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ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a new paradigm of sustainability developed through an extensive qualitative study of social entrepreneurship ventures in India from a purely management perspective. By studying the evolutionary progress of selected ventures across diverse segments of social arena, several dimensions of social entrepreneurship that have a positive impact on sustainability of socio economic eco system in the immediate region of operation of the venture, have been evaluated. The study aims at developing a new insight on sustainability achieved by ventures through social reorganization & inclusive entrepreneurship. The study evaluates the role of transformational leadership and the interaction and applicability of psychological, human and environmental forces in the sustainability equilibrium. The study then highlights the factors that have a strong impact on the scalability & replication of social ventures as it has been established that scalability is a prime mover towards an eco system where social initiatives derive maximum sustainable advantage. The study identifies key drivers of success and also barriers of scalability. The study also compares community oriented development initiative with the micro finance driven initiative.
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INTRODUCTION & CONTEXTUALIZATION

Sustainability has been defined in different ways over the years. Many associate sustainability with some contextual reference like environmental, social order, economic, green efforts, etc etc while a few explanations also cite sustainability with change continuum thereby diffusing the boundary where sustainability is associated with change, equilibrium or maintenance of the present continuum, whether positive or negative. Sustainable entrepreneurship is focused on the preservation of nature, life support, and community in the pursuit of perceived opportunities to bring into existence future products, processes, and services for gain, where gain is broadly construed to include economic and non-economic gains to individuals, the economy, and society. (Dean A. Shepherd & Holger Patzelt, 2011) Sustainability has also been associated with a value creation process chain which has a strong positive impact on the socio economic eco system through the positive aspects of scalability. The sustainable development literature informs the discussion of sustainability by focusing on what is to be sustained, namely, nature, life support systems, and community (Parris & Kates, 2003), and what is to be developed, namely, individuals, the economy, and society (Leiserowitz, Kates, & Parris, 2006; National Research Council, 1999). Our aim in this paper is to broaden the understanding of sustainability through social entrepreneurship through a multi dimensional qualitative analysis of entrepreneurship ventures across different segments that have been classified as social entrepreneurship ventures. The selected sample of ventures or social initiatives have been in existence
for over 3 years, were promoted by a single individual through an innovative idea and have morphed into entrepreneurship ventures that can be replicated across different regions or could be scaled over a broader social region through integration with external inputs like finance, managerial resources, alliances or technological inputs. The selected sample covers a broad framework that can be used to apply meta theoretic perspectives to study the evolution of foundations of sustainability through the evolutionary process adopted by the selected sample of social ventures and initiatives. Another important dimension constructed as a boundary while selecting the sample was origin or location of the venture in a socially or economically under developed region. The selected sample thus represented a cross section of economically disparate society that had not been exposed to external commercial contexts. The selected sample also conforms to the definitive framework of social entrepreneurship in that the evolutionary phase of the venture was entirely driven by bringing into the operational ambit various sections of society and the growth momentum was not provided through any major external construct in the form of finance, marketing support, alliance or government incentives. One of the aims of the selected ventures in the sample was to create an entrepreneurial action as a mechanism for sustaining nature and thereby improve human health (Pretty, Hine, & Peacock, 2006). The main promoter of the venture was primarily concerned for preservation of natural resources as a key life support for sustaining social eco system. Environment was considered as a source of resources and services for the utilitarian life support of humankind” (Costanza et al., 1997; Daily, 1997). In this category, the focus on regenerating eco system services was also considered because declining ecosystem services also have a direct impact on human life support, for example, when the reduced purification capacity of aquatic habitats due to contamination leads to a shortage of drinking water (Zedler & Kercher, 2005), or when erosion of soil diminishes its fertility leading to lower crop yields (Schröter et al., 2005). Another important parameter of inclusion was efforts aimed at sustaining communities and maintaining their equilibrium with nature. Communities refer to a complex web of relationships between a set of individuals who share values, norms, meanings, history, and identity (Etzioni, 1996). Families and other closed ethnic groups have also been considered as inseparable part of communities. Studies report that the disintegration of the family means that individuals are less capable of assuming social responsibilities that enhance community development (Stevens, 1994), and that disruption of families diminishes individual well-being (Forste & Heaton, 2004). Based on this premise, the selected sample also included community based ventures because Peredo and Chrisman (2006) introduced the concept of community based enterprise where all individuals forming the community act as an entrepreneur and is a strong driver of efforts that are able to sustain the ecological balance and natural environment of the region in which the community operates. Moreover community based ventures are less profit driven and have the freedom to act in a socially responsive manner and contribute to the development of their community (Peredo and Chrisman, 2006).

All along, the explanations associated with sustainability have bordered on contextual references. Sustainability has been more associated with the benefits of ensuring continuity of a process chain that has been proven to generate positive returns in a context or environment which abounds with social, economical, political, environmental or any other problem that impacts on the continuation of a positive natural cycle or equilibrium. Thus sustainability is associated with an activity that continues to generate positive return with respect to the elimination of the contextual problem.

While defining the contextual problems that have a major impact on the society, the cited research indicates that economical, cultural and political problems are higher order problems that have their origin in the social or ecological domain. These two domains have been considered as the pyramidal base of most of the problems that plague the society. Ecological imbalance has resulted in numerous natural disasters while social eco system imbalance has resulted in regional disparity. The impact of these two domains has been most discernible and has given rise to problems in the other domains.

We now have our focus of analysis as ecological and social domains. These domains are in itself very wide and all encompassing. These two domains are interdependent and any change in one affects the other significantly. The way society functions and is dependent on the ecology for its
survival also dictates the equilibrium between the social and ecological sub systems. Eco system services comprise of components of nature directly enjoyed, consumed or used to yield human well-being (Boyd & Banzhaf, 2007). Notion of preserving ecosystem services is a condition in which the ecosystem maintains its diversity and quality—and thus its capacity to support people and the rest of life—and its potential to adapt to change and provide a wide range of choices and opportunities for the future (Parris & Kates, 2003). Any process which transcends from one to the other is bound to change the equilibrium unless effort has been made to ensure that it is ecological friendly. During the last decade, there has been significant increase in the awareness and focused attention to maintain ecological balance so that a regenerative environment can be sustained enabling the social eco system to prosper.

To maintain a regenerative equilibrium, we need to ensure that major activities conform to sustainable development which means that we continue to generate factor services without disturbing the ecological balance between mankind and nature. So we have our attention focused globally on carbon emissions and green efforts. We also need to evaluate how social settlements interact with environment and what can be done to promote a positive equilibrium. By positive equilibrium we intend to define sustainability in a new construct whereby activities that continue to provide goods or services for consumption by the social eco system also contribute positively to either sustain ecological balance or provide a forward thrust towards better equilibrium by its eco friendly process adoption. Under this category, we classify all such activities or process chains that interact closely with natural eco system to either create additional value for the social eco system or helps in cleaning the natural eco system of negative elements or processes by consuming the negative elements and thereby assist in creating positive equilibrium conditions.

Going to the next step, we come across a broader term in use for such activities; Social Entrepreneurship, defined as an entrepreneurial activity with an embedded social purpose ( Austin, Stevenson, Wei Skillern, 2006), involves deployment of new business models that address basic need of society ( Seelos & Mair, 2005). Numerous definitions exist for social entrepreneurship but the one most apt in our context of sustainability is any activity which encompasses the activities and processes undertaken to discover, define, and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner (Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum, & Shulman, 2009). Broadening this scope, we also consider social entrepreneurship covers sustaining current state of nature, sources of life support, and community. These are the neglected positive externalities covered in the positive theory of social entrepreneurship ( Santos Filipe of INSEAD Social Innovation Centre, 2009), stating social entrepreneurship domain is to address problems involving society, environment and the broader socio eco system where profit motive cannot always be achieved. We further extend this domain by adding that social entrepreneurship not only addresses problems but also creates a situation wherein value creation or value enhancement becomes a distinct possibility.

Proposition 1 : Social entrepreneurs aim to identify situational contexts which can support entrepreneurial activities for public benefit, enhancing positive value creation without disturbing the ecological or social equilibrium of the region.

A social entrepreneur may identify a situational context where he can capitalize the abundance of untapped value in the social and / or natural eco system without disturbing the equilibrium between the ecological and social sub systems. A very common example is the use of renewable energy sources like solar energy, wind energy, tidal energy or hydraulic potential of waterways. But these situations involve use of a strong technical input as an external facilitator and hence cannot be covered under our domain construct for social entrepreneurship. Consider one of our sample study participant Kashmir Apiaries which is a perfect fit to extend the domain definition of social entrepreneurship. This venture was started on a very small scale by identifying the potential of organic honey for the larger benefit of the consuming segment of the society. He also identified the natural potential of honey bees to migrate towards regions where plenty of natural pollen carrying flowers are present in abundance.

To extend the benefit of honey collection and to integrate the entire process chain, he started the venture by seeding nearby farmers’ fields with man made honeycombs. As a variant, he dispersed the
honey combs in different fields carrying different crops. The result was collection of pure organic honey of varying taste as per the variation of the flower(crop) and an additional income for the farmer as part of the value was created in the farmer’s field, so Kashmir Apiaries was happy to share the proceeds. This venture was successfully scaled to different regions as the crops were in any case ready and bees too were there, only the missing link was to be integrated. This example illustrates our domain definition of social entrepreneurship as an activity or integration of a chain of activities that are able to enhance value or create additional value from the same eco system to provide a positive thrust and assist positive regeneration of the socio eco system. Here the positive thrust and positive regeneration of equilibrium are important terms that we want to introduce as they have a strong impact on our understanding of social entrepreneurship as the foundation of social and ecological sustainability. We would like to explain this context by another example of one of our ventures in the sample study, Bamboo House India. This venture was born out of necessity of a couple who were looking for eco friendly furniture for their new house and were intrigued that despite India being a large bamboo producer, most of the furniture sold in the country was from China. The search led them to an impoverished tribal dominated village that was producing the world’s best bamboo species-Thryostostachys Oleverii. However the species and the artisans who were using bamboo for handicrafts, both were dying due to a government ruling which limited cultivation, movement and usage of bamboo by classifying it as a tree, rather than as grass. This legislation bottled up supply side and squeezed the demand side too. By organizing the entire community as a self help group with assured market for their produce, a successful sustainable business model was created. This venture was able to impact the bamboo eco system by creating a regenerative positive equilibrium. The project recouped the area of bamboo cultivation, reversed the flow of capital to the tribal community, regenerated the environment as a bamboo produces 35% more oxygen than any other tree. The venture has a full scale potential of impacting the lives of 5 million tribals, who were fighting for their sustenance and had begun migrating to urban centers. This is a classic case of social entrepreneurship venture laying the foundation for a sustainable socio eco system through the adoption of a triple bottom line approach involving financial, social as well as environmental benefits. The abundance of untapped natural capital was identified by this visionary couple and the community’s vocational talent was channelized into a creative set of value enhancing activities that helped lift the entire community out of poverty. This venture has also created a positive impact on government as bamboo is now being reclassified as a grass and all restrictions are being removed. This further reinforces the construct that social entrepreneurship ventures influence national legislation within 5 years of their launch ( Sen, 2007). This is also an example of a neglected positive externality being addressed through social entrepreneurship and then later strengthened by the government ( Santos Filipe of INSEAD Social Innovation Centre, 2009).

Proposition 2 : Social entrepreneurship lays a strong foundation for sustainable development of social and ecological systems through a triple bottom line approach in the weakest localized segments of society. It creates a chain of activities that regenerates the positive equilibrium.

The important term in this proposition relating social entrepreneurship with foundation of sustainability is “ weakest localized segments of society”. The integration of this term while studying the issue of sustainable development brings into ambit a very important social domain. The weakest localized segments of society live in abject poverty away from all forms of civic development, devoid of any kind of civic or technological infrastructure. This segment may or may not have access to natural capital. They may be connected to developed section of the society through media or telecom but the fruits of development remain out of reach of this segment. This segment of population is also termed weak and incapable because of absence of any education, vocational knowledge and entrepreneurial capabilities. Due to their inability in influencing policies, the government is also not keen to evaluate the problems and propose solutions through external influences like finance or grants. It is this segment that has been observed over time to be most mobile often migrating to developed urban centers. This segment is also observed as a strong force for seasonal migration. Migration of a large section of society is known to create social and ecological imbalance which threatens equilibrium...
as well as sustainability of the region. It is this section which is least cared for by the government as their voice has no intellectual covering and therefore offers no incentive for the government which is known to tilt towards the opinion maker segment of the society, defined as having high status and ability for collective action. The sample group of social entrepreneurship ventures contain a few examples of social initiatives targeting this weakest section of the society. Analysis reveals that in most of these ventures, at the core is a passionate leader having strong links with this section or region who feels strongly for the miseries of the people and/or the region and creates a scalable sustainable venture that helps in reversing the social migration by creating enhanced value from the same resources through innovation or application of technology or combining their knowledge and skills with strategy to create a strong value deliverable for the excluded marginalized section of the society and helping them integrate with the mainstream society. The passionate leader in such instances was able to grow his idea into a sustainable venture by organizing the local section of the society as a self help group or as an entrepreneur community where every member fulfills his/her role as an entrepreneur through division of functional tasks. So while value creation occurs through organized community effort, capitalizing this value by integrating the efforts with a commercial chain of activities is often performed by the leader with a small core group of members as his team. The enterprise continues to grow as more and more members of the society integrate with the community and the model is then replicated across different regions. The benefit of such a model is the equitable distribution and growth of each member of the community. This is quite opposite to the concept of microfinance that has been hailed as the saviour of the marginalized section of the society. While advantages of microfinance cannot be overlooked in select situational contexts, we find the biggest weakness of this concept of social entrepreneurship is that it is exploitative and does not provide the very vital management and leadership inputs which are needed the most by this section of the society. Microfinance assumes that only finance is the constraint in the progress and inclusive growth of the society and that each microfinance assisted entrepreneur would be able to create a value enhancing chain of activities that will provide a positive thrust to sustainability. The fallacy of microfinance is that it assumes entrepreneurial traits and management instincts are present in the underprivileged deprived section of society and providing each member with finance would spur inclusive growth.

Proposition 3: Microfinance can act as a catalyst for sustainable development in very select situational contexts and is largely exploitative. This form of external influence to spur sustainability through social entrepreneurship should be controlled by governments to check exploitation of uneducated communities through high interest rates on credit.

Why we say microfinance is exploitative is because its survival depends on the microentrepreneurs generating a net surplus of more than 35% of the capital infused as the cost of microfinance is somewhere around 30-40%. Moreover, microfinance does not provide any assistance in building up entrepreneurial and managerial capabilities and thrives on the massive creative input of the microentrepreneur to generate such high returns. This is the reason we have seen a sharp increase in the number of privately owned companies offering microcredit to a large section of rural population, particularly women, and thriving on high returns through exorbitant interest rates going up to 36% per annum in many cases. This high cost is very cleverly camouflaged in turnover related repayments. Quite often the availability of finance is linked to the receivers participation in share ownership of the company to give it the shape of community driven entrepreneurship and avail government incentives. The only situational context where microfinance can change the economic profile and contribute to sustainable development is where the receiver is trained in a vocational craft and is high on entrepreneurial instinct and has access to external marketing mechanism. Yet another paradox with microfinance is that it fails in creating a forward flow of capital from the organized affluent developed urban society to the underprivileged marginalized sections, rather the reverse holds true because microfinance capitalizes the entrepreneurial efforts and the untapped market potential of the region in which the microentrepreneur operates and generates a net positive capital flow to the organized developed urban centers. This reverses the basic tenets of sustainable development and inclusive growth and hence we do not classify microfinance as a social entrepreneurship activity rather we would like to term it as an activity that provides an avenue of generating high returns on urban capital through
entrepreneurial efforts of members of the underprivileged section of the society in creation and expansion of rural market for consumerism. Contrasting with the social entrepreneurship efforts in organizing self help groups for sustainable development of the social or natural eco system which mobilizes the entire community as a single entrepreneur and the leader integrates the efforts of the community with the external commercial variants, micro finance creates multiple entrepreneurs who often compete with each other. Self help groups organized under a single entrepreneurial venture thus have a far greater impact in regeneration of sustainable equilibrium, as the activities of the community are complimentary and are channelized towards the achievement of the core objective of the group, ensuring equitable distribution of value creation as well as capital distribution, thereby ensuring truly inclusive growth and integration of the marginalized community into the main stream developed society. This analysis brings us to another construct for sustainable development and social entrepreneurship.

Proposition 4: Social entrepreneurship in the form of self help groups as community entrepreneur, ensures equitable distribution of value and capital through equitable complimentary efforts, directed by a charismatic leader who integrates the entrepreneurial community with external commercial inputs through his knowledge, skills and leadership qualities, to generate a positive impact on sustainable development of the marginalized community through a reverse flow of capital, knowledge and social value from the developed section to the undeveloped marginalized section of society.

This proposition expands the impact of a social enterprise on the community over a longer period of time to successfully reverse the flow of value, knowledge and capital from the developed section to the marginalized community. This means any successful social entrepreneurship venture has a significant impact at the community level over extended duration. Here I also include interaction with market based mechanism as a necessity if the socially inclined venture has to create a positive stream of money to the target community or region. Interaction with market based mechanism ensures a steady conversion of entrepreneurial community’s efforts into money which lifts the entire community above the poverty line. Financial inclusion facilitated through market based mechanism can be sustained over longer duration of time and can be replicated over other regions or communities. As the entire community acts as a single entrepreneur, the positive flow of money is equitably distributed. The same is applicable to other benefits like knowledge and skill. As the entire community has open access to the knowledge and skill coming from the developed region through their leadership team, the equitable acquisition by deserving candidates and its reflection in enhanced value creation for the community becomes the hallmark for sustainable development. This process is repeated with incremental streams of positive flows thereby enabling the community to experience a continuous positive thrust towards a state of regenerative equilibrium. An example out of a number of similar examples from our sample that typifies this proposition is the Barefoot College at Tilonia village in Rajasthan, India where the entire community, with women as focus, was empowered with practical skills and knowledge of healthcare, computers, water conservation, organic farming and handicrafts. Women with no formal education can perform simple dental procedures, birth and maternal care and have a direct market interface at global level, marketing their produce of handicrafts to customers directly in US and Europe through internet. After more than two decades of sustained existence, experiencing a continuous positive flow of knowledge, skill and money, the community is today in a position where it is impacting other communities and regions in effecting a social change.

Analyzing the impact parameters of sustained development and scalability of social entrepreneurship ventures, a strong interface with education, technology, marketing, finance, innovation, communication, vocational training & leadership is essential to create a positive thrust towards a state of regenerative positive equilibrium. Many examples of social entrepreneurship ventures have been cited in the past involving external influence through government and/or public private partnership concept rather than a direct marketing mechanism. ( Santos Filipe of INSEAD Social Innovation Centre, 2009) & ( Rangan et al. 2006 ) Here we differ with the past propositions which state that market based mechanisms are not the most efficient form of economic organization for positive externalities and that such mechanisms are not suitable for effecting a sustainable solution.
The study sample suggests otherwise. In all the examples from the sample study, a strong interface with external market mechanism has resulted in sustained development through a continuous stream of positive inflows and has been a big factor in replication and scalability. A big factor in sustainable solution to social problems through social entrepreneurship is absolute value of the efforts as the net effect of value appropriation versus value creation. For sustainability, it is important that community becomes self sufficient and is not dependent on external support in the form of government spending. The community needs to be empowered and no external parameter should be thrust that may enable external control. As proposed by Santos Filipe (2009), social entrepreneurs empower as opposed to the logic of control. This is why we had rejected micro credit or micro finance or even government grants or aid grants by global development agencies as proponents of social entrepreneurship as they impose control over the recipient, direct or indirect and are in direct opposition to the basic principles of social entrepreneurship & sustainable development. In contrast, what we propose as the mantra for sustainable advantage is a composite package of external influences.

Proposition 5: A strong foundation of social and ecological sustainability can be structured around a strong interface between a community and composite external influences comprising of education, technology, marketing, finance, communication and vocational knowledge through a transformational leadership, provided by the social entrepreneur who can envision an innovative & creative, self sustaining value chain, integrates with natural capital and that can be replicated, is scalable and provides a strong thrust towards regenerative positive equilibrium.

Building on the theory of scaling social entrepreneurial impact (Bloom & Chatterji, 2009) and the SCALERS model of scalability (Bloom & Smith, 2010), we have included some new variants like technology, education, vocational knowledge and transformational leadership to arrive at the model of social and ecological sustainability through social entrepreneurship.

The sample study reflects a strong interface with technology as an essential component of the model. SMS FARMING, SELCO, D LIGHT DESIGN and BAREFOOT are a few examples that indicate technology as an essential driver of sustainable solutions. Technology overcomes other infrastructural and natural hurdles that may impede the value chain by providing an overriding integrating medium. In SMS FARMING, technology is an enabler to bring remotely located farmers on the same info platform as their city counterparts by updating them daily about the market rates of their produce thereby enabling them to convert their produce into maximum money. The technology cost is more than compensated by increased return through sale of produce at best market rates. BAREFOOT deploys technology to develop low cost locally adaptable solutions for community development and helps save money outgo. SELCO & D LIGHT DESIGN have used solar energy as the core for sustainable home lighting solutions for farmers and rural communities enabling them to overcome infrastructural deficiencies that were becoming a barrier of development.

Education is another crucial driver of sustainability. Education has a disparate presence over different regions and communities. As knowledge is power in the globalized village, education as the foundation of knowledge acts as a strong force in enabling one community or region to attract more value for its activity value chain than the one deficient in knowledge. So while KAIVALYA EDUCATION FOUNDATION brings leadership development programs for rural school principals enabling them to run their schools better and provide leadership training to bright community children, RAMANUJAN SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS provides training to rural children and helps them crack the entrance exam of the Indian Institute of Technology, top engineering education institutions of India. The efforts of these social entrepreneurs has helped bridge the gap between communities and urban development and helped create a sustainable model of development.

Transformational leadership is another very important driver of sustainability. The sample list contain many examples where a single person was able to create a significant difference to the lives of people of an impoverished community and bring them to a sustainable livelihood equilibrium state.

The model of sustainability through social entrepreneurship that emerges from the analysis of sample ventures has the backing of proven initiatives over the last 3-5 years. After carefully evaluating the progress of these ventures, we propose a new model of social and ecological sustainability. This model can be used to develop an impact assessment index for social enterprises by the commercially...
inclined investors and the same model can be used by social entrepreneurs to develop a strategy for undertaking community development.

Proposal 6: EFFECTIVE model of sustainability through social entrepreneurship.

Based on the analysis of the successful social entrepreneurship ventures, we have identified some of the key drivers that can significantly impact the scalability and replication of the social entrepreneurship model and provide a positive thrust to the social and ecological equilibrium. These drivers have been identified after a detailed qualitative evaluation of each of the selected unit, field surveys and visits, interaction with local community and other external interfaces. The idea is to create a broad base of drivers that can be used to create a meta theoretical construct for planners, entrepreneurs, leaders, venture capital firms and other institutions planning to provide an interface to the region or community for sustainable development through a social entrepreneurship initiative.

E Entrepreneurial community: For the success of any model of sustainable development, it is important to develop an entrepreneurial instinct in the community so that the entire community can be molded as a single entrepreneur and all the members have equitable development opportunities. Scaling up and replication of the development model would then be easier. This we feel is the most important driver in the model because we feel that organization of the people as a community creates a multiplier effect over their individual efforts. A community can be organized around a core objective and functional roles distributed as per the individual’s capability thereby creating a unified action plan for the development through value creating and value enhancing activities. Consolidation of resources is easier in a community oriented development initiative. The sample study list has this one unique feature common to almost all the initiatives in that successful ventures have community at the core.

F Financially regenerative: The value chain of the development model should be financially regenerative. This is an important intervention as any activity that would be dependent on external support for financial survival would not be sustainable and would remain a value appropriation activity rather than a value creation activity. Financially regenerative activities continue to provide value for the efforts of the community and helps in reversal of flow of capital from urban developed centers to the impoverished region. It is in this context that we find many social initiatives aimed at social development fail because they were conceptualized on a perpetual financial support from an external influencer. In most of the failures that came across our field surveys, we found that whether its the government or public agency or any private charity or an NGO, after some time they start exercising control on the receivers and as a result, the initiative fails to achieve its desired objectives.

F Functional Transformational Leadership: At the center of the sustainability model is the necessity of having a charismatic leader who can provide functional leadership and effect transformation of the community. Innovation is the key to transformational leadership. To tackle social problems and bring about a lasting solution, a visionary leader is required to create a sustainable model that may transform the community.

E Ecological Capital: Many successful models can be built around ecological capital if the leader is able to identify the potential that the natural or ecological abundance offers for developing the region or community. From our sample list, there is SARAN RENEWABLE ENERGY which has built a power plant in a remote region, with no power lines, that runs on a leafy plant Dhaincha, available locally in abundance. In the process, enabled cleaning of the region, provided cheap power to the community which relied on diesel generating sets and thus helped in reducing carbon emissions too. BAMBOO HOUSE INDIA is another example that helped in the regeneration of ecology and the community through the locally grown bamboo.

C COMMUNICATION: Communication is closely related to the development of social capital (e.g. Bourdieu 1986). Communication has also been identified as a driver in the SCALERS model of scalability ( Bloom & Smith, 2010 ). Communication is a component of our construct of sustainability as it helps replicate the model over different regions and communities and is also an equalizer in intra community developments. Communication is also an effective medium for dispersion of leadership driven motivation and work ethics.

T- TECHNOLOGY: Technology has been a big driver of change in communities far removed from development. Remotely located regions have been brought on the same knowledge platform
through the internet and cellular communication. For sustaining change, technological intervention is an important driver. Technology can be modified to develop customized solutions and innovations in its application can help enhance value creation.

I -INTEGRATIVE VALUE CHAIN: Many examples in our sample study could succeed only because they adopted an integrated value chain for effecting change. Innovation could impact only when other important drivers were integrated. Community development could be made sustainable only by adopting an integrated value chain which ensured a sustained positive thrust. A disintegrative value system relying on one or two key external influences like finance or marketing could not sustain over longer durations as a self sustaining mechanism could not be developed. So while micro finance was hailed as the only driver for uplifting the lot of poor section of society, it could not survive the period when the impact of high cost of servicing the micro credit rendered the venture unprofitable and forced the recipients to default. Reliance on a single influence to deliver the desired change also created disruptive growth pattern. Easy finance availability in the initial stages led to mushroom growth of entrepreneurial ventures which were way below the scalability scale and were fighting for the same space and same consumers. With margins squeezed due to intense competition, default was bound to happen. Contrast this development theory by the development led by community entrepreneurship and self help groups which adopted an integrated value chain and formed a large scalable enterprise having properly defined functional division of activities. The model was easily replicated and scaled to create a sustainable development scenario.

V- VOCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE: This is a new driver which we propose as an essential component of sustainable development. Globally, communities are dispersed and over the years have adopted a fixed pattern of sustenance. This has given rise to disparate prosperity and poverty leading to social and ecological problems. To break this pattern and introduce change that may create a positive thrust towards regeneration of equilibrium, an external interface with vocational knowledge is needed. Vocational knowledge introduced in a community helps higher value creation from the same resources.

E- EDUCATION: Education impacts an entire generation and has long lasting effect on sustainability. Education is a great leveler of disparity. It is through education as a strong external influence that community development has succeeded.

Proposal 7: Even after taking care of drivers under EFFECTIVE model, we need to cover certain behavioral and psychological factors that act as barriers to scalability and replication of the model for sustainable development.

The construct of EFFECTIVE may help planners and socially inclined thinkers to map a suitable strategy for community development. The construct may also help in removing barriers to development. Some of the interesting barriers to scalability & replication revealed by the analysis of the sample list of ventures indicate dominance of behavioral and psychological factors. A questionnaire recording the response of the promoters of the enterprises on a Likert scale of 1-5 indicated the following:

1. FEAR OF COMPETITION: The units having a strong external interface with finance and marketing mechanisms and where the business model could be replicated easily over other regions or communities indicated the biggest barrier as “fear of competition”. Success in fact acted as a catalyst to creation of a barrier to withhold communication to other communities so as to avoid dispersion of strategic information about the success metrics adopted by the enterprise. The fear of creating competition if success metrics leaked out of the closed community was the single biggest factors of the success of one community not getting scaled or replicated to neighboring communities or regions with similar demographic profile. This psychological barrier existed in initiatives in developed urban centers also, where some initiatives in ecological conservation and cleansing of cities of plastic and e-waste, were kept as a closely guarded secret and the success metrics or the technological component was not publicized for replication. In such cases, the government should act to take up proprietary ownership of the technology or the process that can be replicated for public benefit by buying over the intellectual proprietary rights and working out some royalty
agreements. Such an intervention would help in scaling up and replicating technologies or processes or social initiatives that can be useful for larger public consumption.

2. FEAR OF LOSING ICONIC STATUS: The ventures having less dependence on finance and marketing mechanisms and built around qualitative innovative method of change in the community, indicated the biggest barrier as “Fear of losing iconic status”. The respect generated by these promoters in the society through their innovation also developed a fear of losing the iconic status if the model was replicated by someone else. The presence of this barrier was more evident in cases where the promoter single handedly created a sustainable model of improvement in the community through an entrepreneurial process or through another useful intervention using education, training or capitalizing of natural capital for the benefit of the entire community or that region. In such cases, the person often becomes an icon and commands respect and unquestionable leadership and does not want to partake crucial information to enable replication of his model.

3. “Communication ability” was cited as another barrier to replicating the model. Communication was also at the base of another cited barrier as “lack of external mechanisms like finance, marketing and technology”.

4. “Inability to develop a multi tier leadership” was also cited as an important barrier to scalability and replication of the model in other regions and communities.

LIMITATIONS OF THE ANALYSIS

The qualitative analysis may not have been able to throw up all drivers of success nor does it reveal all barriers to scalability, which otherwise may act as drivers for success. As the focus of the study was to construct a qualitative model for sustainable development of social and ecological domains, not much analysis was done for barriers of scalability and replication of the successful model. The research also suffers from the absence of empirical analysis but as it is said that it is important to first develop the right theory than to go in for verification of the theoretical construct, hence it is more important that researchers debate and question the construct of my model of sustainability through social entrepreneurship. Yet another limitation is that the research is based on a sample of successful ventures, some having successfully scaled up and replicated while others have not. The study was also done for a small sample of 32 initiatives which failed to take off. 29 of these ventures were dependent on finance from government and when the funding stopped, they were disbanded. In depth analysis could not be done for identifying other reasons of failure and the sample size could not be increased in order to keep the focus on successfully established ventures. More research would be needed to expand the sample size of successful ventures and also to cover ventures in different stages of growth and maturity and in different regions. Situational context is also missing from the sample as it was not considered a significant variable and as the study was aimed to analyze the general drivers for success, situational context was eliminated. However, situational context could be an important parameter to develop a success matrix.

FUTURE RESEARCH, More research is required to establish the validity of the selected drivers in EFFECTIVE and their impact index can be developed to assess their relative importance in a situational context. Additional research based on a larger sample with situational context as a variant could be done to assess the relative changes in the impact of each driver. An impact assessment index could also be developed keeping demographic profile as a variant as well as individual and collective impact of the drivers in EFFECTIVE. Dimensions of performance based on social value creation and ecological conservation and their benchmarks could also be researched for different segments of social enterprises and the impact of each of the driver individually and collectively need to be assessed keeping demographic profile as a control variable. This is still an evolving research segment and a lot needs to be covered.

CONCLUSION:

The emerging field of social entrepreneurship and its impact on social and ecological sustainability is a big challenge considering the number of unquantifiable variants and difficulty in
identification and assessment of initiatives by individuals and organizations. Identification of some prominent drivers that may greatly impact the scalability and replication of entrepreneurship model is just a small step towards the development of a firm structure of this segment from management’s perspective. The study reflects some interesting findings that can be used to modulate public policy and initiate governmental intervention for promotion and replication of social entrepreneurship initiatives by removing the barriers to scalability and replication. The study also offers an opportunity to develop a rethinking on the blatant promotion and permission of micro finance without putting in place laws to safeguard the interests of the very same community for which micro finance is intended.
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