



Social Proclivity of Social Entrepreneurship in Secondary Education of Assam

Rajdeep Deb & Nagari Mohan Panda

North Eastern Hill University, Shillong, Meghalaya, India

Abstract

Social sector is an important segment of India's economy and comprises several key areas viz. education, health and medical care, social security and poverty alleviation, etc. that play an integral part in human and social development. While discussing the importance of social sectors, schools are regarded as crucial agencies to bring societal transformation. This makes the study of schools an interesting topic for researchers. In this context, entrepreneurship may hold great potential to revolutionize and impact the social sector enterprises in India. Recognizing this as an opportunity, many individuals have started to come forward with entrepreneurial ideas. The study was done in Assam, as it is one of the older and largest states of the most under developed region of India, while secondary school sector is chosen for its importance in the societal reformation. Since our objective is to ascertain the degree of social proclivity, we have included in our population only those schools which are registered either under Societies Registration Act XXI of 1860 or Indian Trusts Act, 1882. The Principals being the leader of the schools and are the key persons to formulate or influence the goals of the schools are treated as social entrepreneurs. The present study aims to empirically assess the social proclivity of social entrepreneurship in secondary education of Assam i.e., how social 'social entrepreneurs' really are. For the purpose of the study, four established theoretical constructs were identified from the literature (Stevens & Moray, 2009) and the same were empirically tested to study the extent of social proclivity. The four constructs are; organizational identity, work values, social responsibility, and organizational goals. One of the core findings of the study confirms that social entrepreneurship in secondary education of Assam exhibits higher degree of social as well as economic motives for pursuing the dual-bottom line that characterizes their enterprises, although the importance of social proclivity is higher compared to economic proclivity.

Key words: Social Entrepreneurship, Social Enterprise, Social & Economic Proclivity, Secondary Education, Assam

JEL Classification: L31, L26, P13, I2

Paper Classification: Research Paper

Introduction

The coming into existence or prominence of social entrepreneurship (SE) may be bestowed upon the complex mechanism of prevailing socio-political and economic transition happening across the globe as well as at local levels (Johnson, 2000; Kramer, 2005; Christie & Honig, 2006). It is increasingly being acknowledged by the academicians, public, private and non-governmental

organizations (NGOs) as a solution to the complex and pressing social problems faced by the world today. The contribution of social entrepreneurs is increasingly being discussed and acknowledged at various fora and conferences across the globe. For instance, Azim Premji doubled his financial efforts towards development of education through the Azim Premji Foundation to 275140 million rupees in 2015 from 123160 million rupees, the previous year (The Times of India, 2016), reflects a visible change in how people perceive about transferring wealth. In the last decade, social entrepreneurship managed to earn a great deal of interest in literature as a means to satisfy the unmet social needs in a new, cost-effective and sustainable way (Seelos and Mair 2005; Christie & Honig, 2006). Social entrepreneurship, as the term is coined and used in common academic world, shows in its conceptual geography some inherent contents which are both entrepreneurial and social (Certo & Miller, 2008). In other words, application of entrepreneurship for a social purpose or space or a person or a group or an organisation undertaking the act of social entrepreneurship has to exhibit entrepreneurial behavioural disposition (Misra & Kumar, 2000) for building and managing sustainably an enterprise in pursuit of social purpose(s). The common feature of social enterprises is that they place high value on social value creation and differ in their expectations for financial returns (Schuler & Cording, 2006). This is equally echoed by Mair & Marti (2006) who assert that, “the main difference between entrepreneurship in the business sector and SE lies in the relative priority given to social wealth creation versus economic wealth creation” (p. 39). Social enterprises are basically seen as enterprises with a social purpose to facilitate change, rather than doing activities to seek profits (Bornstein, 2004). Because of this fundamental characteristic, social enterprises work toward creating social wealth instead of making personal wealth (Chell, 2007; Dees, 1998).

Most of the research studies on social entrepreneurship till date, from a theoretical perspective, have extensively talked about the dominant social mission, either by ignoring or undermining the need for economic resources to pursue the very mission. Economic resources being the life blood of the social enterprises, a basic question pertaining to very survival of the entity arises threatening the philosophical buzzword ‘live and let others live’. Although Certo & Miller (2008) theoretically view both social and economic missions to be important for social enterprises, empirical research by Stevens et al. (2015) unearth the reality that, “the social is largely taken for granted and the economic is considered as a crucial framework condition” (p. 106). This triggers the question of the extent to which social and economic missions are targeted to the actual mission of the social enterprises. However, to date, there are hardly a few papers investigating the relationship between the two dimensions. Stevens and Moray (2009) working on established theoretical constructs identified several dimensions and operational measures that help us to a great extent in enhancing our knowledge and understanding the social and economic proclivity of social enterprises in the context of a region of Belgium. Due to economic status and cultural variation, the degree of social proclivity as found in their study vary in another context, particularly in the context of a developing region of a developing nation like India emerges as a worth pursuing research question.

Social sector is an important sector for India’s economy and comprises several key areas including education, health and medical care, social security and poverty alleviation, etc. that play an integral part in human and social development. Social sector as a value system of an economy has given rise to values such as philanthropy, social business, social entrepreneurship etc. Due to the dynamic nature of marketplace and ever growing need to improve quality of life, there is a need for social sector reforms. In this context, entrepreneurship may hold great potential to revolutionize and impact the social sector enterprises in India. Recognizing this as an opportunity, many individuals have started to come forward with entrepreneurial ideas. While discussing the importance of social sectors, schools are regarded as crucial agencies to bring societal transformation. Assam being one of the older and largest states of the most under developed region of India has been selected as the

appropriate study area and the secondary school sector is chosen for its importance in the societal reformation.

Social Entrepreneurship – An Insight

Social entrepreneurship being a social science concept has been understood in different ways by scholars depending upon their respective disciplinary training and experiences, as a result of which no universally acceptable definition has emerged (Venkataraman, 1997). Although shared meanings are taken out about the concept, those prescriptive definitions divulge mainly on the degree of emphasis laid on various aspects of the concept. An analytic enquiry to some of the scholarly prescriptions as to the contents of the concept reveals that the social entrepreneurship mainly extends along two continua; 1) the social element in the concept, and 2) the entrepreneurial element. The below table (Table 1) depicts some of the definitions of the phenomenon to demonstrate how the scholars commonly understand the complex concept as directing entrepreneurial behaviour through organisational activities towards accomplishing social purposes.

Table 1: Social Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurs: A Snapshot

Source	Definition
Leadbetter (1997)	Social entrepreneurship is regarded as the process of applying entrepreneurial behaviour for achieving social and economic objectives. In other words, economic returns generated from market-based actions are employed for the welfare of a particular marginalised and excluded group.
Thake & Zadek (1997)	Social entrepreneurs are stimulated by their want for social justice. They attempt to develop a direct relationship between their activities and upliftment in the quality of life for those who belong to deprived section of the society. They pursue them by offering viable solutions which are considered to be sustainable not only economically but also in terms of social, environmental and organizational.
Dees (1998)	Social entrepreneurs are identified as change agents in the social sector, who pursue a mission to generate and sustain social benefits along with economic gain, explore opportunities aggressively to cater to that mission, put in efforts to innovate, adapt and learn continuously, behave actively without being constrained by limited available resources at his disposal and display higher accountability to the markets served and for the results.
Fowler (2000)	The generation of appropriate socio-economic arrangements or structures, bonding, organizations and practices that produces and sustains social gains.
Drayton (2002)	A social entrepreneur is a change agent whose primary aim revolves around recognizing, addressing and eliminating social inadequacies.
Mort et al. (2003)	Social entrepreneurship is a multidimensional construct comprising an entrepreneurial behaviour to achieve the social goal and an ability to identify opportunities to create social value through innovation, proactiveness and calculated risk taking.
Alford et al. (2004)	Generating innovative approaches to solve existing social issues and mobilizing the ideas, abilities, assets and social structures to facilitate social transformations.
Harding (2004)	Social entrepreneurs are stimulated by social mission to start some innovative activity or venture.
Tan et al. (2005)	Process of earning profits with the engagement of community by being innovative and taking a certain degree of risks. The benefits generated out of the activity will be reinvested to that segment of the society.
Mair and Marti (2006a)	Social entrepreneurship is a value creation process by organizing resources in innovative way, identifying and pursuing opportunities by arousing social change or satisfying social needs.
Peredo and McLean (2006)	The emergence of social entrepreneurship is attributed to the eagerness of generating social value by some individuals or groups or organization by demonstrating the ability to spot opportunities and to pursue them, resorting to innovativeness, taking a calculated risk and not constrained by limited resources in hand.

Continued...

Robinson (2006)	The process of social entrepreneurship involves recognition of a specific social problem and a viable solution to eliminate it, assessing its social impact and examining the business model that develops social goal as well as directed towards accomplishing the double (social & economic) or triple bottom line (social, economic & environmental).
Martin & Osberg (2007)	Social entrepreneurship process does not deal with contemplating or combining resources in order to earn speedy economic gain for himself or herself or for his or her investors.
Certo & Miller (2008)	To social entrepreneurs, a social goal is of supreme importance that constitutes a key attribute of social venture.
Zahra et al. (2009)	The phenomenon of social entrepreneurship covers the actions and processes carried out to explore and exploit opportunities with the purpose of enhancing social value by setting up new ventures or by displaying innovativeness in managing the existing enterprise.
Dacin et al. (2010)	Social entrepreneurs attempt to maximize social change as well as profitability by making social value dominant in terms of mission.
Santos (2012)	Social entrepreneurs are the ones who work explicitly with social mission and overlooking economic wealth creation. For that matter generating economic resources is characteristically social as it ensures the welfare of the community.
Moulaert et al., (2013)	Social entrepreneurship qualifies initiatives where social mission is integral to initiatives and that support their mission by reinvesting a large part of their surpluses.
Stevens et al. (2015)	Social entrepreneurs place higher value on social mission and generate revenue to ensure sustainability of the social mission.

Source: Author's own elaboration (2017)

It can be drawn from the above that most of the social entrepreneurs are highly motivated to seek and achieve social wealth creation. However, the descriptions also focus on the generation of social wealth, delivery of social justice, alleviating complex social problems etc. Taking a holistic view, it can be said that most of the prevailing definitions of social entrepreneurship view it as a process to identify and exploit opportunities to bring about social change and development, rather than simply stressing on profit maximization as being done by traditional entrepreneurs.

Social entrepreneurship strives for achieving both economic and social sustainability by offering an alternative business model and delivery system for public services to enterprises (Harding, 2004). Many scholars link social entrepreneurship as a process that applies traditional and market oriented models to offer new and innovative solutions to complex societal problems previously ignored by government, private and non-government organizations (Spear, 2006; Mair and Noboa, 2003) while Cox and Healey (1998) consider social entrepreneurs as change agents who address the persistent social issues through innovative, cost-effective and non-traditional methods. In exploring a particular opportunity, social entrepreneurs often target social as well as economic goals (Thompson and Doherty, 2006).

In this context, the authors put in efforts to empirically examine the social proclivity of social entrepreneurship in secondary education of Assam i.e., how social 'social entrepreneurs' really are.

Conceptualization of Social Proclivity

This section mainly elaborates the identified dimensions for measuring social and economic proclivity of social entrepreneurs. Building on established theoretical constructs, one of the effective ways to understand the social and the economic proclivity of social entrepreneurs is the conceptualization of these missions as multidimensional constructs (Stevens et al., 2015). The past and existing works on social entrepreneurship acknowledge that it is quite difficult to capture the multidimensional essence of social and economic concepts with the help of a single construct. With the purpose of getting clarity of the social and economic proclivity constructs, four different

dimensions are adopted in line with Stevens & Moray (2009). In the following section, we explain these established constructs, 'organizational identity- normative and utilitarian', 'work values- other and self regarding work values', 'social responsibility- economic, legal, ethical and discretionary/ philanthropic', and 'organizational goals'.

Organizational Identity

One of the constructs, called organizational identity, refers to shared ideas about the central, distinguished, and durable qualities of the organization by their people (Fiol, 2001; Ravasi and Schultz, 2006; Brickson, 2007). It is a "well-established and well-researched construct in management studies" (Stevens et al., 2015, p. 1065). It also offers a clarification to the question, 'who are we?' (Stevens and Moray, 2009). In order to comprehend organizational identity, Foreman and Whetten (2002) define it in terms of "multiple and competing" identities. They are, a normative system – highlighting traditional values and symbols, altruism, etc. and a utilitarian system – economic rationality, economic gain, self interests etc. The authors, further, feel that the degree of normative and utilitarian identity can establish the social and economic missions of social entrepreneurs.

Work Values

Ros et al. (1999) define work values as "what a person wants out of work in general and are guiding principles for evaluating work outcomes and settings and for choosing among different work alternatives"(p. 68). Research has shown that values have an impact on behaviour (Elizur et al., 1991) and decision making (Mumford et al., 2003). Murillo & Lozano (2006) identify personal characteristics and work values of entrepreneurs to be key elements in deciding business practices of the organization towards the creation of social wealth. To answer the question of to what extent is behaviour of social entrepreneurs self-interested or beneficial to others, a significant dimension is the degree of 'other' regarding and 'self' regarding values (Agle et al., 1999).

In this context, we feel that the level of self-and other-regarding values communicate to a greater extent the social and economic motives of social entrepreneurs.

Social Responsibility

Social responsibility of a business implies that firms have responsibility and accountability towards society beyond their profit maximization function (Aguilera et al., 2007). Stevens & Moray (2009) to study the growing level of social involvement of business has adopted the CSR model propounded by Carroll. The four dimensions of CSR are economic, legal, ethical and discretionary/ philanthropic in nature (Carroll, 1979). The ethical and philanthropic aspects together may be considered to be a corporate social responsibility (McWilliams & Siegel, 2001).

The authors argue that these four stances mainly reflect the social and economic intentions of social entrepreneurs.

Organizational Goals

Simon (1964, p. 3) defines goals as "value premises that can serve as inputs to decisions" and these goals are different from the motives of the individual managers. Stevens & Moray (2009) defined organizational goals as "a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize as espoused by top management" (p. 5). The importance of organizational goals' specification and clarification has been emphasized by many academicians (Berson and Avolio, 2004; Roth and Ricks, 1994). The goals in real world of entrepreneurship drive the entrepreneurial choices be it recruitment of employees, adoption of a technology, design of marketing channel or choice regarding a particular source of finance. The level of attention to organizational goals mainly reflects the social and economic motives of social entrepreneurs.

Research Methodology

The objective of the study has been pursued by analysing primary data collected through a questionnaire based survey method.

Limiting the scope of the study to the secondary educational enterprises operating in Assam and considering the secondary schools (i.e., imparting education up to class X or above) as social enterprises, all schools have been taken as the population other than the government, government-aided, corporate and sole proprietary schools imparting secondary education in the state of Assam. Out of which a representative sample is drawn following stratified random sampling technique for studying the extent of social proclivity of the sample social enterprises. The State has been stratified into various regions based on the level of literacy as per the Census data pertaining to the year 2011. Since our objective is to ascertain the degree of social proclivity, we have included in our population only those schools which are registered either under Societies Registration Act XXI of 1860 or Indian Trusts Act, 1882, because their goals are exclusively social and these schools under the law are supposed to have commercial exchanges only for their sustainability. Although some commercial exchanges are made, the profits/surplus is channelized back directly to social benefits or in support of the social enterprise. The private schools are excluded because their social goals are construed as either subordinate to their economic goals or are prominent among other goals. Government schools have been excluded because they operate without any commercial exchange. The Principals being the leader of the schools and are the key persons to formulate or influence the goals of the schools are treated as the social entrepreneurs. Due to non-classification of schools on the basis of such characteristic at the level of the Department of School Education, Govt. Of Assam and difficulty associated in making a ground level survey, questionnaires were mailed to the Principals of all schools categorised as Non Aided Private schools that include the schools registered as society. Out of the total 350 Principals to whom the questionnaires were mailed, only 132 responded. While screening, 12 questionnaires were found unusable due to either incompleteness or received from a school outside our defined population. Finally 120 (with an effective response rate of 34 percent) usable questionnaires were taken for analysis. The details of sampling and basis of stratification are presented in a table (Table 2). The tool used by Stevens and Moray (2009) is modified in the context of the study area's socio-political characteristics and used to collect primary data from the respondents.

Table 2: Sampling and Basis of Stratification

School location				
Survey particulars	Literacy wise Highly Advanced Region	Literacy wise Moderately Advanced Region	Literacy wise Less Advanced Region	Total
Population size#	263	158	294	768
Sample size (45%)	147	71	132	350
Questionnaire received	62	43	27	132
Response rate (percent)	42.17	60.56	20.45	37.7
Questionnaire rejected	0	2*	10**	12
Effective sample size	62	41	17	120
Effective response rate (percent)	42.17	57.7	12.9	34.28

#Source: SEMIS (2010-2011) *private school **incomplete questionnaire

Measures

The measurement of the items was done on ordinal scales ranging from 1 (do not agree) to 7 (completely agree). To assess the normative and utilitarian identity, operationalisation of Stevens & Moray (2009) is used. Following them, five items were included that represent the utilitarian identity and five items that represent normative identity. The importance of the items was indicated on a seven-point Likert scale by the respondents. Stevens & Moray (2009) developed seven items out of which four-items were used to assess the other-regarding values three items to assess the self-regarding values. Respondents indicated their preference of each item by rating on a seven-point Likert scale. To realize the entrepreneurs' social orientation, respondents were asked to divide 100 points among four items reflecting the four areas of responsibility. In line with Stevens & Moray (2009), to gain understanding of the importance of social goals, respondents were asked to divide 100 points among five organizational goals. Lastly, the absolute importance of social value with two items on a seven-point Likert scale is measured.

Analysis

The goal of data analysis is to understand the way social entrepreneurs achieve trade-off while choosing between a social and an economic orientation.

Descriptive Analysis

Sample displays that the schools vary in number of years in the market (from new schools to well-established schools of above 10 years). 86% of the schools are more than 10 years old while 12% of the schools are between 5 to 10 years old. 64% of sample belongs to society while remaining 36% of the schools operate under trust. Majority of the respondents (46%) has been working as a Principal for the last 5-10 years, while 33% of the respondents have already been working as a Principal for more than 10 years. Only 21% of the respondents have got experience of below five years. 58% of the schools have students between 500 – 1000, 25% of the schools have students below 500 and 17% percent has students more than 1000. So far as location of the school is concerned, 70% of the schools are located in urban areas, 25% of the schools are located in semi-urban areas and only five percent of the schools are located in rural areas. Finally, sample data reveals that 61% of the schools has scope of only secondary education while 39% has scope of both secondary and higher secondary education.

The Extent of Social Proclivity of Social Entrepreneurs

The following arguments are developed to offer insights in the extent of social proclivity of social entrepreneurs operating in secondary education of Assam.

Normative and utilitarian identity

To assess the importance of five identified items representing a utilitarian identity and five identified items representing a normative identity, respondents were asked to mark their preference by rating on a seven-point Likert scale. Table 3 exhibits the meaningfulness of normative as well as utilitarian identity in study. The normative identity is found to be more important (sum 3862 and median 33.5), followed by the utilitarian identity (sum 3099 and median 28.5).

Table 3: Identity of Social Entrepreneurs

Items	N	Median	Maximum	SD	Sum of scores	Wilcoxon test*	
						z-score	p-value
Normative identity						-9.070	0.000
Community engagement	120	6.5	7	0.58	775		
Social bonding with other members	120	7	7	0.3	828		
Priority of quality of work to profit	120	6	7	1.23	684		
Democratic decision making	120	7	7	0.7	802		
Member ownership & control	120	7	7	0.8	773		
Sum normative identity	120	33.5	35	3.26	3862		
Utilitarian identity						-9.070	0.000
Value of products & services	120	5.5	7	2.07	549		
Service offered to customers	120	6	7	1.3	646		
Price related to products & services	120	7	7	0.44	808		
Expertise of school staff	120	6	7	2.06	652		
Reputation of quality of products & services	120	4	7	2.2	444		
Sum utilitarian identity	120	28.5	35	7.65	3099		

*Wilcoxon test conducted of the two sets of identities

The Friedman test indicates a significant difference between the different organizational identities ($p < 0.001$). Pairs of identities are further analysed by conducting Wilcoxon-tests to gain insight in the trade-off between normative and utilitarian identity. The result shows there is a significant difference between the two identities. Though, both the identities are equally important, but data favours a greater normative identity in social entrepreneurs.

Work Values

Secondly the work values of the participants are assessed on seven-point Likert scale, who rated their preference for six values. From the analysis, it is quite clear that social entrepreneurs in the study consider wealth to be the least important (median 1 and sum 137), whereas welfare seems to be the most important (median 7 and sum 814), followed closely by equality and affectionate and tender.

The Friedman test ($p < 0.001$) conducted points toward a significant difference among the six identified work values. Then, the other-regarding and self-regarding values are summed up. Table 4 shows that self-regarding values (sum 571) is least important for social entrepreneurs operating in secondary education in Assam. Wilcoxon test shows that the difference between both the values is significant.

Table 4: Work Values of Social Entrepreneurs

Items	N	Median	Maximum	SD	Sum of scores	Wilcoxon test*	
						z-score	p-value
Other-regarding values						-9.533	0.000
Welfare	120	7	7	0.41	814		
Supportive & empathetic	120	7	7	0.89	756		
Equality	120	7	7	0.43	811		
Affectionate & tender	120	7	7	0.44	808		
Other regarding values	120	27	28	1.64	3189		
Self-regarding values						-9.533	0.000
Comfortable life	120	4	7	1.57	434		
Wealth	120	1	2	0.35	137		
Self-regarding values	120	5	9	1.79	571		

*Wilcoxon test conducted of the two sets of values

Social Responsibility

Table 5 displays that the key responsibility of a social entrepreneur operating in secondary education of Assam is the discretionary/philanthropical responsibility (sum 3780 and median 30), followed closely by ethical responsibility (sum 3360 and median 30). It shows that the degree to which social entrepreneurs stick to ethical and discretionary responsibilities decides their social orientation.

The Friedman test suggests that there lies a significant difference between the different perspectives of the social entrepreneurs ($p < 0.001$). Wilcoxon test is performed to further analyse the pairs of responsibilities to enhance understanding of the social entrepreneur’s achieving the trade-off between the discretionary responsibility and the other responsibilities. The test also shows that the importance of discretionary and ethical responsibilities is greater than that of economic and legal responsibilities.

Table 5: Extent of Social Responsibility Measure

Items	N	Median	Maximum	SD	Sum of scores	Wilcoxon test*	
						z-score	p-value
Economic responsibilities	120	25	40	6	2960	-8.865	0.000
Legal responsibilities	120	15	25	5.2	1900	-5.780	0.000
Ethical responsibilities	120	30	40	3.3	3360	-4.290	0.000
Discretionary responsibilities	120	30	50	6.6	3780	//	//

*Wilcoxon test conducted of the sets of responsibilities

Social Goal

Lastly, the respondents are asked to divide 100 points between the five identified organizational goals and to rate the degree of importance of social goals on two seven-point Likert scales. Table 6 points out the fact that social entrepreneurs tend to follow a number of goals ranging from social to economical. This is consistent with Peredo and McLean (2006). The data shows that social value maximization is the most important goal (sum 4090 and median 40), followed closely by maximizing stability and longevity of the school (sum 3340 and median 30).

The Friedman test exhibits a significant difference between the five organizational goals ($p < 0.001$). After performing Wilcoxon test, it became clear all goals differ significantly from the goal of social value maximization, excepting the goal of maximizing the stability and longevity of the school. It signifies the fact that the social and stability and longevity of the school go hand in hand.

Table 6: Measure of Organizational Goals

Items	N	Median	Maximum	SD	Sum of scores	Wilcoxon test*	
						z-score	p-value
Maximizing social value	120	40	40	6.6	4090	//	//
Maximizing profitability	120	10	25	5.6	1835	-8.928	0.000
Maximizing revenue growth	120	20	25	5.7	1925	-8.824	0.000
Maximizing value of the institution for eventual acquisition	120	10	20	5.7	830	-9.342	0.000
Maximizing stability and longevity of the school	120	30	50	6.1	3340	-7.234	0.130

*Wilcoxon test of maximizing social value goal with other goals

Conclusion

The idea of integrating social with economic or profit making goals has been a major trend and new movement across the world today. This is more so after the world has witnessed a major 2007-2009 economic crisis which strongly indicated the problems of having goal of pure profit-maximization.

This study is a humble attempt in the direction of actually assessing the essentiality of social and economic proclivity to the enterprises and also to what extent social entrepreneurs operating in secondary education of Assam are really social. One of the crucial findings of the study brings forth the existence of both the social and economic proclivity, although the importance of social proclivity is higher compared to economic proclivity as evident in earlier studies conducted in other parts of the globe (Dacin et al., 2010). This finding is also in line with Stevens & Moray (2009), who have empirically tested four potential measures of social proclivity and found results to exhibit that social entrepreneurs in Belgium display strong social and economic purposes for capturing the dual-bottom line that characterizes their enterprises. To be more specific, social goals along with stability and longevity of the school is found to be more important. While analysing normative and utilitarian identity, the importance of normative identity is found to be more significant, although both of them scored high. In case of the extent of social responsibility, the same argument holds true as the ethical and discretionary responsibility of social entrepreneurs display high scores. The finding of the study also points out the adherence of social entrepreneurs to other regarding values against self-regarding values. The present study though based on a small sample provides empirical evidence to how social is the secondary schools in a developing region of a developing nation. However, future research may be undertaken for examining the degree of social proclivity not only in other sectors of the economy but also in other geographical regions.

References

- Agle, B. R., Mitchell, R. K., & Sonnenfeld, J. A. (1999). Who matters to CEOs? An investigation of stakeholder attributes and salience, corporate performance, and CEO values. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(5), 507-525.
- Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., & Ganapathi, I. (2007). Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 836-863.
- Alford, S.H., Brown, L.D., & Letts, C.W. (2004). *Social entrepreneurship: Leadership that Facilitates Societal Transformation – An Exploratory Study*. (Working Paper Series; 03-08), Cambridge, MA: Center for Public Leadership.
- Berson, Y., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). Transformational leadership and the dissemination of organizational goals: A case study of a telecommunication firm. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15 (5), 625-46.
- Bornstein, D. (2004). *How to change the world: Social entrepreneurship and the power of new ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brickson, S. L. (2007). Organizational identity orientation: The genesis of the role of the firm and distinct forms of social value. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 864-888.
- Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497-505.
- Certo, T., & Miller, T. (2008). Social entrepreneurship: Key Issues and concepts. *Business Horizons*, 51(4), 267-271.
- Chell, E. (2007). Social enterprise and entrepreneurship: Towards a convergent theory of the entrepreneurial process. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(1), 3-19.
- Christie, M.J., & Honig, B. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: New research findings. *Journal of World Business*, 41 (1), 1-5.
- Cox, A., & Healey, J. (1998). Promises to the poor: the record of European development agencies. *ODI Poverty Briefings*, 1, 1-4.
- 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. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), 37-57.
- Das, A. (2016, January 9). Azim Premji gives away Rs 27,514 crore, stays most generous Indian. *The Times of India*, p.5.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship. Retrieved from http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/documents/dees_SE.pdf.
- Drayton, B. (2002). The citizen Sector: Becoming as Entrepreneurial and Competitive as Business. *California Management Review*, 44(3), 120-132.
- Elizur, D., Borg, I., Hunt, R., & Beck, I. M. (1991). The Structure of Work Values - a Cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 21-38.
- Fiol, C. M. (2001). Revisiting an identity-based view of sustainable competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 27, 691-699.
- Foreman, P., & Whetten, D. A. (2002). Members' identification with multiple-identity organizations. *Organization Science*, 13(6), 618-635.
- Fowler, A. (2000). NGOs as a moment in history: beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation? *Third World Quarterly*, 21(4), 637-654.



- Harding, R. (2004). Social enterprise: The New Economic Engine? *Business Strategy Review*, 15(4), 39-43.
- Johnson, S. (2000). *Literature Review on Social Entrepreneurship*. Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship. Retrieved from <http://www.bus.ualberta.ca/ccse>.
- Kramer, M.R. (2005). *Measuring Innovation: Evaluation in the Field of Social Entrepreneurship*. Skoll Foundation, USA: Foundation Strategy Group.
- Leadbeater, C. (1997). *The Rise of Social Entrepreneurship*. London: Demos.
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006a). Social Entrepreneurship Research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- Mair J., & Noboa, E. (2003). *Social Entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social enterprise get formed*. (WP521). Barcelona: IESE Business School.
- Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007) Social entrepreneurship: the case for a definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 5(2), 29-39.
- McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2001). Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26 (1), 117 - 127.
- Misra, S., & Kumar, E.S. (2000). Resourcefulness: A proximal conceptualisation of entrepreneurial behaviour. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 9(2), 135 - 154.
- Mort, G. S., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: towards conceptualisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 76-88.
- Moulaert, F. et al. (eds.) (2013). *The International Handbook on Social Innovation; Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Mumford, M. D., Helton, W. B., Decker, B. P., Connelly, M. Z., & Van Doorn, J. R. (2003). Values and beliefs related to ethical decisions. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 7(2), 139-170.
- Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56-65.
- Ravasi, D., & Schultz, M. (2006). Responding to organizational identity threats: Exploring the role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), 433-458.
- Robinson, J.A. (2006). Navigating social and institutional barriers to markets: how social entrepreneurs identify and evaluate opportunities. In Mair, J., Robinson, J.A. and Hockerts, K. (Eds), *International Perspectives on social entrepreneurship* (pp. 95-120). Houndsmill : Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ros, M. (1999). Basic individual values, work values, and the meaning of work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48 (1), 49-71.
- Roth, K., & Ricks, D. A. (1994). Goal configuration in a global industry Context. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15 (2), 103-20.
- Santos, F.M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 335-351.
- Schuler, D. A., & Cording, M. (2006). A corporate social performance-corporate financial performance behavioral model for consumers. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(3), 540-558.
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: creating new Business models to serve the poor, *Business Horizons*, 48(3), 241-246.
- Simon, H. A. (1964). On the concept of organizational goal. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9(1), 1-22.

- Spear, R. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: a different model? *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33(5/6), 399–410.
- Stevens, R., & Moray, N. (2009). Social Proclivity of Social Entrepreneurs: How social are they? Retrieved from <https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/697803/file/5957940.pdf>
- Stevens, R., Moray, N., & Bruneel, J. (2015). The social and economic mission of social enterprises: dimensions, measurement, validation, and relation. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 39(5), 1051–1082.
- Tan, W. L., Williams, J., & Tan, T. M. (2005). Defining the ‘social’ in ‘social entrepreneurship’: Altruism and entrepreneurship. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1(3), 353-365.
- Thake, S., & Zadek, S., (1997). *Practical people, noble causes. How to support community based social entrepreneurs*. London : New Economic Foundation.
- Thompson, J., & Doherty, B. (2006). The diverse world of social enterprise. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33(5/6), 361-375.
- Venkataraman, S. (1997). The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research: An editor’s perspective. *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth*, 3, 119–138.
- Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519–532.
-

Authors’ Profile

Rajdeep Deb is currently pursuing PhD in the area of social entrepreneurship from Department of Commerce, North Eastern Hill University, Shillong, Meghalaya, India. He has presented research papers in national and international seminars and also published research papers in various journals.

Nagari Mohan Panda is a Professor at the Department of Commerce, North Eastern Hill University, Shillong, Meghalaya, India. He has more than 30 years of teaching experience. His area of interests include Cost and Management Accounting, Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management. He has presented more than 50 papers. He is a Life Member of All India Commerce Association, Indian Accounting Association, Indian Accounting Association – Research Foundation.
