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ABSTRACT

Sociological perspectives or concern for understanding entrepreneurship shows that the entrepreneurship is affected by levels of stratification and inequality in a society. This is shaped by the life chances of founders of employment and their employees. Organizational foundations generate a great deal of employment volatility through job creations and destruction. Thus there is need to understand the business groups and the even group firms or collection of firms which are change agents in a economy or society.
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INTRODUCTION

The research focuses on the evolution of the branch of economic sociology for conceptual framework of entrepreneurship along with types and processes of entrepreneurship. The various approaches of entrepreneurship and importance of social entrepreneurship depicts the journey of the economic sociology to make under entrepreneur as agent of social change. The book by Smon Bridge, Ken O’neill and Stan Cromie (2003) best contribution to the field or discipline of economic sociology, are used at the baseline for this article.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The book chapter by Simon Bridge, Ken O’neill and Stan Cromie (2003) Understanding Entreprise, Entrepreneurship and Small Business, Palgrave Publications intends to reflect on Sociology of Entrepreneurship, sociological perspective or concern for understanding entrepreneurship, its role as a social problem solver, and finally entrepreneurs as an change agents in a society. The article says that all the capital constitute in the making of the human capital. This article is best contribution to the field or discipline of economic sociology, economics, management etc. The article relates to a current debate or trend in the above fields and also in the social entrepreneurship, social management and so on. The theoretical lineage or school of thought out of which the article is written arises from economic sociology. The article is well-written. There is accuracy is the information related bibliography and explanation. The illustrations given in the article are very connecting and helpful. They are illustration are benefiting the reading of this article. This article should be rejoinder to the other articles in this field. This article can be used
in many courses because it is very clear to be fit into multi or inter-disciplinary due to its structure and examples. This can provide with useful context.

METHODOLOGY

This is an content analysis or book review for the purpose of analysing institutional types to understand economic sociology and latter entrepreneurship. The book by Simon Bridge, Ken O’neill and Stan Cromie (2003) chosen cases of social entrepreneurs on behalf of poor and marginalised communities. The book also discusses sociological prespective of entrepreneurship. Together these book content analysis or reviews helps to bring forth the article on the issue of entrepreneurship: as an agent of social change

UNDERSTANDING INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The article starts with discussion on the new institutional economist like Alston, North, Williamson etc. who agrees that understanding of institutions requires integrating of sociological variables like shared beliefs, norms and social relationships to understand motivation to follow rules. Here sociologist like Max Weber are also discussed focusing on the actors and different social institutions for understanding systems of shared beliefs (religious and cultural), custom, values, norms, polity, economy, education, law, state and etc. Even Durkheim’s conceptions of systems of shared beliefs, norms and collective sentiments are also discussed. Marxism says economic institutions (relation) shapes the world but religion is also considered for it. It is here that the powerful groups succeed in promoting practices and public policies that are in their interest as being in the common interest. Robert K. Merton viewed institutions as structures of opportunity, shaping the interest and strategic action of individuals.
Further in the research, Coleman stresses, it’s not sufficient to speak of actors and their interests; it has to consider resources and control also. Pierre Bourdieu states the individual actors in the economic field bring with them their economic habitus (or economic predispositions) which relates their future actions to their past experiences. According to North, institutions consists of formal rules like constitutions, laws and property rights and also informal elements such as code of conducts, customs, traditions, sanctions and taboos.

To add, Bruce Carruthers explains that not only economic interests influence political interests but also the opposite i.e., political interests influence economic action. Parsons and Smelser explicate that economy is a subsystem, which inter-changes with the other three sub-systems, the polity, the integrative sub-system and the cultural-motivational sub-system. Viviana Zeliser put forward that the goal should be to take economic and cultural factors into account to understand economy. Here George Simmel’s work also reflects on the connections of money with authority, emotions, trust and other phenomena.

Clarifying further, DiMaggio has been skeptical of a full-scale cultural analysis of the economy, but argues that it should include a cultural component but not more in ratio. Durkheim, Weber, Pareto, Tonnies and Talcott Parsons are structural-functionalist of modern sociology. They conceived of institutions as organized systems of cultural beliefs, norms and values common to most individuals in a society. Systems giving rise to socially structured interests organize incentives for individuals.

**SOCIOLIGICAL PERSPECTIVES OF ENTERPRENUERSHIP**
After looking at this research from the sociological perspectives or concerns for understanding entrepreneurship, business and economic ventures it has been increasingly applied to the context of social problem solving. The solutions to the problems often demand fundamental transformations in the political, economic and social systems. So the test of the business entrepreneurship is the creation of a viable and growing business and not only survival and expansion. Here social entrepreneurship may change in the social dynamics and systems that created and maintained the problem by organization which may be small and less viable as it succeed.

The research says that variety of initiatives are focused on the problems of poor and marginalized population that have transformed the lives of thousands of people around the world. It has lead to significant changes in the social, political and economic contexts. Not-for-profit organizations may have commercial subsidiaries and use them to generate employment or revenue that serves their social purposes.

Even For-profit organizations may donate some of their profits or organise their activities to serve social goal. These initiatives use resources generated from successful commercial activities to advance and sustain their social activities. Social entrepreneur as a catalyze for the social transformation go well beyond the solutions of the social problems as the initial focus of concern.

Here, social entrepreneurship at its best produces small change in the short term that reverberate through existing systems to catalyze large changes in the longer term. Social entrepreneur in this tradition needs to understand not only immediate problems but also the larger social system and its inter-dependencies. This understanding allows for the
introduction of new paradigms at critical leverage points that can lead to mutually-reinforcing changes to create and sustain transformed social arrangements.

Sustainable social transformation includes both the innovations for social impacts and the concern for ongoing streams of resources which characterise the other two perspectives on social entrepreneur. They also lead to major shifts in the social context within which the original problem is embedded and sustains. More specifically, this shows that social entrepreneurship creates innovative solutions to immediate social problems and also mobilizes the ideas, capacities, resources and social arrangements required for long-term, sustainable social transformation.

In comparing the cases of social entrepreneurship, there is focus on four aspects of their experiences like the nature of the innovations, characteristics of their leaders, the organisational and institutional features of social entrepreneurship and the paths chosen for scaling up their impacts. All innovative efforts to solve persistent social problems of poverty and marginalization that, to some extent, have been successful in increasing their impacts and catalysing social transformation.

ENTREPRENEURS AS AN CHANGE AGENTS IN SOCIETY

Are the entrepreneurs an change agents in a economy or society? By serving new markets or creating new ways of doing things, they move the economy forward. Entrepreneur are identified as the catalysts and innovators behind economic progress, entrepreneur has served as the foundation for the contemporary use of the concept. The solutions to the problems often needs fundamental change or transformations in not only the economic but also in the political and social systems. Entrepreneurs can both
reproduce and challenge the existing social order because social inequality is existing in all spheres of society and it is not only visible in economic organization’s production and distribution.

CONCLUSION

Sociological perspectives or concern for understanding entrepreneurship shows that the entrepreneurship is affected by levels of stratification and inequality in a society. This is shaped by the life chances of founders of employment and their employees. Organizational foundations generate a great deal of employment volatility through job creations and destruction. So there is need to understand the business groups and the even group firms or collection of firms which are change agents in a economy or society.
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