**Different Perspective on Social Entrepreneurship**

Social entrepreneurs are recognized for their contribution for the welfare of the communities; however, social entrepreneurship has been struggling for gaining the academic legitimacy. There is a need of properly defined theoretical framework for linking the social entrepreneurship and theory of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship is understood as recognizing and acting upon the market opportunities. Social entrepreneurship can be understood as entrepreneurial behavior for delivering social value with financial independence and sustainability. Emerging as the academic inquiry field, it has been flourishing practically. Social entrepreneurship is a growing global movement and it is the new approach to solve the old problems.

Social entrepreneurship is the way of using the scarce resources for solving problems with the innovative solutions for the unsolved community needs (Dees 1998). It shouldn’t only be defined by non-profit organizations focusing on social missions only. Entrepreneur is an innovator who creates and changes the values towards the society and economy. With any organizations having social mission, having the financial goal must be in the picture. Idea of hybrid organizations has been realized by many scholars and referred as social venture or social welfare as well (Dorado, 2006, Townsend & Hart, 2008). As these organizations are focused on blending business and social goals, the performance is also evaluated with social and financial outcomes (Clark et al., 2004).

Entrepreneur shifts the economic resources to the high productivity and greater yield. They primarily create value and move the economy forward by serving the new ways of doing things. We could see the upsurge of interest in social entrepreneurship in the recent years. Today, not for profit organizations have been operating in highly competitive environment, are generally tight for funding to the environment conservation and saving. Corporate Social Responsibility has been one of the most important aspect of the organization as it helps to preserve the environment and the nature. Life can’t sustain without the nature and without life no business or entrepreneur can exist in the globe. Social entrepreneur has been remaining the emerging topic but still ill-defined concept. There have been suggestions for the provision of innovative and exceptional leadership in the social enterprises (Dees, 1998b; Prabhu, 1998).

Entrepreneurship in the public domain refers to the leadership of public organizations (e.g., Lewis, 1980) or the development of public policy (e.g., King & Roberts, 1987). According to research, social entrepreneurs have leadership attributes such as personal credibility, honesty, and the capacity to inspire followers by structuring their ventures around social values rather than merely economics (Borins, 2000; Lewis, 1980; Waddock & Post, 1991). Previous study on social entrepreneurship has mostly examined leadership traits.

Researchers highlight the significance of innovation in social entrepreneurial groups (Borins, 2000). According to Prabhu (1998) and Sullivan Mort et al. (2003), social entrepreneurship is based on three essential characteristics: innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking. Social entrepreneurship, led by enterprising individuals, has been suggested as a response to the need for radical welfare reform (Leadbeater, 1997; Thompson, 2002). Cook, Dodds, and Mitchell (2002) contend that despite its popularity, this tactic may hinder a rights-based approach to social services. These strategies look at social entrepreneurship from a welfare economics lens.
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