

OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGE FACED BY SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS

Preeti kumari

Research Scholar, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal, Sonapat,
131039

Dr Satpal

Associate Professor, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal, Sonapat,
131039

Abstract

Our article attempt to explore the challenges faced by social entrepreneurs and identify the opportunities available to them. Therefore, we collected the data from 480 individuals who have intent to become social entrepreneurs or started their business as social enterprise. MS Excel and SPSS V.24 have been used to analyze the data. The findings suggest that social entrepreneurs faced institutional, operational, cultural, educational, and government-related challenges. Therefore, the study facilitates to increase the social entrepreneurship in India. The government needs to take various measures to increase the social entrepreneurship among citizen.

Keywords: Challenges, Opportunities, Social Entrepreneurship, Innovation.

1. INTRODUCTION

The entrepreneurship concept has traditionally been associated with economic initiatives, i.e increasingly being applied to social problem solutions (Thake & Zadek, 1997). Finding effective and long-term solutions to many social problems is difficult, and many of the characteristics associated with successful commercial innovation may be required. Solutions to social problems, on the other hand, often necessitate fundamental changes in political, economic, and social structures, such as the long-term alleviation of the constellation of problems associated with long-term poverty. Despite the fact that the concept of social entrepreneurship is new, efforts that use entrepreneurial skills to solve social problems are not. Agencies have been launching programmes and implementing initiatives to assist disadvantaged and marginalized people for years. Several billions of dollars have been invested by government assistance agencies and private organizations to fund such efforts, some of which have been highly inventive. But, all too frequently, the outcomes of these projects have been unsatisfactory in terms of effectiveness and long-term viability, let alone their ability to scale up their effects into meaningful social change (e.g., Cernea, 1987; Tendlar, 1989).

In the present scenario, a large body of literature has surfaced around social entrepreneurship and social enterprise (e.g., Dees & Anderson, 2006; Shaw & de Bruin, 2013), which indicates a significant egress from traditional entrepreneurship and the generality of non-profit and for-profit enterprises. To a significant extent, the two streams of literature have developed independently, obstructing progress toward the formation of a

strong conceptual and theoretical foundation and, ultimately, field maturity (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). In particular, modern research incorporates a variety of theoretical viewpoints. The purpose of this paper is to fulfill the research gap by proposing a solid theoretical framework which is adjustable to accommodate with the concept.

The prime motivation for social entrepreneurship is to create social value rather than personal or shareholder's wealth (Noruzi, et al., 2010; Thake & Zadek, 1997), and the activity of doing so is illustrated by pattern-breaking change or innovation (Munshi, 2010), through the creation of new combinations, for example, products, services, organisation, and production (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). Therefore, the rest of article is organized as follows. Section 2 shows the review of literature. Section 3 provides the research methodology. Section 4 analyzed the data. Section 5 conclude the results and findings.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Despite the fact that the field encompasses numerous promises to aid countries cope with their most recent and critical problems in novel route. Social entrepreneurship is practiced in broader way for cultures as well as geographical areas, and consequently, it addresses a multiple range of social issues (Sud et al., 2009). Hence, it can certify a set of ideal principles or practices, both practically and academically.

Researchers have only recently been interested in entrepreneurship as a means of promoting social improvement (Boschee, 1995; Thompson, 2002). The evolution of social entrepreneurship as a research area closely mirrors the evolution of entrepreneurship research. As a social problem-solving endeavor, social entrepreneurship is emerging as a socially creative business model for the world's essential social transformation and change. The field of S-ENT is attracting a lot of attention from both academics and practitioners around the world because of its potential for solving societal problems (Thompson et al., 2000).

In one country, there may be different type of issues that need to be addressed, say, water unavailability and famine, while in another, there may be misogyny. This enlarged gap between social issues puts a significant impediment for academicians and practitioners seeking to excel the field, both theoretically and practically. It's also tough to keep track of every social enterprise and/or individual's true objective and expectations from their actions. Muhammed Yunus, the world's most well-known social entrepreneur and Nobel Laureate, publicly chastised some microfinance organisations for "promoting and prioritising commercial value (income) over the purpose of social value creation" (Dacin et al., 2011).

So the difficulty here is staying committed to the original objective, which is entirely social in character. The goal of social entrepreneurs is to provide social benefit to the personnel in one way or the other. Social value is difficult to quantify than financial value, and thus, it is difficult to explain to the relevant stakeholders, including governments and politicians, funding bodies, and the general public. The way social entrepreneurship is promoted could also stymie the field's progress. Individual "heroic" social entrepreneurs and their successes are frequently the focus.

Individually successful social entrepreneurs generate rich and strong tales that tend to attract money, get noticed, and are typically celebrated, as Dacin et al. (2010) point out. However, this concentration on

people ignores the social actions of organisations (Light, 2006) (NGOs or companies) and teams of varied stakeholders (Spear, 2006), resulting in a limited vision of social entrepreneurship.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

As aim of this article is to exploring challenges faced by social entrepreneurs and opportunities available to social entrepreneurs, we collected the data from individuals who want to intent or become social entrepreneurs. To collect the required data, we designed a structure questionnaire which keeps statements on challenges faced by social entrepreneurs. Initially, we spread 600 questionnaires among individual through online and offline mode. Out of 600 questionnaires, 490 questionnaires were received back by survey respondents. Then, 480 of the 490 questionnaires were found in an appropriate manner for further analysis. So, this article is based on responses of 480 individual. MS Excel and SPSS V.24 were exploited to analyze the data. The questionnaire is provided as **Annexure A**.

4. DATA DISCUSSION

4.1 Demographic characteristics of respondents

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of respondents. The results show that 60% of respondents were male followed by 40% of female respondents. In addition, the findings show that 32.92% of respondents were less than 30 years, 64.58% of respondents were 31-60 years old and rest of 2.50% of respondents were more than 60 years old. Then, our findings show that 25% of respondents were less than 12th standard, 46.88% of respondents were graduates, 26.04% of respondents were post-graduates and rest of 2.08% of respondents were other degree holders. In last, our results show that 64.58% of respondents belong to nuclear family followed by 35.42 of respondents who belong to joint family.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of respondents

Variables	Category	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	288	60.00
	Female	192	40.00
Age (years)	<30	158	32.92
	31-60	310	64.58
	>60	12	2.50
Educational qualification	<12th	120	25.00
	Graduation	225	46.88
	Post-Graduation	125	26.04
	Others	10	2.08
Family Status	Nuclear	310	64.58
	Joint	170	35.42

Notes: N=480.

4.2 Challenges faced by social entrepreneurs

Table 2 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of social entrepreneurship knowledge”. Our results show that 5.4% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of social entrepreneurship knowledge” and 24.2% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 22.3% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of social entrepreneurship knowledge” and 15.8% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 32.3% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of social entrepreneurship knowledge”.

Table 2: Lack of social entrepreneurship knowledge

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	26	5.4
Disagree	116	24.2
Neutral	107	22.3
Agree	76	15.8
Strongly Agree	155	32.3
Total	480	100.0

Table 3 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Low priority to provide loans to the social entrepreneurship”. Our results show that 2.9% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Low priority to provide loans to the social entrepreneurship” and 16.9% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 27.9% of respondents are neutral with statement “Low priority to provide loans to the social entrepreneurship” and 22.7% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 29.6% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Low priority to provide loans to the social entrepreneurship”.

Table 3: Low priority to provide loans to the social entrepreneurship.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	14	2.9
Disagree	81	16.9
Neutral	134	27.9
Agree	109	22.7
Strongly Agree	142	29.6
Total	480	100.0

Table 4 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of government support as business entrepreneurs”. Our results show that 2.3% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of government support as business entrepreneurs” and 12.1% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 30.8% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of government support as business entrepreneurs” and 24.4% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 30.4% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of government support as business entrepreneurs”.

Table 4: Lack of government support as business entrepreneurs

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	11	2.3
Disagree	58	12.1
Neutral	148	30.8
Agree	117	24.4
Strongly Agree	146	30.4
Total	480	100.0

Table 5 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of trained workforce”. Our results show that 2.7% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of trained workforce” and 11.9% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 30.2% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of trained workforce” and 33.3% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 21.9% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of trained workforce”.

Table 5: Lack of trained workforce

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	13	2.7
Disagree	57	11.9
Neutral	145	30.2
Agree	160	33.3
Strongly Agree	105	21.9
Total	480	100.0

Table 6 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of finance support from financial institution i.e. banks, NBFCs etc”. Our results show that 2.3% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of finance support from financial institution i.e. banks, NBFCs etc” and 13.5% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 29.4% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of finance support from financial institution i.e. banks, NBFCs etc” and 32.5% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 22.3% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of finance support from financial institution i.e. banks, NBFCs etc”.

Table 6: Lack of finance support from financial institution i.e. banks, NBFCs etc.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	11	2.3
Disagree	65	13.5
Neutral	141	29.4
Agree	156	32.5
Strongly Agree	107	22.3

Total	480	100.0
-------	-----	-------

Table 7 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of political will from government”. Our results show that 17.5% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of political will from government” and 24.2% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 25% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of political will from government” and 23.3% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 10% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of political will from government”.

Table 7: Lack of political will from government

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	84	17.5
Disagree	116	24.2
Neutral	120	25.0
Agree	112	23.3
Strongly Agree	48	10.0
Total	480	100.0

Table 8 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of Acquiring Technologies”. Our results show that 4.6% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of Acquiring Technologies” and 24.2% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 32.1% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of Acquiring Technologies” and 26.7% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 12.5% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of Acquiring Technologies”.

Table 8: Lack of Acquiring Technologies

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	22	4.6
Disagree	116	24.2
Neutral	154	32.1
Agree	128	26.7
Strongly Agree	60	12.5
Total	480	100.0

Table 9 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of awareness programme for becoming social entrepreneurs”. Our results show that 2.9% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of awareness programme for becoming social entrepreneurs” and 21.3% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 37.5% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of awareness programme for becoming social entrepreneurs” and 27.5% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 10.8% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of awareness programme for becoming social entrepreneurs”.

Table 9: Lack of awareness programme for becoming social entrepreneurs.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	14	2.9
Disagree	102	21.3
Neutral	180	37.5
Agree	132	27.5
Strongly Agree	52	10.8
Total	480	100.0

Table 10 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of investors who ready to invest in social entrepreneurship”. Our results show that 6.3% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of investors who ready to invest in social entrepreneurship” and 20.4% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 32.5% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of investors who ready to invest in social entrepreneurship” and 29.2% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 11.7% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of investors who ready to invest in social entrepreneurship”.

Table 10: Lack of investors who ready to invest in social entrepreneurship

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	30	6.3
Disagree	98	20.4
Neutral	156	32.5
Agree	140	29.2
Strongly Agree	56	11.7
Total	480	100.0

Table 11 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Problem in raising funds from public”. Our results show that 2.3% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Problem in raising funds from public” and 0.2% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 3.8% of respondents are neutral with statement “Problem in raising funds from public” and 34.2% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 59.6% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Problem in raising funds from public”.

Table 11: Problem in raising funds from public

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	11	2.3
Disagree	1	0.2
Neutral	18	3.8
Agree	164	34.2
Strongly Agree	286	59.6

Total	480	100.0
-------	-----	-------

Table 12 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of support from parents”. Our results show that 2.3% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of support from parents” and 0.2% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 1.7% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of support from parents” and 51.3% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 44.6% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of support from parents”.

Table 12: Lack of support from parents

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	11	2.3
Disagree	1	0.2
Neutral	8	1.7
Agree	246	51.3
Strongly Agree	214	44.6
Total	480	100.0

Table 13 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of support from spouse”. Our results show that 2.1% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of support from spouse” and 0.4% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 8.1% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of support from spouse” and 49% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 40.4% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of support from spouse”.

Table 13: Lack of support from spouse

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	10	2.1
Disagree	2	0.4
Neutral	39	8.1
Agree	235	49.0
Strongly Agree	194	40.4
Total	480	100.0

Table 14 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Lack of support from friends”. Our results show that 2.1% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Lack of support from friends” and 0.4% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 5% of respondents are neutral with statement “Lack of support from friends” and 40.8% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 51.7% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Lack of support from friends”.

Table 14: Lack of support from friends

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	10	2.1
Disagree	2	0.4

Neutral	24	5.0
Agree	196	40.8
Strongly Agree	248	51.7
Total	480	100.0

Table 15 shows the results corresponding to the statement “Difficulty in availing loans from the government agencies”. Our results show that 2.1% of respondents are strongly disagree the statement “Difficulty in availing loans from the government agencies” and 0.4% of respondents are disagree with statement. In addition, 5% of respondents are neutral with statement “Difficulty in availing loans from the government agencies” and 40.8% of respondents are agree with statement. Furthermore, our findings show that 51.7% of respondents are strongly agree with the statement “Difficulty in availing loans from the government agencies”.

Table 15: Difficulty in availing loans from the government agencies

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	10	2.1
Disagree	2	.4
Neutral	30	6.3
Agree	190	39.6
Strongly Agree	248	51.7
Total	480	100.0

4.3 Opportunities available to social entrepreneurs

This section of article attempt to discuss the opportunities available to social entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurship is a rapidly expanding global movement. Social work is no more solely concerned with activism. Presently, in addition to national and international bodies, NGO's as well as social companies offer numerous chances in child welfare, community policing, counseling, healthcare, and other fields. There is also a lot of room for social entrepreneurship and launching your own social enterprises. Because social entrepreneurship will play a significant role in bringing growth to India's rural masses, it is critical to research the aspects that will create the social entrepreneurship ideology, such as fair trade.

First, we'll look at the issues that India is dealing with, some of which are given below:

1. Increasing the employability of educated youths—many of our courses are not geared to meet the needs of business.
2. Affordability of healthcare
3. Sanitation in Cities and Rural Areas
4. Making use of renewable energy sources

5. Poor people's nutrition and food

6. Housing that is affordable.

7. Agriculture.

There are many more, but these are the basic requirements of Indian society, which have been the subject of debate for many years, and many policies and legislation have been passed by India's state and national governments. However, it still remains! All acts of entrepreneurship begin with a vision of enticing possibilities. An appealing opportunity is one that has the potential to justify your time, energy, and money investment. It is a novel phrase that encompasses the characteristics of non-profits, governments, and businesses. Change agents are sometimes referred to as social entrepreneurs. They use ideas to bring about large-scale change and encourage others to follow suit. National or global change is possible. In India, the prospective context has a big influence on social entrepreneurship. Nobel [award winner Dr. Mohammad Yunus] gave the greatest boost in social entrepreneurship. When his brainchild, Grameen Bank, became effective in assisting people in rural Bangladesh to raise themselves out of poverty by providing them with credit without collateral, he was ecstatic. In these industries, social companies will not only offer many opportunities, but they will also be able to solve these problems. An enterprise that trains kids in industrial skills, for example, is a solid entrepreneurial alternative while also solving the problem of unemployed educated youth.

In India, the central and state governments have a number of programmes and plans in place to promote rural entrepreneurs at various levels. The Indian government started the "Swarna Jayanthi Grama Swarozgar Yojana" programme in 1999-2000 to promote poverty eradication through self-employment and the formation of Self Help Groups. The loans granted under this scheme have provided women in communities a new lease of life in terms of social and economic empowerment. (Shetty and Vasanthi, 2019).

5. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study paper was to look into the obstacles that social entrepreneurs encounter as well as the opportunities that are accessible to them in India. The challenges were categorized into different major factors: cultural and educational, institutional and operational, policymaking and government-related challenges. Restricted access to capital, limited access to technical help for social entrepreneurs, and limited access to competent staff were among the institutional and operational hurdles. The cultural and educational barriers were related to the general public's and institutions' lack of understanding of social entrepreneurship as a sector, as well as the lack of social entrepreneurship education in schools and universities, which makes it difficult to secure sponsorships. The new NGO statute, taxation, inflexible observation and regulation, negative perceptions of dealing with the government, and the individual kind of the government's support, rather than a systematic one, were among the policymaking and government problems. Therefore, the authors' study facilitates the increase of the social entrepreneurship in India.

REFERENCES

- Boschee, J. (1995), 'Social entrepreneurs', *Across the Board*, Vol 32, No 3, p 20.
- Cernea, M. (1987). Farmer organizations and institution building for sustainable agricultural development. *Regional Development Dialogue*, 8(2), 1-24.
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24, 36-56.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). Enterprising nonprofits: What do you do when traditional sources of funding fall short? *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 55-67.
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1, 32-53.
- Munshi, N. V. (2010). Value creation, social innovation and entrepreneurship in global economies. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business*, 11, 160-165.
- Noruzi, M. R., Westover, J. R., & Rahimi, G. R. (2010). An exploration of social entrepreneurship in the entrepreneurship Era. *Asian Social Science*, 6(6), 4-10.
- Shaw, E., & Carter, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14, 418-434.
- Shaw, E., & de Bruin, A. (2013). Reconsidering capitalism: the promise of social innovation and social entrepreneurship? *International Small Business Journal*. 31(7), 737-746.
- Spear, R. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A different model? *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33, 399-410.
- Sud, M., Craig, V.V. and Baugous, A.M. (2009), "Social entrepreneurship: the role of institutions", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 85 No. S1, pp. 201-216.
- Thake, S., & Zadek, S. (1997). *Practical people, noble causes: How to support community-based social entrepreneurs*. London: New Economics Foundation.
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G. and Lees, A. (2000), "Social Entrepreneurship - A New Look At the People and the Potential", *Management Decision*, Vol. 38 (5), pp. 328-338.
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G. and Lees, A. (2000), "Social Entrepreneurship - A New Look At the People and the Potential", *Management Decision*, Vol. 38 (5), pp. 328-338.

Annexure A: Questionnaire

Section A

Demographic profile of the respondent (kindly tick)

1. Gender (years):
- Male
- Female
-

2. Age (years):
- < 30
- 31-60
- > 60
-

3. Educational qualification:
- < 12th
- Graduation
- Post-Graduation
- Others
-

4. Family status:
- Nuclear
- Joint
-

Section B

This section of questionnaire has been developed to challenges faced by social entrepreneurs; please specify (✓) your opinion on each of them:

Strongly disagree (SD) = 1; Disagree (D) = 2; Neutral (N) = 3; Agree (A) = 4; Strongly Agree (SA) = 5

Code	Items	SD	D	N	A	SA
X1	Lack of social entrepreneurship knowledge					
X2	Low priority to provide loans to the social entrepreneurship.					
X3	Lack of government support as business entrepreneurs					
X4	Lack of trained workforce					

X5	Lack of finance support from financial institution i.e. banks, NBFCs etc.					
X6	Lack of political will from government					
X7	Acquiring Technologies					
X8	Lack of awareness programme for becoming social entrepreneurs.					
X9	Lack of investors who ready to invest in social entrepreneurship					
X10	Problem in raising funds from public					
X11	Lack of support from parents					
X12	Lack of support from spouse					
X13	Lack of support from friends					
X14	Difficulty in availing loans from the government agencies					