



SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Rajkumar Wadje

ABSTRACT

Social entrepreneurship has emerged as an important approach for addressing persistent social, economic and environmental problems through entrepreneurial methods and innovative institutional arrangements. Unlike conventional entrepreneurship, which primarily emphasizes commercial returns, social entrepreneurship places the creation of social value at the centre of organizational activity while using entrepreneurial methods to achieve financial and operational sustainability. Social enterprises operate in areas such as employment generation, education, healthcare, agriculture, financial inclusion, environmental protection, women's empowerment, rural development and support for marginalized communities. Their significance has increased because governments and traditional development institutions often face limitations in addressing complex and multidimensional social problems. Community development refers to a process through which individuals, groups, local institutions and organizations collectively identify community needs, mobilize resources, develop local capacities and improve social and economic conditions. Social entrepreneurship can contribute to this process by transforming locally identified problems into sustainable economic and social initiatives. Social entrepreneurs may create employment opportunities, develop local markets, strengthen community participation, improve access to essential services and encourage innovation. OECD literature identifies social enterprises as organizations that can contribute to local employment, social inclusion, community development and inclusive growth.

The relationship between social entrepreneurship and community development is particularly relevant in developing societies where unemployment, poverty, social exclusion, inadequate infrastructure and unequal access to resources remain significant concerns. In India, social enterprises and community-oriented organizations have increasingly worked with women producers, farmers, artisans, self-help groups and marginalized communities. A UNDP India assessment, for example, examined social enterprises working with women-led cooperatives in agriculture, handlooms and handicrafts and identified challenges involving markets, finance and the wider enabling ecosystem. The present study examines the conceptual relationship between social entrepreneurship and community development, identifies major areas of social entrepreneurial intervention, analyses its contribution to employment, empowerment, social inclusion and local economic development, and discusses challenges affecting sustainability and scaling. The study uses a descriptive and analytical research methodology based primarily on secondary sources, including books, academic literature, institutional reports and policy documents. The study finds that social entrepreneurship can strengthen community development when entrepreneurial innovation is combined with local participation, appropriate financing, capacity building, market access, accountable governance and systematic measurement of social



impact. At the same time, social entrepreneurship cannot independently solve structural poverty, inequality or inadequate public services. Its contribution is strongest when social enterprises operate within a supportive institutional environment and work in partnership with communities, government agencies, civil society organizations and responsible markets.

KEYWORDS: *Social Entrepreneurship, Social Enterprise, Community Development, Social Innovation, Social Value, Social Inclusion, Local Development, Employment Generation, Women Empowerment, Rural Development, Entrepreneurship, Sustainable Development.*

INTRODUCTION

Social entrepreneurship has become an increasingly significant area of study in business, sociology, economics, development studies and public policy. The concept combines entrepreneurial processes with the pursuit of social objectives. Social entrepreneurs identify social problems as opportunities for innovation and develop products, services, organizations or institutional models intended to generate positive social outcomes. The concept is broader than charity because social enterprises generally seek to develop sustainable mechanisms for delivering social value rather than depending exclusively on donations or grants. Academic literature has used different definitions of social entrepreneurship. Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum and Shulman explain social entrepreneurship through activities and processes undertaken to discover, define and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth. Mair and Martí emphasize the creation of social value through entrepreneurial processes. Peredo and McLean similarly identify social value creation, innovation and opportunity recognition as important elements of social entrepreneurship. The diversity of definitions reflects the interdisciplinary character of the field. A systematic literature review has found considerable variation in the ways social entrepreneurship has been conceptualized and studied. Dacin, Dacin and Tracey argue that social entrepreneurship represents a broad field involving entrepreneurial activities directed toward social objectives. Choi and Majumdar further suggest that the field contains several related but distinguishable concepts, making conceptual clarity important for research and policy.

The OECD describes social enterprises as organizations situated between traditional public and private-sector arrangements and emphasizes their contribution to employment, social inclusion and the provision of goods and services. More recent OECD work also emphasizes the diversity of social and solidarity economy organizations in terms of purpose, legal form, business model and practices. Community development, meanwhile, is concerned with improving the social, economic, cultural and institutional conditions of communities. It emphasizes participation, collective action, local leadership, empowerment, capacity development and sustainable use of local resources. Historically, community development approaches have sought to move beyond welfare-oriented intervention toward participation and local self-help. India's early community development experience similarly emphasized local participation, decentralized institutions and coordination of development activities. The 1957 study of Community Projects and the National Extension Service highlighted grassroots participation, local accountability and democratic decentralization as important components of community development. Social entrepreneurship and community development therefore intersect at several points. Both emphasize local problems, human capabilities, participation and sustainable improvement. Social entrepreneurs may identify unmet community needs and establish enterprises that address those needs. Communities can provide local knowledge, labour, resources, social networks and markets. In turn, successful social enterprises can generate employment, income, skills, services and institutional capacity within communities.

The relationship is especially important in rural and economically disadvantaged areas. Conventional markets may not adequately provide essential services to low-income populations because purchasing power is limited and transaction costs may be high. Social entrepreneurs can sometimes develop alternative business models that combine revenue generation with social objectives. Social entrepreneurship can operate across a wide range of sectors. In agriculture, enterprises may connect small farmers with markets, provide technological services or develop value-added products. In handicrafts, enterprises may connect artisans to consumers and improve product design and market access. In education, social enterprises may provide low-cost learning technologies and vocational training. In healthcare, they may develop affordable services and technologies. In environmental protection, social enterprises may create business models around recycling, renewable energy, sustainable agriculture and waste management.

Women's empowerment is another important area. Social enterprises can provide employment, entrepreneurship opportunities, skills, market access and collective organization to women. UNDP India's study of social enterprises working with women-led cooperatives in agriculture, handloom and handicraft sectors identified market ecosystem gaps as well as opportunities for interventions that could help women producers scale their activities. The significance of social entrepreneurship has also increased because governments are seeking new approaches to inclusive development. OECD research identifies social enterprises as contributors to inclusive growth, social cohesion and local development, while also emphasizing the importance of finance, markets, skills, legal frameworks and institutional support. However, social entrepreneurship should not be understood as a substitute for government responsibility or public welfare systems. Social problems such as poverty, discrimination, unemployment and unequal access to education and healthcare have structural causes that require public policy and institutional responses. Social enterprises can complement government and civil society efforts, but their reach and sustainability depend on the wider economic and institutional environment.

The present study therefore examines social entrepreneurship as one component of a broader community development system. It considers both its potential contributions and its limitations and focuses on how entrepreneurial approaches can support locally grounded and sustainable development.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Aim

The major aim of the study is to examine the role of social entrepreneurship in promoting community development and to understand how social enterprises contribute to social, economic and institutional transformation at the community level.

Objectives

1. To explain the concept and characteristics of social entrepreneurship.
2. To examine the relationship between social entrepreneurship and community development.
3. To identify major areas in which social enterprises contribute to community development.
4. To examine the contribution of social entrepreneurship to employment generation.
5. To analyse the role of social enterprises in poverty reduction and livelihood development.
6. To examine the contribution of social entrepreneurship to women's empowerment.
7. To study the role of social enterprises in promoting social inclusion.
8. To examine how social entrepreneurs mobilize local resources.
9. To analyse the contribution of social innovation to community development.
10. To examine the role of social entrepreneurship in rural development.

11. To understand the contribution of social enterprises to education and skill development.
12. To analyse the role of social entrepreneurship in environmental sustainability.
13. To identify major challenges faced by social enterprises.
14. To examine issues related to finance, markets, skills and institutional support.
15. To suggest measures for strengthening the contribution of social entrepreneurship to sustainable community development.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Social entrepreneurship has developed as an interdisciplinary research field involving entrepreneurship, sociology, economics, management and development studies. Early discussions frequently focused on the activities of entrepreneurs who pursue social missions and create new organizational solutions to social problems. Dees described social entrepreneurship as an innovative approach to addressing social problems and emphasized the importance of social mission, opportunity recognition, innovation, accountability and resource mobilization. His work contributed substantially to the conceptual development of modern social entrepreneurship. Mair and Martí examined social entrepreneurship as a process involving the creation of social value through combinations of resources and entrepreneurial action. Their approach emphasized the importance of institutions, social relationships and opportunity structures.

Peredo and McLean reviewed different definitions of social entrepreneurship and identified social value creation, innovation, change agents, opportunity recognition and risk as recurring elements. Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern compared commercial and social entrepreneurship and demonstrated that social entrepreneurship involves distinctive combinations of mission, resource mobilization, opportunity recognition and stakeholder relationships. Zahra et al. developed a typology of social entrepreneurs and emphasized differences in how entrepreneurs respond to social problems and opportunities. Their framework demonstrates that social entrepreneurship is not a single organizational form but a diverse field of activity. Mair, Robinson and Hockerts highlighted the potential of social entrepreneurship to address social and environmental challenges while discussing the institutional environments within which social entrepreneurs operate.

Nicholls examined the development of social entrepreneurship and its relationship with social innovation, accountability and institutional change. Dacin, Dacin and Tracey emphasized that social entrepreneurship encompasses multiple forms of activity and should be understood through the relationship between social problems, entrepreneurial processes and institutional contexts. Choi and Majumdar examined the conceptual boundaries of social entrepreneurship and identified social value creation as a central theme. A systematic review of definitions published in the *Social Enterprise Journal* found substantial variation in the conceptualization of social entrepreneurship. This variation demonstrates that researchers have approached social entrepreneurship through different theoretical perspectives and research traditions. A later content-analysis study examined 80 articles published between 1998 and 2016 to investigate the conceptualization of social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurs and social enterprises. The study identified recurring themes involving social missions, organizational forms, entrepreneurial processes and impact. Critical scholarship has also examined conceptual ambiguity. Zahra et al. and other scholars have demonstrated that the field includes different organizational forms and motivations. This means that social entrepreneurship cannot be reduced simply to nonprofit organizations or businesses with charitable activities.

OECD literature provides an important institutional perspective. The OECD's work on social enterprises identifies their role in local employment, social inclusion and economic development. The

OECD's later review of social and solidarity economy concepts further emphasizes the diversity of organizational purposes, legal structures and business models. The OECD and European Union's work on social enterprise development identifies finance, market access, skills, legal frameworks and support structures as important factors influencing the development of social enterprises. The OECD has also emphasized that appropriate legal frameworks can help create conditions for social enterprise development, although legal recognition alone cannot resolve all challenges faced by the sector.

UNDP research has connected social enterprise with poverty reduction, employment generation and community cohesion. Its study of social enterprises in Europe and the CIS identified social enterprise as an approach that can contribute to poverty reduction and cohesive communities. In the Indian context, community development has a long institutional history. India's Community Development Programme and subsequent rural development initiatives emphasized participation, local leadership, institutional coordination and decentralized development. Historical government reports demonstrate the continuing importance of community participation in development planning. Research on Indian social enterprises has increasingly focused on agriculture, handicrafts, women-led cooperatives, rural livelihoods and financial inclusion. UNDP India's 2023 assessment of social enterprises working with women-led cooperatives examined agriculture, handloom and handicraft value chains and identified market access, financing and ecosystem support as major areas requiring attention. The literature therefore demonstrates that social entrepreneurship has considerable potential for community development, but the realization of this potential depends on the availability of finance, entrepreneurial skills, institutional support, markets, community participation and effective social-impact measurement.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a **descriptive and analytical research methodology**. The study is primarily based on secondary information because the purpose is to examine the conceptual and developmental relationship between social entrepreneurship and community development. Secondary information has been collected from academic books, peer-reviewed journal articles, research reports, institutional publications, government documents, policy papers and credible organizational sources. The study follows a qualitative analytical approach. Relevant literature is reviewed to identify major themes concerning social entrepreneurship and community development. These themes include employment generation, poverty reduction, social inclusion, women's empowerment, rural development, education, healthcare, environmental sustainability, social innovation, local resource mobilization and institutional development.

The study also uses a thematic approach to examine challenges such as inadequate finance, limited market access, shortage of entrepreneurial skills, regulatory difficulties, inadequate infrastructure, limited awareness and problems of measuring social impact. The study does not claim to represent the entire population of social enterprises through primary statistical sampling. Instead, it synthesizes existing knowledge and institutional evidence to develop a broader understanding of the subject.

Sources of Data

The major sources include:

- Academic books
- Peer-reviewed research papers
- Research journals
- Government reports
- OECD publications

-
- UNDP publications
 - Development-agency reports
 - Policy documents
 - Institutional reports
 - Relevant historical community development documents

Method of Analysis

The collected literature is organized into major thematic areas. The study compares different perspectives and identifies common patterns concerning the relationship between social entrepreneurship and community development. The methodology is appropriate for a conceptual and analytical study because social entrepreneurship involves diverse organizational structures and community contexts that cannot always be captured through a single quantitative indicator.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Many communities continue to experience poverty, unemployment, inadequate access to essential services, social exclusion, limited educational opportunities, weak market linkages and unequal access to economic resources. Conventional economic growth does not automatically guarantee that the benefits of development will reach all sections of society. Governments have introduced numerous development programmes to address these problems, but implementation can be affected by resource constraints, administrative limitations, geographical inequalities and differences in local needs. At the same time, private businesses generally prioritize commercial sustainability, which may limit their willingness to serve communities or populations with low purchasing power.

Social entrepreneurship has emerged as an alternative mechanism through which entrepreneurial resources can be directed toward social objectives. Social enterprises can develop products, services and employment opportunities that respond to community needs while generating revenue. However, several problems remain. Many social enterprises struggle to obtain appropriate finance. Some have difficulty entering formal markets. Others face limitations in managerial capacity, technology, skilled personnel and impact measurement. Community participation may also vary significantly across different projects. There is therefore a need to examine whether and how social entrepreneurship contributes to community development and under what institutional and social conditions its contribution becomes sustainable.

NEED OF THE STUDY

The study is important because social and economic problems increasingly require innovative and participatory solutions. Poverty, unemployment, social exclusion and environmental degradation cannot always be addressed effectively through conventional approaches alone. Social entrepreneurship provides a mechanism for connecting entrepreneurial creativity with social objectives. It can transform local needs into opportunities for employment, production, service delivery and community participation. The study is particularly relevant to developing communities where local resources may remain underutilized. Social entrepreneurs can identify local skills, traditional knowledge, agricultural resources, crafts, cultural assets and community networks and connect them with markets.

The study is also important for understanding women's economic participation. Women often face barriers related to finance, property ownership, mobility, markets and skills. Social enterprises and producer organizations can create opportunities for collective economic participation. The study contributes to understanding rural development because many rural communities face limited non-farm

employment opportunities and weak market access. Social entrepreneurship can potentially diversify rural livelihoods and strengthen local value chains.

The study is also relevant to policymakers because successful social enterprises often require an enabling ecosystem consisting of finance, skills, legal recognition, infrastructure, markets and institutional partnerships. OECD research similarly identifies finance, market access, skills, legal frameworks and support structures as important dimensions of social enterprise development.

Finally, the study is significant from the perspective of sustainable development because social enterprises may integrate economic, social and environmental objectives.

FURTHER SUGGESTIONS

Social entrepreneurship should be integrated into broader community development strategies rather than treated as an isolated economic activity. Greater attention should be given to community-based entrepreneurship education. Educational institutions can introduce social entrepreneurship programmes that connect students with local development problems. Local governments can facilitate social enterprises by providing information, infrastructure, market platforms and access to public procurement opportunities. Financial institutions can develop financing instruments appropriate to the longer development cycles of social enterprises. Digital technologies should be used to improve market access for rural producers and community enterprises. Women-led social enterprises should receive specialized training, financial assistance and market-support services. Impact measurement should become a regular component of social enterprise management. Community members should participate in identifying problems and evaluating outcomes. Partnerships among government, universities, social enterprises, civil society organizations and private companies should be strengthened. Social entrepreneurs should be encouraged to use environmentally sustainable production methods. Training programmes should focus not only on entrepreneurship but also on accounting, marketing, digital technologies, leadership and governance.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

Scope

The study covers the conceptual and practical relationship between social entrepreneurship and community development. It includes areas such as employment, poverty reduction, women's empowerment, rural development, social inclusion, education, healthcare, environmental sustainability, financial inclusion and social innovation. The study considers social enterprises operating at local, rural and community levels. It also examines institutional factors such as finance, markets, skills, legal frameworks and policy support. The study has relevance to India as well as the broader international context.

Limitations

The study is primarily based on secondary information. It does not involve a primary survey of a statistically representative sample of social entrepreneurs. Social enterprises differ substantially in their legal structures, objectives, sectors and geographic contexts, making direct comparison difficult. Available impact data may differ in quality and methodology. Social impact is multidimensional and cannot always be represented through a single quantitative indicator. The study does not evaluate the financial performance of individual social enterprises. The findings should therefore be interpreted as analytical conclusions from existing literature rather than as statistical estimates for all social enterprises.

FINDINGS

The study identifies several major findings. Social entrepreneurship provides an important mechanism for connecting entrepreneurial activity with social objectives. Social enterprises can contribute to community development through employment generation, livelihood development and improved access to goods and services. Social entrepreneurship has particular potential in communities where conventional markets do not adequately address social needs. Women can benefit from social enterprises through employment, entrepreneurship, skills and market participation. Social enterprises can support marginalized groups by creating opportunities for economic participation. Rural communities can benefit from social enterprises that strengthen agricultural and non-agricultural value chains. Social innovation can improve the effectiveness and accessibility of community services. Local resource mobilization is an important characteristic of sustainable community-based entrepreneurship.

Market access remains a major challenge for many community enterprises. Finance is one of the most important constraints affecting enterprise establishment and expansion. Entrepreneurial and managerial skills influence organizational sustainability. Digital technologies can improve market access, communication and service delivery. Institutional partnerships are important for scaling social impact. Legal and regulatory frameworks can influence the operating environment of social enterprises. OECD research specifically emphasizes the importance of appropriate legal frameworks and ecosystem support. Impact measurement remains an important challenge because social outcomes are multidimensional. Social entrepreneurship can complement government programmes but cannot replace public responsibility for basic services and structural social policy. Community participation is essential for ensuring local relevance and ownership. Sustainable social entrepreneurship requires a balance among social mission, financial viability and organizational capacity.

DISCUSSION

The findings demonstrate that social entrepreneurship can be understood as an important institutional mechanism for community development. Its significance comes from the ability to combine economic activity with social objectives. Traditional welfare approaches generally depend on public or charitable resources. Conventional businesses generally prioritize financial returns. Social enterprises occupy a space in which financial sustainability and social value are pursued simultaneously. This hybrid character creates both opportunities and challenges. The opportunity lies in the ability to generate resources through economic activity. Revenue can support continued service delivery and reduce dependence on donations. At the same time, the social mission can direct enterprise activity toward underserved communities. The challenge is maintaining the social mission while achieving financial sustainability. Pressure for financial performance can sometimes lead enterprises to prioritize customers with greater purchasing power rather than the most disadvantaged groups. This tension demonstrates why social entrepreneurship should not be assessed solely through financial indicators. Community development also requires participation. A social enterprise that provides services without involving local people may have limited long-term impact. Local participation can improve understanding of needs and increase community ownership.

The literature also demonstrates that social enterprises operate within broader institutional environments. Finance, legal frameworks, public procurement, market access and entrepreneurial skills influence their capacity to develop. OECD studies identify these factors repeatedly across different national contexts. The Indian experience further demonstrates the importance of connecting enterprises with local producer groups and women-led organizations. UNDP India's work on women-led cooperatives indicates that market ecosystem conditions are significant for the development and scaling of social enterprises. The

findings therefore support a partnership-oriented model of community development. Social enterprises, government institutions, community organizations, financial institutions, educational institutions and private markets can contribute different resources. Government can provide infrastructure and policy support. Communities can provide local knowledge and participation. Financial institutions can provide capital. Universities can provide research and training. Social enterprises can provide innovation and organizational capacity. Markets can provide revenue opportunities. Such collaboration can strengthen the sustainability of community development initiatives.

CONCLUSION

Social entrepreneurship represents an important approach to addressing social problems through entrepreneurial innovation, resource mobilization and sustainable organizational models. Its significance lies in its ability to connect economic activity with social objectives. The study demonstrates that social entrepreneurship can contribute to community development through employment generation, livelihood development, poverty reduction, women's empowerment, social inclusion, rural development, education, healthcare, environmental sustainability and local resource mobilization. The contribution of social entrepreneurship is particularly significant where communities face limited market opportunities and inadequate access to essential services. Social enterprises can identify unmet needs and develop locally relevant solutions.

However, social entrepreneurship should not be viewed as a replacement for government responsibility or public development programmes. Structural problems such as poverty, inequality, unemployment and social exclusion require broader institutional and policy responses. The sustainability of social enterprises depends on an enabling ecosystem. Access to appropriate finance, markets, technology, skills, infrastructure, legal recognition and institutional partnerships can significantly influence enterprise development. OECD research similarly emphasizes the role of supportive ecosystems in enabling social enterprises to contribute to inclusive and sustainable development. Community participation is another fundamental requirement. Enterprises are more likely to contribute meaningfully to community development when local people participate in identifying problems, designing solutions and evaluating outcomes. Social entrepreneurship therefore has considerable potential as a component of community development, particularly when it combines innovation with local participation, social accountability and financial sustainability. The future of social entrepreneurship will depend on the ability of social enterprises and supporting institutions to balance three dimensions: **social value, economic sustainability and community ownership**.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Social entrepreneurship education should be expanded in universities, colleges and vocational institutions.
- Governments should create supportive policy environments for social enterprises.
- Appropriate and affordable financial mechanisms should be developed for social enterprises.
- Social enterprises should receive greater access to markets and public procurement opportunities.
- Capacity-building programmes should provide training in management, accounting, marketing and digital technology.
- Special support should be provided to women-led social enterprises.
- Rural social enterprises should be connected with agricultural and non-agricultural value chains.
- Digital platforms should be used to improve market access for community producers.
- Universities should establish social entrepreneurship incubation and innovation centres.

-
- Financial institutions should develop patient and flexible financing mechanisms.
 - Social enterprises should adopt transparent systems of governance and accountability.
 - Social-impact measurement should be strengthened.
 - Community members should participate actively in enterprise planning and evaluation.
 - Government agencies should encourage partnerships between social enterprises and local institutions.
 - Social enterprises should incorporate environmental sustainability into their business models.
 - Skill development should be connected with actual local employment opportunities.
 - Support systems should be developed for marginalized entrepreneurs.
 - Local governments should provide information, infrastructure and facilitation services.
 - Research on social entrepreneurship should include long-term community-level impact assessment.
 - Social entrepreneurship should be incorporated into broader sustainable development strategies.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1–22.
 2. Choi, N., & Majumdar, S. (2014). Social entrepreneurship as an essentially contested concept: Opening a new avenue for systematic future research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(3), 363–376.
 3. Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1203–1213.
 4. Dees, J. G. (1998). *The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship*. Stanford University, Graduate School of Business.
 5. Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 32–53.
 6. Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36–44.
 7. Mair, J., Robinson, J., & Hockerts, K. (Eds.). (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship*. Palgrave Macmillan.
 8. Nicholls, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Oxford University Press.
 9. OECD. (1999). *Social Enterprises*. Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED). OECD Publishing. ([OECD](#))
 10. OECD. (2007). *The Social Economy: Building Inclusive Economies*. OECD Publishing. ([OECD](#))
 11. OECD. (2009). *The Changing Boundaries of Social Enterprises*. OECD Publishing. ([OECD](#))
 12. OECD/European Union. (2016). *Policy Brief on Scaling the Impact of Social Enterprises: Policies for Social Entrepreneurship*. OECD Publishing. ([OECD](#))
 13. OECD/European Union. (2017). *Boosting Social Enterprise Development: Good Practice Compendium*. OECD Publishing. ([OECD](#))
 14. OECD. (2019). *Boosting Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprise Development in the Netherlands*. OECD Publishing. ([OECD](#))
 15. OECD. (2021). *Boosting Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprise Development in Brandenburg, Germany*. OECD Publishing. ([OECD](#))
 16. OECD. (2022). *Designing Legal Frameworks for Social Enterprises: Practical Guidance for Policy Makers*. OECD Publishing. ([OECD](#))
 17. OECD. (2023). *What Is the Social and Solidarity Economy? A Review of Concepts*. OECD Publishing. ([OECD](#))
-

18. Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56–65. ([ScienceDirect](#))
19. 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.
20. Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2017). Fundamentals for an international typology of social enterprise models. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 28, 2469–2497.
21. Hoogendoorn, B., Pennings, E., & Thurik, R. (2010). What do we know about social entrepreneurship? An analysis of empirical research. *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 8(2), 71–112.
22. Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 5(2), 28–39.
23. Nicholls, A. (2010). The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: Reflexive isomorphism in a pre-paradigmatic field. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 611–633.
24. UNDP. (2015). *Social Enterprise: A New Model for Poverty Reduction and Employment Generation*. United Nations Development Programme. ([UNDP](#))
25. UNDP India. (2023). *Assessment of Social Enterprises Working with Women-led Cooperatives*. United Nations Development Programme India. ([UNDP](#))
26. Planning Commission, Government of India. (1957). *Report of the Team for the Study of Community Projects and National Extension Service*. Government of India. ([NITI Repository](#))
27. Planning Commission, Government of India. (1961). *Report of the Study Group on the Welfare of the Weaker Sections of the Village Community*. Government of India. ([NITI Repository](#))
28. Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2010). *Social Entrepreneurship: What Everyone Needs to Know*. Oxford University Press.
29. Elkington, J., & Hartigan, P. (2008). *The Power of Unreasonable People: How Social Entrepreneurs Create Markets That Change the World*. Harvard Business Press.
30. Leadbeater, C. (1997). *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*. Demos.
31. Yunus, M. (2007). *Creating a World Without Poverty: Social Business and the Future of Capitalism*. PublicAffairs.
32. Yunus, M., Moingeon, B., & Laurence, L. (2010). Building social business models: Lessons from the Grameen experience. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), 308–325.
33. Smith, B. R., & Stevens, C. E. (2010). Different types of social entrepreneurship: The role of geography and embeddedness on the measurement and scaling of social value. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 22(6), 575–598.
34. Bacq, S., & Janssen, F. (2011). The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(5–6), 373–403.
35. Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., & Linder, S. (2019). Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises. *Journal of Management*, 45(1), 70–95.