communities, and other stakeholders can facilitate knowledge sharing, resource mobilization, and collective action.
- **Adaptable Business Models:**
Developing business models that are tailored to the unique needs and conditions of rural areas is essential for success.
- **Promoting Social Entrepreneurship:**
Raising awareness about the potential of social entrepreneurship and encouraging young people to pursue it can create a more supportive environment for innovation.
- **Community Engagement:**
Involving local communities in the design and implementation of social entrepreneurial solutions can ensure that they are relevant and sustainable.

7. CONCLUSION:

Social Entrepreneurs can change the essence of society in rural Odisha as well as India, there have been numerous such models and activities which run under the flag of social business enterprise and end up being life changing for individuals of that region. In rural Odisha particularly social business has better possibilities as the social issues are at full swing here. Social business enterprise is a one of a kind blend of innovative attributes and charity. In Social Entrepreneurship, items and administrations are intended to have greatest social effect alongside making extensive benefits for the firm. Here the working zone of firm is regularly the region/locale which are commonly disregarded by huge firm of financial business enterprise. In a manner the item and administration contributions of social enterprise is very special and provides food the cultural necessity better than monetary prerequisites. This is careful of pioneering qualities being executed for a social reason/issue.

REFERENCES:

1. Bulsara, H. P., Gandhi, S., & Chadwani, J. (2015, January/June). Social Entrepreneurship in India: An Exploratory Study. *International Journal of Innovation*, 8(1), 7-16.
2. Council, B. (2016). The State of Social Entrepreneurship in Bangladesh, Ghana, India and Pakistan. Retrieved from <https://www.britishcouncil.org/society/social-enterprise>
3. Rawal, T. (2018, January). A Study of Social Entrepreneurship in India. *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET)*, 5(1), 829-837.
4. Satar, M. S. (2016, September). A Policy Framework for Social Entrepreneurship in India. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 18(9), 30-43.
5. Singh, K., & Sharma, M. (2019, August). Social Entrepreneurship in India: Opportunities and Challenges. *International Journal of Engineering Science and Technology*, 9(8), 23619-23623.
6. Singh, P. (2012, October). Social Entrepreneurship: A Growing Trend in Indian Economy. *International Journal of Innovations in Engineering and Technology (IJJET)*, 1(3), 44-52.
7. 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.
8. Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. (2005) Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 329.
9. Bosma, N., & Levie, J. (2010) Global Entrepreneurship Consortium. *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor; 2009 Executive Report*.
10. 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>
11. 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>
12. Chakraborty, S. K. (1987) *Managerial Effectiveness and Quality of Work life: Indian Insights*. New Delhi, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. Limited.
13. Dees, G. J. (2001). *The meaning of Social Entrepreneurship*. Durham, NC: Duke University. http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees_sedef.pdf.
14. 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
15. DiMaggio, P. J. (1988) Interest and Agency in Institutional Theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment*, 3-22.
16. Dr. Jyotsna Sethi. —Entrepreneurs and Entrepreneurship. Retrieved from www.smallindustry.com.
17. 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/>
18. Giddens, A. (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
19. Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
20. 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.
21. Khanapuri, V., & Khandelwal, M. (2011) Scope for Fair Trade and Social Entrepreneurship in India, *Business Strategy Series*, 12(4), 209-215.
22. 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
23. Makhoul, H. (2011) Social Entrepreneurship: Generating Solutions to Global Challenges. *International Journal of Management and Information Systems*, 15(1), 1.
24. McAdam, D., Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C. (2001) *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge University Press.
25. Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998) Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage.
26. 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).

27. Ajzen, I. (1996). The social psychology of decision making. In E. T. Hi (Ed.), *Social psychology: A handbook of basic principles* (pp. 297–325). New York: Guilford Press.
28. Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, Self-Efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned Behavior1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(4), 665–683.
29. 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).
30. Ajzen, I., Fishbein, M., Atomic, I., Agency, E., Federal, T., & Commission, T. (1980). Theory of reasoned action / theory of planned behavior.
31. 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).
32. 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.
33. Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended twostep approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411.
34. 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>.
35. 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.
36. Bandura, A., & Bandura, A. (1997). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales (pp. 307–337).
37. 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.
38. 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>.
39. Beugré, C. (2016). *Social Entrepreneurship: Managing the Creation of Social Value*. Routledge.
40. Bird, B. (1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case for intention. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 442–453.
41. 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.
42. Boren, A. E. (2010). Emotional Intelligence : The secret of successful entrepreneurship ? *Leadership in Agriculture*, 2, 54–61.