

A Study On Differences Of Opinion Based On Socio-Demography Of Social Entrepreneurs With Regard To Social Entrepreneurship Variables

Poornima, A.¹ and Dr. Rajini, G.²

¹(Doctorate Research Scholar, School of Management Studies and Commerce, Vels Institute of Science, Technology & Advanced Studies, Pallavaram, Chennai, India)

²(Professor & Head- MBA, School of Management Studies and Commerce, Vels Institute of Science Technology and Advanced Studies, Pallavaram, Chennai, India)

Abstract:

Social entrepreneurship is both an evolutionary alongside revolutionary concept. It has evolved over year after year as a “hybrid” organisation combining enterprises making profit and enterprises operating in a service mode, while also providing innovative methods and notions for generating additional worth for everyone – the purchasers, the enterprise initiators, and over all community. Primary Goals of social entrepreneurship is to maximise worth for everyone included in the ecosystem. **Objectives:** To analyse the difference of opinion among social entrepreneurs based on socio-demography and social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social innovation, Sustainable development and network. **Methodology:** Purposive sampling method was adopted to collect data through telephonic interview. **Data Analysis:** Reliability and analysis of variance was carried out to meet the objective by using SPSS 24.0. **Findings:** The opinion regarding Social vision and social innovation of the entrepreneurs varies based on the location and social vision varies based in the type of social enterprise registered. **Implications:** Social entrepreneurs in rural location should be given training to disseminate their vision which helps to network and innovate for sustainable development.

Keywords: Social Entrepreneurs, Social Innovation, Sustainable Development, Social Vison Network, Personality Trait

1. Introduction

In today’s business world common good and ethics are the key factors to be followed. Individuals who are socially conscious have introduced many innovation in their business to address problems in the society through out the world which was traditionally ignored not only by business houses but also by many government organisationa and NGOs. Such entrepreneurial individuals created an astonishing new way to improve adverse conditions in the society mainly in under developed and emergent markets wherein prevalence of scarcity of reources, resource underutilisation and bribery practice among Non- government alongside government organisations badly prohibits the focus needed on important social needs and issues (Prahalad, 2008 and Zahra et al., 2009). Now, it has become important to protect people and planet and alongside an entrepreneurial zeal. We

A Study On Differences Of Opinion Based On Socio-Demography Of Social Entrepreneurs With Regard To Social Entrepreneurship Variables

need business that address the gaint gaps that exists between formal constitution and social reality (sannams4.com). In this line an entrepreneur who is highly motivated by social objectives has to be given importance to protect people and planet who are termed as social entrepreneurs (Hardings, 2004). A business venture with a social motive is primarily identified as social enterprise or social business is very much needed at this hour.

In today's scenario, the part played by social entrepreneurship is widely developing and improving among profit making business sector and service oriented business sector (Letaifa,S.B. 2015). Income earning strategies adopted by non-government institutions started primarily for social mission when the government aids and donations were started to decline gives rise to social enterprises. Social entrepreneurs are frequently described as visionaries because of their ability to perceive social problems and also have a potential to imagine and implement feasible solutions to these challenges. Social entrepreneurs can be visionary at the community level in terms of their ability to distinguish local social needs and possible solution, as well as at the global arena in recognition of opportunity to create social wealth via transacting goods and services; at the module level in terms of its ability to recognise major global social crises and organise resources to address these systemic challenges (**Zahra et al. 2009**)

Objectives of the Study: To find the difference of opinion regarding social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, social innovation, network, personality trait and sustainable development.

Operational definition

Personality Trait: Personality traits are aspects of individual behaviour that help us understand why different people respond differently to the same circumstance. (Llewellyn and Wilson, 2003).

Social Entrepreneur: A type of entrepreneur who takes advantage of opportunities to tackle a local social demand and has a understanding of environmental circumstances and resources available at hand at a local level. In this study, the social entrepreneurs matched the description given to social bricoleur in typology stated by Zahra et al.,2009.

Social Vision: To make the social vision into reality, social entrepreneurs need Clarity, Abstractness, Future orientation, Desirability and Realising factors of vision such as Organisational alignment, and communication is needed.

Social Innovation: It is finding a novel answer to any societal issue that is having highest usefulness, cost effective, viable, or equitable when compared to the prevailing answers and generates social worth primarily rather than commercial value to single individuals or organisations as defined by Phill et al ., 2008.

Network: Network is referred to as the relationship between an Social entrepreneur, and with various institutions such as the financial, legal, educational, trade association, Business club, Incubators, Foundations, R&D Centres and also relationship with friends, family and team in their social venture.

Sustainable Development :It can be understood from the perception of importance given by social entrepreneurs in achieving sustainable development goals.

2.REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Personality trait

According to **Costa and McCrae (1992)**, entrepreneurs who score high on the emotionality index cope with problems, stressors, and issues by taking an optimistic mindset, focusing on the aim, and taking direct and timely steps to overcome such challenges. Extrovert personality has a sense of proactivity needed in fuelling and pushing Social entrepreneurs' Charismatic vision **Crant (1996)**. **Ahmed (1998)** also portrayed a few of the personality traits linked with innovation process from previous researches, such as a high valuation of aesthetic qualities in experience, wide interests, interest to complexity, highly energetic, autonomy of judgement, gut instinct, self-confidence, capacity to handle opposites, perseverance, curiosity, and energy, which can promote innovation in the workplace. **Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007)** defines that Honesty attributes are defined as diminished opportunities for an individual to earn personal gains through exploitation of others. Honesty is also related with a lower chance of loss as a result of others' cooperation withdrawal. Also they claims that High Honesty-Humility is associated with lower engagement in unethical behaviour. **Nga, J. K. H., & Shamuganathan, G. (2010)**. investigated the Big Five personality qualities of openness, extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness on social entrepreneurship elements such social vision, sustainability, financial returns, innovations, and social networks. The data analysis' results shows agreeableness impacting all facets of social entrepreneurship, but openness impacts on financial returns, innovation and social vision. Conscientiousness was discovered to have a good impact on sustainability as well as financial returns. The study also discovered that openness and agreeableness were favourable personality factors that influenced social vision. Neuroticism which is similar to emotional stability in HEXACO Scale has a negative impact on the development of social networks.

2.2 Social Vision

Thompson et al., (2000) pointed that vision of an entrepreneur and perseverance important attribute to establish social endeavour. **Bornstein (2007)** defines social entrepreneurship as perceiving a problem and imagining a new solution, acting on the vision, amassing resources to preserve and promote the vision, and overcoming resistance to attaining the vision. According to **Prabhu (1999)**, social entrepreneurs could exhibit many of the qualities and behaviours of business entrepreneurs when starting and managing their companies, whereas they

primarily differs in their vision and ideologies. **Baum, J.R., Locke, E.A. and Kirkpatrick, S.A. (1998)** conducted a longitudinal study to discover the impact of vision of an entrepreneur and the impact of communication of on growth of a venture. Research results showed that Vision affects organisational performance significantly and directly whereas vision communication affects organisational performance indirectly.

2.3 Network

In 1973 **Granovetter** explored how a sample of people learned about job prospects. He came to the conclusion that an individual's more frequent interactions were less likely to create information regarding job chances than other less frequent contacts. Less frequent interactions were discovered to have linkages with other networks, potentially providing vital information which was previously unavailable to individuals within a small, closed network. It is also stated that persons who have contacts in a wider range of locations have greater access towards information and resources. He also highlights that diverse contacts are much more beneficial because everyone in a close-knit group knows the very same things. **Montgomery et al., (2012)** presented that social companies that are scaling up are likely to require new relationships like Collaborations typically require a significant amount of time and energy.

2.4 Social innovation

Leadbeater, (1997) emphasise that Social entrepreneurship necessitates the development of social innovations by enterprising individuals in order to foster creative approaches to meeting both social and related demands. **Tushman and Anderson, (2004)** states that a critical antecedent to change and is required for an organization's long-term success is Innovation. Central issue in research pertaining to social entrepreneurship is innovation, however further work required for development of Theories of innovation related to social entrepreneurship. **Urban, B(2013)** states that Social innovation is a platform that creates worth by establishing long-term resolutions by combining capabilities, technologies, goods, processes, to make a social and economic acceptability in neglected, unexplored markets. **Emir Ozeren et al (2018)** conducted in-depth interviews with observations were conducted in a semi-structured format. It was discovered that the social enterprise under research dynamically handles the network process while realising the exceptional mutual benefit produced out of social innovation to all the actors involved in the process.

2.5 Sustainable Development

Keogh and Polonsky, 1998 found that Commitment to social concerns is typically accompanied with an emotional attachment and a sense of obligation that pushes one-self for rendering support towards a social cause or to support an environmental protection initiative an environmental and/or social cause. **Ashton, et al., (1998)** displays that a best predictors of empathetic personality is a high level of agreeableness. **Chiang,et al., (2019)** their study results indicated that people who are more emotionally stable and have a better internal locus of control are much more inclined to participate in pro-environmental activities.

3 Methodology:

3.1 Details of Population

Social Entrepreneurs were the population considered for our study. The researcher does not know the real number of social entrepreneurs in India and there are no government records or other official documents that indicate the overall number of social entrepreneurs in India. Therefore, the universe of the study is limited to the lists prepared by the leading agencies that offer financial support, guidance and recognition to the social entrepreneurs in India.

Though other researchers have attempted to conceptually describe social enterprises, India's legal system and framework have been unable to legally define social enterprises, making this particular research challenging in terms of identifying sampling for the research. There is no comprehensive list of social companies on official records, which again is understandable in a developing economy like India, where the term "social enterprises" is not legally defined. This necessitates considerable effort on the part of the government to develop a legal identity for social businesses and incorporate it into its company registry.

In this study individual level i.e micro level was taken for analysis. Social entrepreneurs are the individuals taken as sample in our study. The study is not about any social enterprises (meso-level) and not about international or inter-organisational social enterprises (Macro level). We focus on individual level of analysis corresponding to micro level in this study. Institutions that do not have a specific focus on the underprivileged, as well as social enterprise accelerators & incubators like Ashoka and UnLtd India that engage with social startups, were removed from the study because the study's main purpose is to investigate social bricoleurs.

Data was collected from the agencies such as 1. Impactpreneurs, 2. Tamilnadu Agriculture University's Incubation Centre, 3. Yourstory, 4. BetterIndia, 5. Krishi Vigyan Kendra, 6. Youth For India, 7. NABARD-Database, 8. Self Help group, 9. National Innovation Fund whose beneficiaries were having started up social ventures were studied carefully.

3.2 Sampling Frame

For qualitative study, with regards to social entrepreneurs, the sample were obtained within Tamil Nadu.

3.2.1 Sampling Method: Focus group method. Non- Probability Sampling Method was adapted. This method is a sampling methodology in which not everyone in the population have an equal opportunity in taking part for the study. This type of sampling would be used to demonstrate the presence of a specific trait in the population. It can be utilised when randomization is not possible, such as when the population is unknown. Here in our case the number of social entrepreneurs in the country is not known and our important focus it to get knowledge about social bricoleurs who are not at all in the limelight.

3.2.2 Sampling Technique

All organisations in Tamil Nadu that encourage social entrepreneurship are included in the population. The purposive sampling techniques under non-probability sampling techniques was preferred. Purposive sampling empowers to exercise discretion in selecting examples that will best allow them to answer the research questions (Saunders et al. ,2009).

3.2.3 Reasons for purposive sampling

Social businesses are registered under various legal structures and follow respective legal frameworks under which the company is registered as well as economic responsibilities and duties. To get an in-depth understanding, these individuals were purposively selected based on their venture activities, business priorities and beneficiaries after careful screening. While interviewing some ventures found to be not adhering to social mission and so they were not interviewed further because they were not able to answer questions related to social innovation and vision.

3.3 Data collection Method

The sample chosen is nonrandom and purposeful. Individuals selected was then personally screened with the help of publically existing website content to make sure that participants fulfill the operational definition prescribed in this study. The social entrepreneurs were contacted through phone and after fixing appointment for a telephonic interview at the ease of social entrepreneurs, oral consent for participating in this study was obtained. The researcher requested permission to record the interview, but the social entrepreneurs strictly don't want their interview to get recorded. So, the researcher marked the responses in the interview schedule.

3.4 Data collection Instrument

Interview schedule was prepared by the researcher. Initially the schedule was prepared in English as the researcher realized to conduct the interview within State of Tamil Nadu, the schedule gets translated to Native Language Tamil. The reasons for restricting are the researcher's language barrier since India is a multi-lingual country, and due to funding and time constraints. The questionnaire translated in Tamil was back translated to English with the help of an expert in English and Tamil the content was found to be the same after translation.

3.4.1 Section A

This section contained forced choice method designed to collect demographic details like Age, Educational qualification, Gender, Course studied, Marital status, Numbers of years of work, Years of Prior Work Experience, Family type, Family business if they have already.

3.4.2 Section B

This section is designed to collect data about their social enterprise such as Name of the enterprise, Year of inception, Location of the enterprise, Type of organization, Type of Venture,

Legal registration of the enterprise, Number of patent obtained, Area of focus of their business, Communication platform they use to disseminate their business information, Fund raising pattern, Profit reinvestment. In which the data regarding Beneficiaries, Field of work, Type of innovation that their enterprise adopt in given as multiple answer response type as the three categories nature is so.

3.4.3 Section C

This section is designed to understand social vision, communication process including Vision attributes of the social entrepreneur with respect to his/her social vision. The items were developed based on the theoretical underpinnings of vision attributes such as Clarity, Abstractness, Future orientation, Desirability and Realising factors of vision such as Organisational alignment. The items were framed based on the research work from the following researchers “Baum, J.R., Locke, E.A. and Kirkpatrick, S.A. ,1998; Suskan kantabutra and G. C.Avery, 2010; Shilpa Wadhwa, Daleep Parimoo, 2016; Mahmood S, Rehman AU, 2015; Brush, C. G. 2008.” With the response scales with the intensity Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

3.4.4 Section D

For the measurement of social innovative thought of social entrepreneurs we developed items from features of innovation and elements of innovation taken from “The Young Foundation (2012) Social Innovation Overview: A deliverable of the project: The theoretical, empirical and policy foundations for building social innovation in Europe (TEPSIE), Brussels: European Commission, DG Research”. Items to measure variable was named Social Innovation. 11 items were given with the rating scale strongly agree to strongly disagree.

3.4.5 Section D Sustainable Development

To measure the sustainable development that the social entrepreneurs under study would contribute to the society is measured by asking Social Entrepreneur’s perception of importance about Sustainable Development Goals with the response scale were critical, Very Important, Important, Somewhat Important, Irrelevant. The researcher adopted 17 goals from “The 2030 Agenda for sustainable development” in which each goals were converted into simple items. Therefore 17 items were placed under the variable Sustainable Development.

3.4.6 Section F

20 items were framed to measure the support that the social entrepreneur is receiving during their social entrepreneurial process. This variable was named as Network. Each item represents one actor in the business network ecosystem including formal and informal network actors. “Aldrich, (1989), Black and Boal (1994), Daniel Bjärsholm (2019), Terziovski (2003), Emerson and Twersky(1996), Catford (1998), Alvord et al. (2004), Austin et al. (2006), Leadbeater (1997), Satar and John (2016), Thompson et al. (2000), Nga and Shamuganathan

A Study On Differences Of Opinion Based On Socio-Demography Of Social Entrepreneurs With Regard To Social Entrepreneurship Variables

(2010) were the authors whose articles were used as base for the selection of each item in this construct.

3.4.7 Section G

This section measures the personality trait of the respondents. 60 items were adopted from HEXACO Personality Inventory Revised form 60- Item English version developed by “Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009)”. Out of 60 items, one item was deleted upon the suggestion given by Institutional ethics committee. The response scales were strongly Agree to Strongly disagree.

As the research is carried out within Tamilnadu, Interview Schedule was translated to tamil by a bilingual expert. Then the translated version of the interview schedule was again given to another bilingual expert to translate to English. The translation to original language found similar and the meanings were not distorted from the original instrument developed.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Reliability Analysis

Table No:1, Reliability statistics for the constructs studied with social Entrepreneur

Construct	Cronbach Alpha Value	No of items
Sustainable Development	0.928	17
Social Vision	0.737	9
Social Innovation	0.600	11
Network	0.794	20
Personality Trait	0.614	57(15R and 3 were deleted)
Total number of items	0.866	106

The reliability test results are exhibited in Table No. 1. The Cronbach value across all items in the study is 0.866, which is higher than the threshold value of 0.6 and hence considered satisfactory. The Cronbach alpha value for each construct is examined, and the results are 0.928 (Sustainable Development), 0.737 (Social Vision communication), 0.600 (Social Innovation), 0.794 (Network), and 0.614 (Personality Trait) respectively. All constructs have alpha values larger than 0.6, which appears to be appropriate for the study.

4.2 Demographic details - Social Entrepreneurs.

Majority of respondents in our study were Male aged between 36-45 years being post graduates studied in engineering stream and also having greater than 12 years of prior work

experience. Majority of social entrepreneurs were married living as a nuclear family with no entrepreneurial back ground. Majority of social entrepreneurs have their venture in urban location operating as for profit type of organisation focusing on profit making business with a social mission. Majority of them used their own funds during start-up phase not relying on grants and donation and social entrepreneurs generate greater than 50% of income through trading/ service charge /sales conducting events for running their business. Half of the social entrepreneurs has up to 20% as their Salaries, commissions, royalties, incentives, and operating profits are all included in earned income, as they are self-employed reinvesting upto 75% of their profit for a social cause. Working with a focus on social issues in agriculture and for the benefit of farmers with product innovation in which 93.8% does not have patents using Facebook as a social media platform to disseminate their business related information.

4.3 Kruskal Wallis Test:

This section attempts to determine whether there exist a relationship amongst demographic variables and Social Entrepreneurship Variables. The data was analysed to see if there exist any noteworthy differences. As Social Entrepreneurship variables are not normally distributed we resort to non-parametric tests. The Kruskal Wallis H Test is a nonparametric rank-based test that provides an alternative to one-way ANOVA which could be applied to identify the relationship between the demographic characteristic namely Gender, Age, Education Level, Course Studied, work experience if any, Type of Family, Family Business, Location, Organisation type and Organisation Registered and social entrepreneurship variables such as Social Vision, Social Innovation, Network, Personality Trait and Sustainable Development.

4.3 Hypothesis for Kruskal Wallis Test:

H₂: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' demography

H_{2a}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' Gender

H_{2b}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' Age.

H_{2c}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' Level of Education

A Study On Differences Of Opinion Based On Socio-Demography Of Social Entrepreneurs With Regard
To Social Entrepreneurship Variables

H_{2d}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' Course studied.

H_{2e}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' Marital Status.

H_{2f}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' prior work experience

H_{2g}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' Family Type.

H_{2h}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' Entrepreneurial family Back ground.

H_{2i}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' Location of social venture.

H_{2j}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' Type of social venture.

H_{2k}: The opinion on Social Entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits differs significantly by the social entrepreneurs' Venture registration.

Table No: 2 Kruskal Wallis Tests for Social Entrepreneurs' demographic and Social Entrepreneurship variables

Social Entrepreneurs' Demographic variables		Social Entrepreneurship variables				
		Mean Rank				
		Social Vision	Social innovation	Network	Sustainable Development	Personality Trait
Gender	Female	34.62	34.98	30.02	33.79	26.25
	Male	32.23	31.38	33.71	32.63	30.96
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	0.229	0.517	0.554	0.054	0.968
	Df	1	1	1	1	1

Social Entrepreneurs' Demographic variables		Social Entrepreneurship variables				
		Mean Rank				
		Social Vision	Social innovation	Network	Sustainable Development	Personality Trait
	Sig	0.632	0.472	0.457	0.817	0.325
Age Group	18-25 years	61.00	47.50	63.00	56.00	51.00
	26-35 years	36.15	29.70	33.95	35.35	22.42
	36-45 years	28.10	29.76	29.87	27.87	30.93
	46-55 years	31.35	29.20	25.10	33.35	31.06
	56-65 years	38.58	48.58	41.00	39.58	40.63
	> 66 years	42.75	55.50	49.25	43.25	40.25
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	5.671	9.546	7.782	5.034	7.762
	Df	5	5	5	5	5
	Sig	0.340	0.089	0.169	0.412	0.170
Level of Education	Lower than H.Sc	24.70	32.90	14.90	39.10	41.00
	H.Sc	19.33	14.50	12.33	33.33	22.50
	Under Graduate	27.36	26.00	33.24	29.86	27.25
	Post Graduate	41.50	39.26	36.96	33.61	27.35
	Higher than Post Graduate	28.38	33.25	34.06	35.19	36.44
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	10.619	8.993	9.646	1.240	4.900
	df	4	4	4	4	4
	Sig.	0.031*	0.061	0.047*	0.871	0.298
Course studied	Arts	29.33	31.75	41.67	31.75	28.40
	Agriculture	45.33	60.00	54.00	46.50	45.17
	Business Administration	36.45	38.55	32.23	25.91	30.00
	Commerce	21.25	13.25	4.25	15.75	9.75
	Engineering	31.72	28.03	33.50	31.06	25.50
	Science	36.38	31.79	37.08	33.54	29.75
	Social Work	61.00	27.50	27.50	47.25	7.50
	Technology	9.00	21.00	43.00	30.00	39.00
	Others	26.21	32.63	21.63	39.54	37.68
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	10.724	11.284	15.417	7.557	12.560
	df	8	8	8	8	8
	Sig.	0.218	0.186	0.052	0.478	0.128
Marital Status	Single	34.07	29.36	32.77	36.96	23.42

A Study On Differences Of Opinion Based On Socio-Demography Of Social Entrepreneurs With Regard
To Social Entrepreneurship Variables

Social Entrepreneurs' Demographic variables		Social Entrepreneurship variables				
		Mean Rank				
		Social Vision	Social innovation	Network	Sustainable Development	Personality Trait
	Married	32.71	33.38	32.43	31.91	31.26
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	.058	.514	.003	.786	2.174
	df	1	1	1	1	1
	Sig.	0.810	0.473	0.953	0.375	0.140
Prior work experience	0-3 years	37.31	33.69	35.00	37.27	28.00
	4-7 years	26.94	23.59	26.09	30.06	22.04
	8-11 years	41.80	44.50	41.00	40.00	31.40
	>12 years	32.90	35.05	33.47	31.60	33.69
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	3.430	5.994	3.242	1.909	4.559
	df	3	3	3	3	3
	Sig.	0.330	0.112	0.356	0.592	0.207
Type of the family	Nuclear Family	34.48	34.78	35.00	33.44	30.03
	Joint Family	29.90	27.83	27.38	32.07	28.50
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	0.838	1.976	2.367	.075	.107
	df	1	1	1	1	1
	Sig.	0.360	0.160	0.124	0.784	0.743
Family Business	Yes	33.78	31.28	31.44	32.28	30.28
	No	32.70	32.98	32.88	33.28	29.20
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	0.042	0.109	0.075	0.036	0.047
	df	1	1	1	1	1
	Sig.	0.837	0.742	0.784	0.849	0.828
Location	Rural	23.92	23.53	31.81	34.50	31.57
	Semi-urban	34.25	36.08	28.96	33.38	31.18
	Urban	37.63	36.36	34.12	32.03	27.95
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	6.523	6.319	0.717	0.214	0.603
	df	2	2	2	2	2
	Sig.	0.038*	0.042*	0.699	0.898	0.740
Organisation Type	Non-profit	40.08	32.32	39.83	32.03	25.82
	Profit	30.08	32.58	29.63	33.40	31.29
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	3.792	0.003	3.892	0.071	1.347
	df	1	1	1	1	1
	Sig.	0.051	0.959	0.049*	0.789	0.246

Social Entrepreneurs' Demographic variables		Social Entrepreneurship variables				
		Mean Rank				
		Social Vision	Social innovation	Network	Sustainable Development	Personality Trait
Organisation registration	Co-operatives	33.50	48.50	36.75	25.25	53.00
	Foundation	49.25	58.25	51.50	21.75	34.75
	Micro Enterprises	42.29	29.64	29.14	42.29	23.50
	NGO	34.30	29.40	35.60	32.00	28.60
	NPO/Section 8/ Section 25	50.00	35.75	57.00	17.75	22.50
	private limited company	32.31	31.07	22.81	29.19	15.75
	SHG	10.50	6.50	21.75	22.50	22.75
	Small & medium enterprise	26.20	32.30	31.20	34.94	36.60
	Small scale industries	1.50	16.00	7.00	11.50	30.50
	Society	48.17	35.58	43.83	44.33	32.42
	Trust	43.38	35.38	43.00	28.88	28.50
Others	13.50	31.50	16.50	14.50	4.00	
Kruskal-Wallis H test	H value	19.939	10.726	13.373	9.868	14.952
	df	11	11	11	11	11
	Sig.	0.046*	0.466	0.270	0.542	0.185

*pvalue is significant at 5%

Gender

As per table No: 2, the significance values for H values are 0.632 (Social Vision), 0.472 (Social innovation), 0.457 (Network), 0.817 (Sustainable Development), 0.325 (Personality Trait) with respect to gender are greater than 0.05 and so “the null hypothesis is accepted” meaning that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits of social entrepreneurs does not differ significantly by Gender.

Age

As per Table No: 2, the significance values for H values are .0.340 (Social Vision), 0.089 (Social innovation), 0.169 (Network), 0.412 (Sustainable Development), 0.170 (Personality Trait) with respect to age are greater than 0.05 and so “the null hypothesis is accepted” meaning that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits does not differ by of social entrepreneurs' age.

Level of Education

As per Table No: 2, the significance values for H values are 0.031 (Social Vision), 0.061 (Social innovation), 0.047 (Network), 0.871 (Sustainable Development), 0.298 (Personality Trait) with respect to Level of Education shows that null hypothesis is accepted meaning that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits does not differs by of social entrepreneurs' Level of Education.

Course Studied

As per table No: 2, the significance values for H values are .0.218 (Social Vision), 0.186 (Social innovation), 0.052 (Network) , 0.478 (Sustainable Development), 0.128 (Personality Trait) with respect to course studied shows that null hypothesis is accepted meaning that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits does not differs by of social entrepreneurs' Course studied.

Marital Status

As per table No: 2, the significance values for H values are .0.810 (Social Vision), 0.473 (Social innovation), 0.953 (Network) , 0.375 (Sustainable Development), 0.140 (Personality Trait) with respect to marital status shows that null hypothesis is accepted meaning that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits does not differs by of social entrepreneurs' Marital status.

Prior Work Experience

As per Table No: 2, the significance values for H values are 0.330 (Social Vision), 0.112 (Social innovation), 0.356 (Network), 0.592 (Sustainable Development), 0.207 (Personality Trait) with respect to prior work experience shows that null hypothesis is accepted meaning that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits does not differs by of social entrepreneurs' prior work experience.

Type of Family

As per table No: 2, the significance values for H values are .0.360 (Social Vision), 0.160 (Social innovation), 0.124 (Network) , 0.784 (Sustainable Development), 0.743 (Personality Trait) with respect to Type of the family shows that null hypothesis is accepted meaning that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits does not differs by of social entrepreneurs' Family Type.

Entrepreneurial Family Back ground

As per table No: 2, the significance values for H values are .0.837 (Social Vision), 0.742(Social innovation), 0.784(Network), 0.849(Sustainable Development), 0.828(Personality Trait) with respect to Entrepreneurial Back Ground shows that null hypothesis is accepted meaning that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation,

Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits does not differs by of social entrepreneurs' Entrepreneurial Family Background.

Location

As per table No: 2, the significance values for H values are .0038 (Social Vision), 0.042 (Social innovation), 0.699 (Network), 0.898 (Sustainable Development), 0.740 (Personality Trait) with respect to Location of social venture shows that the null hypothesis is partially rejected. This means that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits does not differs by of social entrepreneurs' Social venture Location.

Type of Organisation

As per table No: 2, the significance values for H values are .0051 (Social Vision), 0.959(Social innovation), 0.049 (Network), 0.789 (Sustainable Development), 0.246 (Personality Trait) with respect to Type of organisation shows that null hypothesis is partially rejected. This means that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits does not differs by of social entrepreneurs' organisation type.

Type of Registration

As per table No: 2, the significance values for H values are .0046 (Social Vision), 0.466 (Social innovation), 0.270 (Network), 0.542 (Sustainable Development), 0.185 (Personality Trait) with respect to Type of registration shows that null hypothesis is partially rejected. This means that opinion on social entrepreneurship variables such as social vision, Social Innovation, Network, Sustainable Development, and personality traits does not differs by of social entrepreneurs' Social venture Registration.

Table No: 3, Overall Summary of Kruskal Wallis Test

Demographic Variables	Social Entrepreneurship Variables				
	Social Vision	Social Innovation	Network	Sustainable Development	Personality Trait
Gender	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
Age	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
Level of Education	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
Course Studied	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
Marital Status	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig

A Study On Differences Of Opinion Based On Socio-Demography Of Social Entrepreneurs With Regard
To Social Entrepreneurship Variables

Prior Work Experience	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
Type of Family	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
Family Business	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
Location	Sig	Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
Organisation Type	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig
Organisation Registered	Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig	Not Sig

Source: Primary Data collected from social entrepreneurs

Not Sig: Not Significant, Sig: Significant

Findings & Discussion

Social Vision

The opinion on social vision does not differ significantly based on Gender, Age, Level of Education, Course Studied, Marital Status, Prior Work Experience, Family Type, Entrepreneurial background of social entrepreneur and the type of organisation in the study. The opinion on social vision differs significantly based on Location and registration of the social venture. The opinion on social vision of the social entrepreneur talks about a clear vision for social upliftment, guide for the development of the community, communicating vision to all stakeholders, drafting policies and objectives based on vision, to select people to attain vision, carefully choose every strategic partner (HR, Marketing, Supply chain, Technology, etc.) to achieve vision, acquiring projects to reach vision, choosing communication channel to achieve vision, evaluate our performance to ensure our path to reach our dream remains the same across male and female, social entrepreneurs having Lower than Higher secondary, Higher secondary, Under Graduate, Postgraduate, Higher than Post Graduation qualification, course studied by social entrepreneurs be it Arts, Agriculture, Business Administration, Commerce, Engineering, Law, Medicine, Para Medical course, Science, Social work, Technology, same among married and unmarried social entrepreneurs, with different prior work experience like upto 3 years, between 4 and 7 years, between 8 and 11years, greater than 12 years of work experience, nuclear and joint family type, with and without entrepreneurial family background, profit or non profit organization.

Social Innovation

The opinion on Social Innovation does not differ significantly based on Gender, Age, Level of Education, Course Studied, Marital Status, Prior Work Experience, Family Type, Entrepreneurial background of social entrepreneur, type of organization, registration of the social venture in the study however The opinion on Social Innovation differs significantly according to Location of their venture . The opinion on Social innovation in this study talks about “Novelty, From ideas to implementation, Meeting a social need, Effectiveness, Enhances society’s capacity to act, Better use of assets and resources” are same among male and female social entrepreneurs, same across social entrepreneurs having Lower than Higher secondary, Higher secondary, Under Graduate, Postgraduate, Higher than Post Graduation qualification, same among married and unmarried social entrepreneurs, the opinion is same among social entrepreneurs with different prior work experience like upto 3 years, between 4 and 7 years, between 8 and 11years, greater than 12 years of work experience, nuclear and joint family type, with and without entrepreneurial family background, profit or non profit organization, the opinion is the same among social entrepreneurs who register their organisation under various legal structure like Co-operative, Foundation Micro Enterprise, NGO, NPO/section 8 company /section 25 company, Private limited company, Self Help Group, Small Scale Industries, Small & Medium Enterprise , Society, Trust, Others whereas the opinion on social innovation differs for other demography.

Network

The opinion on Network does not differ significantly based on Gender, Age, Level of Education, Course Studied, Marital Status, Prior Work Experience, Family Type, Entrepreneurial background of social entrepreneur and type of organization, Location and registration of the social venture in the study. The opinion remains pervasive across the demography and the social venture components. The opinion on network talks about usefulness of business clubs to access resources, R & D centres / Universities’ support in innovation, Social Incubators in training, collaboration, partnership, Foundations’ support, friend and families support, team support Trade associations, Educational institutions, Legal institutions are the same among all demography.

Personality Trait

The opinion on personality does not differ significantly based on Gender, Age, Level of Education, Course Studied, Marital Status, Prior Work Experience, Family Type, Entrepreneurial background of social entrepreneur and type of organization, Location and registration of the social venture in the study. The opinion remains pervasive across the demography and the social venture components. The opinion on personality trait which talk about honesty, emotionality, extraversion, Agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness are the same among all the demography of social entrepreneurs.

Sustainable Development

The opinion on Sustainable Development does not differ significantly based on Gender, Age, Level of Education, Course Studied, Marital Status, Prior Work Experience, Family Type,

A Study On Differences Of Opinion Based On Socio-Demography Of Social Entrepreneurs With Regard To Social Entrepreneurship Variables

Entrepreneurial background of social entrepreneur and type of organization, Location and registration of the social venture in the study. The opinion remains pervasive across the demography and the social venture components. The opinion on sustainable development talks about the perception of importance of achieving sustainable development viz. “Eradicating poverty of society, Ending Hunger, achieving food security, Ensuring healthy lives and promotes well-being, Ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education, Achieving gender equality, Ensuring availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all, productive employment and decent work , Building resilient infrastructure, promoting inclusive and sustainable industrialization, and fostering **innovation**, Reducing inequalities, Making safe, resilient and sustainable cities and human settlements, Ensuring sustainable consumption and production patterns”, the opinion remains the same across various demography of social entrepreneurs.

Discussions

Social entrepreneurs in rural location should be given communication training so that they could disseminated their social mission which in turn would be fruitful to network among all the stake holders needed to achieve the sustainable development goal which they perceived to be important. Though social entrepreneurs in the study prefer to go for social innovation their opinion differs significantly with respect to location . The opinion of social vision of social entrepreneurs differs significantly based on the type of registration that the enterprise is operating. The variation is due legal structure and formalities in the registration of enterprises.

Contribution to Theory

At the theoretical level the study contributes to Social Bricoleurs: A type of Social entrepreneur. The study also contributed to body of knowledge regarding Innovative Ecosystem. Prevalence of Social Innovation School of Thought among Gen Z. Social Vision and Vision Communication contributes to visionary leadership style.

Contribution to Practice

Implication to Social Entrepreneurs and innovators

Grass root innovators should come forward to enterprise their innovation for the benefit of the whole society. Social Entrepreneurs should not end up their innovation with patenting but also could create change through the founding of new organizations. Social entrepreneurs should not end up their innovation without patenting.

Implications to Government/Funding Agencies

Tailored government/funding agency policies and involvement is needed to boost the number and eminence of sustainable social enterprises; Government programs and policies be

strengthened and reachable to all potential younger generation all through the development cycle of a social enterprise. An innovative ecosystem should be made available for social entrepreneurs.

Limitation of the study

- Study was limited to the social entrepreneurs in Tamil Nadu.
- No proper list of social entrepreneurs is found and so the data collection has become tough.
- Environmental factors and organisational factors were not included in the study
- Language has become a barrier and so we confine the research to Tamil Nadu alone.

References:

1. Ahmed, P.K. (1998). Culture and climate for innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 1(1), 30-43.
2. Aldrich, H., Reese, P. R., & Dubini, P. (1989). Women on the verge of a breakthrough: Networking among entrepreneurs in the United States and Italy. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 1(4), 339-356.
3. Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: An exploratory study. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, 40(3), 260-282.
4. Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and social psychology review*, 11(2), 150-166.
5. Ashton, M. C., Paunonen, S. V., Helmes, E., & Jackson, D. N. (1998). Kin altruism, reciprocal altruism, and the Big Five personality factors. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 19, 243-255.
6. Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both?. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 30(1), 1-22.
7. Baum, J. R., Locke, E. A., & Kirkpatrick, S. A. (1998). A longitudinal study of the relation of vision and vision communication to venture growth in entrepreneurial firms. *Journal of applied psychology*, 83(1), 43.
8. Black, J. A., & Boal, K. B. (1994). Strategic resources: Traits, configurations and paths to sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic management journal*, 15(S2), 131-148.
9. Bornstein, D. 2004. *How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Brush, C. G. (2008). Pioneering strategies for entrepreneurial success. *Business Horizons*, 51(1), 21-27.
11. Catford, J. (1998). Social entrepreneurs are vital for health promotion—but they need supportive environments too. *Health Promotion International*, 13(2), 95-97.

A Study On Differences Of Opinion Based On Socio-Demography Of Social Entrepreneurs With Regard To Social Entrepreneurship Variables

12. Chiang, Y. T., Fang, W. T., Kaplan, U., & Ng, E. (2019). Locus of control: The mediation effect between emotional stability and pro-environmental behavior. *Sustainability*, 11(3), 820.
13. Costa Jr, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and individual differences*, 13(6), 653-665.
14. Crant, J. M. (1996). The proactive personality scale as a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions. *Management*, 29(3), 62-74.
15. Emerson, J., & Twersky, F. (Eds.). (1996). *New social entrepreneurs: The success, challenge and lessons of non-profit enterprise creation*. Homeless Economic Fund, the Roberts Foundation.
16. Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American journal of sociology*, 78(6), 1360-1380.
17. Harding, R. (2004). *Social Enterprise: The New Economic Engine?* *Business Strategy Review*, 15(4), 39–43. doi:10.1111/j.0955-6419.2004.00338.x
18. Kantabutra, S., & Avery, G. C. (2010). The power of vision: statements that resonate. *Journal of business strategy*.
19. Keogh, P. D., & Polonsky, M. J. (1998). Environmental commitment: a basis for environmental entrepreneurship?. *Journal of organizational change management*.
20. Leadbeater, C. (1997). The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur. Demos.
21. Letaifa, S. B. (2016). How social entrepreneurship emerges, develops and internationalises during political and economic transitions. *European Journal of International Management*, 10(4), 455-466.
22. Llewellyn, D. J., & Wilson, K. M. (2003). The controversial role of personality traits in entrepreneurial psychology. *Education+ Training*.
23. Mahmood, S., & Rehman, A. U. (2016). Impact of effective vision attributes on employee satisfaction. *International Journal of Economics & Management Sciences*, 5(02).
24. Montgomery, A.W., Dacin, P.A. and Dacin, M.T. (2012), “Collective social entrepreneurship: collaboratively shaping social good”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 111 No. 3, pp. 375-388.
25. Nga, J. K. H., & Shamuganathan, G. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions. *Journal of business ethics*, 95(2), 259-282.
26. Ozeren, E., Saatcioglu, O. Y., & Aydin, E. (2018). Creating social value through orchestration processes in innovation networks. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*.
27. Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 6(4), 34-43.
28. Prabhu, G. N. (1999). Social entrepreneurial leadership. *Career development international*.
29. Prahalad, C. K. (2008). The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid: Eradicating poverty through profits. *McKinsey briefing notes series*, 36(3), 52-74.
30. Satar, M. S., & John, S. (2016). A conceptual model of critical success factors for Indian social enterprises. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*.

31. Saunders, K. C., Ghanem, A., Hon, W. B., Hilder, E. F., & Haddad, P. R. (2009). Separation and sample pre-treatment in bioanalysis using monolithic phases: A review. *Analytica chimica acta*, 652(1-2), 22-31.
32. Shilpa, W., & Parimoo, D. (2016). Impact of Vision and Mission on Organizational Performance in India context. *The International Journal of Business & Management*, 4(12), 165-171.
33. Terziovski, M. (2003). The relationship between networking practices and business excellence: a study of small to medium enterprises (SMEs). *Measuring business excellence*.
34. Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship—a new look at the people and the potential. *Management decision*.
35. Tushman, M., & Anderson, P. (2004). *Managing strategic innovation and change: A collection of readings*. Oxford University Press, USA.
36. Urban, B. (2013). Social entrepreneurship in an emerging economy: A focus on the institutional environment and social entrepreneurial self-efficacy. *Managing Global Transitions: International Research Journal*, 11(1).
37. 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.