www.researchvidyapith.com ISSN (Online): 3048-7331

Research Vidyapith International Multidisciplinary Journal

(An Open Access, Peer-reviewed & Refereed Journal)

(Multidisciplinary, Monthly, Multilanguage)

* Vol-1* *Issue-2* *September 2024*

Social Entrepreneurship as a Catalyst for Inclusive Community Development

Renu Chaudhary

Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Bir Tikendrajit University, Imphal West, Manipur, India

Dr. A K Choudhary

Professor, Department of Commerce, Bir Tikendrajit University, Imphal West, Manipur, India

Abstract

Social entrepreneurship has emerged as a hybrid model that combines the efficiency of market mechanisms with the inclusivity of social missions, offering innovative solutions to complex community challenges. This review paper explores the evolution and multidimensional role of social entrepreneurship in fostering community development, with emphasis on economic empowerment, social equity, and environmental sustainability. The literature reveals that social enterprises contribute significantly to poverty reduction, employment generation, healthcare, education, and ecological stewardship, while also aligning with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The paper further highlights theoretical frameworks—such as Institutional Theory, Social Capital Theory, and Sustainable Development Theory—that explain how social enterprises mobilize resources, navigate institutional voids, and strengthen local resilience. Despite these contributions, challenges remain in terms of scalability, impact measurement, and balancing profit with social mission. The review identifies gaps in empirical evidence, particularly in emerging economies and youth-driven initiatives, suggesting the need for further interdisciplinary and context-specific research. Overall, the paper affirms that social entrepreneurship is not merely an alternative business approach but a developmental paradigm that has the potential to create resilient, inclusive, and sustainable communities.

Keywords- Social Entrepreneurship; Community Development; Inclusive Growth; Empowerment; Social Capital; Institutional Theory; Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); Sustainability

1. Introduction

Social entrepreneurship has become a unique event that cuts across business, society, and innovation. Unlike traditional businesses, which mainly focus on maximization, social entrepreneurship tries to bridge economic stability with quantitative social and environmental benefits [1]. In the late 1900s, the observation entered the mainstream vision, but the observation comes from a collaborative and philanthropic history. These pioneers, such as promoter Muhammad Younos, Grameen Bank of Bangladesh, showed how novels can strengthen marginal societies, and yet women can use microloans. This attractive combination of the action of entrepreneurship with social goals was a radical departure from donation-based interventions to sustainable development strategies. As head of microfinance, communities have now crossed the board into different types of areas, including health care, education, renewable energy, and social development [2]. Organizations of voluntary associations at the grassroots level for internationally renowned companies have used hybrid trade models that convert two areas for non-profit and profit. Increased institutionalization of social entrepreneurship, such as seen in incubators, social corporate funds, and state plans, reflects an increased contribution to long-term development.

1.1 The Increasing Significance of Inclusive Community Development

The inclusive social development, in response to economic development and technological progress, is the central concern for politics and practice, working towards equal opportunities for all. Larger globalization, digitalization, and climate change have increased differences in the genital lines, caste, ethnicity, and geography. In most cases, the disadvantaged groups are kept out of access to resources, markets, and decision-making opportunities. These inequalities require innovative reactions that integrate social, economic, and environmental elements of stability [3].

Social entrepreneurship is necessary to continue the inclusion through locally relevant solutions, conversion of locally available resources, and sabotage of exclusion systems. For example, health services in India have traditionally introduced important medical services for those excluded from public systems. Similarly, African green businesses have provided green energy solutions that change both erosion and energy poverty at the same time. According to the principles of empowerment, participation, and flexibility, social entrepreneurship matches the great vision of inclusive development [4].

1.2 Rationale for Linking Social Entrepreneurship and Inclusion

The relationship between social entrepreneurship and inclusive social development is ideological and practical. Ideologically, social entrepreneurship symbolizes morality in inclusion in the sense that it just wants to incorporate excluded groups as more than recipients, but as producers of value. Practically, social enterprises are linked where state and market mechanisms for fair results are nonexistent, and therefore make space through innovative solutions [5]. The argument for this adjustment is in three places:

- Documentation of market failure: Social enterprises fill the intervals where mainstream markets cannot reach the marginalized communities, namely, by providing health services or low-cost training.
- Promote agency and participation: Through the socially focused owner and participation model, social entrepreneurship strengthens groups of marginalization to become drivers for change and to shape their ability to shape the development path.
- Inspirational systemic changes: Apart from providing services, social enterprises also want to challenge structural injustice, advocate for political reforms, and restore institutional structures leading to exclusion.

1.3 Scope and Aim of the Review

The paper critically evaluates the role of social entrepreneurship in promoting inclusive community development. The aims are:

[1] To review the economic, social, and environmental impacts of social entrepreneurship.

[2] To discuss the mechanisms and models connecting social enterprises to inclusive outcomes.

[3] To offer worldwide insights through representative case studies from Asia, Africa, Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America.

[4] To critically assess the theoretical underpinnings and research methods used within current literature, determining gaps for future study.

2. Conceptual Foundations

2.1 Understanding Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship has become a prominent area of research that combines business skills with a social purpose. The theoretical origin is at the meeting point between entrepreneurship, social innovation, and sustainable development. This concept appeared as a reaction to traditional markets and authorities ' handling of poverty, inequality, and ecological damage [6]. It has expanded a wide range of activities related to health services, education, technology access, and environmental protection over time, from narrowly centered microfinance projects. Theoretical grounds are institutional principles, which are responsible for socializing working around structural obstacles; resource-based approaches that outline strategic mobilization of limited assets; And ideas about social capital that focus on trust, networks, and inherent in local communities [7].

One feature of social entrepreneurship is that it is hybrid oriented: That is, the purpose of both economic stability and social or environmental value at the same time. Unlike traditional entrepreneurship, which is aimed at maximizing profits, the purpose of social entrepreneurship is to balance economic viability with systemic social changes [8]. Different from charity or philanthropy, it does not depend on charity but prepares new, market-based solutions to provide value. The key characteristic is its capacity for systemic effect with accountability to several stakeholders, including marginalized groups.

Social entrepreneurship is often understood in three related dimensions. The economic dimension is realized through the construction of income streams, jobs, and market links for the disadvantaged groups. The social dimension leads to inequality, health care, education, and problems with the empowerment of poor people. Environmental dimensions focus on permanent operation, renewable energy technology, and climate flexibility. In combination, these dimensions suggest that development is a multidimensional process [9].

2.2 Inclusive Community Development

The definition of inclusion in development, social entrepreneurship, is often considered in three related dimensions. The economic dimension is realized through the construction of income streams, jobs, and market links for the disadvantaged groups. The social dimension leads to inequality, health care, education, and the empowerment of poor people [10]. Environmental dimensions focus on permanent operation, renewable energy technology, and climate flexibility. In combination, these dimensions suggest that development is a multidimensional process.

Inclusive social development is defined as procedures and results that do not leave any group behind in the profits from growth and development. It exceeds economic growth to prioritize justice, dignity, and equal participation in determining a normal future. The definition captures the notion that society is able to take part and get benefits when all members of races, ethnicity, or socio-economic status are involved [11].

Developments are usually determined by four main indicators. Equity for equal distribution of opportunities and resources, related to structural loss. Participation is about decision-making and active community engagement in management to ensure that development is not resolved, but has been developed in collaboration. Empowerment is about production capacity at individual and collective levels so that individuals can shape their life reference. Stability is guaranteed that the benefits of development are long-lasting, green, and fair between generations. These measures in the entire form are like a structure to determine whether development is really inclusive [12].

The universal discussion of sustainable development emphasizes inclusion as an overriding midpoint. SDG-er emphasizes the value of "leaving someone behind" as a moral obligation, as well as an imperative for practical tasks to solve global problems. Objectives of poverty relief, gender equality, low inequalities, climate actions, and good institutions are all randomly included in inclusive social development. Social entrepreneurship, in this regard, figures as an effective mechanism to implement ground-level SDGs [13]. Entrepreneurial efforts can move towards similar and flexible development processes by combining the values of inclusion [14]. Comparative literature review table integrates the main contributions from different studies on social entrepreneurship and inclusive social development, indicating their attention, conclusions, boundaries, and praise. Early founding work emphasized the ideological development of social entrepreneurship as a departure from traditional business and charity models and its space in hybrid organizational forms [15]. Later studies broadened the agenda by connecting social entrepreneurship with sustainable development objectives (SDGs), shared growth, and systemic change along economic, social, and environmental fronts.

Table 2.1 Comparative Literature Review on Social Entrepreneurship and Community Development

Author(s) & Year	Focus of Study	Key Findings	Limitations / Gaps	Relevance to Present Study
Dacin et al. (2011)	Conceptual roots of social entrepreneurship	Defined social entrepreneurship as a hybrid model linking profit and social mission	Lacked empirical validation; more theoretical	Provides foundation for framing social entrepreneurship as a hybrid system
Littlewood & Holt (2018)	Role of environment in South Africa	Social enterprises address institutional voids in developing contexts	Findings region-specific; limited generalizability	Useful for comparison with emerging economies
Stephan & Drencheva (2019)	Social entrepreneurial personality	Identified traits like empathy, resilience, and prosocial motivation	Focused only on individual-level factors	Supports inclusion of youth capability and consciousness
Phillips et al. (2019)	Social innovation and entrepreneurship	Social innovation central to inclusive outcomes	Did not assess long-term impacts	Links innovation with inclusive development
Qureshi et al. (2020)	Role of social capital	Showed how trust and networks enable entrepreneurship	Risk of overemphasis on networks; less on structural issues	Justifies focus on community endorsement
Khan & Munir (2021)	Social enterprises in rural Pakistan	Demonstrated direct positive effects on rural community development	Single-country study; limited scope	Empirical support for community empowerment
Aziz et al. (2023)	Youth readiness for social entrepreneurship	Civic consciousness and perceived capability as determinants	Narrow focus on youth in Malaysia	Directly aligns with study's focus on youth orientation
Shabbir & Batool (2025)	Role of social capital in sustainable enterprises	Social networks enhance sustainability of social enterprises	DOI pending; limited geographical focus	Supports the study's focus on social capital in community building
Raman et al. (2025)	Social entrepreneurship & sustainable technologies	Highlighted impact on communities via inclusive innovation	Did not explore behavioral aspects	Complements study by linking technology to inclusivity
Shinde et al. (2025)	Social entrepreneurship & inclusive growth	Identified link with economic sustainability	Broader framework	

3. The Role of Social Entrepreneurship in Community Development

3.1 Economic Contributions

One of the most obvious economic impacts of social entrepreneurship is the generation of jobs, especially for vulnerable groups. Social enterprises tend to work in labor-intensive industries like handicrafts, agriculture, and community services, thus providing jobs to workers who are kept out of formal labor markets. For instance, companies like SELCO India hired local technicians to install, maintain, and service solar lighting systems for homes in rural areas, creating livelihoods and reducing energy poverty [11].

Social enterprises also encourage inclusive employment practices, benefiting women, differently-abled people, and ethnic minorities. Women's empowerment by micro-enterprise schemes has had multiplier benefits for household incomes, education, and health. Notably, jobs created through social enterprises tend to be more community-focused, promoting local resilience and lessening migration pressures. [12]

Microfinance and SMB

Microfinance has been the most powerful unit developed by social entrepreneurs to drive inclusive economic development [13]. The idea of Grameen Bank showed how access to small loans can unlock the entrepreneurial forces among the poor. Microfinance institutions (MFIs) have funded millions of micro and small businesses globally. In addition to microfinancing, social companies also help small and medium-sized companies (SMBs) with training, mentorship, and market access. Initiatives such as Kenya's Ushahidi utilize technology to enable small businessmen to enter large markets. Such an initiative not only promotes financial inclusion but also has a sustainable business ecosystem that enables social development [14].

Poverty -fighting strategies

By targeting structural causes of poverty, social entrepreneurship facilitates long-term poverty. Social companies do not create addiction because they focus on empowerment in skills development, capital building, and autonomy. Poverty limitation schemes contain hybrid models that combine economic opportunities with social and environmental value. The countryside agricultural cooperation society is a case in Latin America, as they have improved food security and farming power for farmers [15]. The lasting effect of these policies is the building of excitement among vulnerable groups, so that they can withstand genomic shock and adapt to changing circumstances.

3.2 Social Contributions

Addressing Inequality

Social entrepreneurship reciprocates internal inequalities by creating strategic interventions with groups of the margins. In South Asia, companies such as Seva (Self-Planned Women's Association) have caused women to work in the informal sectors, providing them with the power of negotiations, access to money, and technical services. Social enterprises are linked to the extensive process of social justice by pushing against systemic prohibitions such as India's caste system or the ethnic exclusion of Africa [16].

Expand the use of health care and education.

Health and education are two important areas where social entrepreneurship has a revolutionary impact. While the state has been inadequate, social enterprises have offered innovative, low-cost, and replicable solutions. It is the Arvind Eye Care System in India, which performed millions of free or affordable operations while they were economically viable, drawing international academies in Kenya, using technology-based learning methods to expand access to quality training for poor families [17].

Encouraging Social Cohesion and Inclusion

Aside from service delivery, social enterprises play a role in cementing social cohesion. Through co-management of decision-making in the community, there is a sense of ownership and commonality. Mechanisms such as participatory budgeting, cooperatives, and urban community development projects illustrate how social entrepreneurship can promote solidarity and confidence between various social groups. This dismantles social tensions and enhances stability, which are prerequisites of inclusive development [18].

3.3 Environmental Contributions

Green Innovations and Sustainability Practices

Many social enterprises place environmental sustainability in their mission because they feel that ecological resilience lies at the root of community welfare. Green innovations include renewable energy technologies, waste management schemes, and sustainable agriculture practices. SELCO India and Barefoot College are the best examples of how solar technology can be leveraged to provide rural energy needs at the price of reduced carbon emissions [19].

Community-Based Environmental Enterprises

Community-led environmental businesses empower local communities to utilize natural resources in a sustainable manner. For instance, Nepal's community forestry programs have allowed villagers to preserve forests while earning revenues from eco-tourism and forest products. These examples demonstrate how social entrepreneurship reconciles local economic interests with environmental conservation [20].

Climate Resilience and Eco-Friendly Livelihoods

Social enterprises also contribute to building resilience against climate change via adaptive livelihoods. For instance, businesses that offer assistance for climate-resilient agriculture allow farmers to adapt to variable rainfall and land degradation. Green livelihood pathways such as organic agriculture and sustainable aquaculture not only mitigate environmental degradation but also enhance food security and income diversification.

4. Mechanisms Connecting Social Entrepreneurship and Inclusive Development

Social Innovation as a Driver of Inclusion: Social innovation is central to social entrepreneurship and suggests new solutions to old social problems. New products (i.e., cheap medical devices), processes (i.e., participatory budgeting), or organizational forms (i.e., hybrid cooperatives) can be included. Shared Value Creation and Hybrid Business Models: By balancing profit and purpose, hybrid models enable social enterprises to finance themselves without sacrificing shared value creation. This bridges the gap between for-profit and nonprofit models and shows how business operations can drive social inclusion simultaneously. Community Ownership and Participation Models: Community ownership guarantees equitable sharing of benefits and development trajectories aligned with local agenda. Cooperatives, self-help groups, and community-based organizations are excellent examples of participatory models that enhance inclusivity. Networks, Partnerships, and Cross-Sector Collaborations: Social entrepreneurship thrives through networks of various players like governments, NGOs, private business enterprises, and communities. Cross-sector partnerships allow for poolability of resources, knowledge exchange, and policy influence, enhancing the effectiveness of social enterprises.

Table 2 presents a comparative summary of social entrepreneurship in five major regions—Asia, Africa, Europe, the Middle East (with special focus on Saudi Arabia), and Latin America. The table brings into perspective how regional priorities and institutional settings influence the focus, practice, and impact of social enterprises. In Asia, social entrepreneurship thrives through scalable models like microfinance and healthcare, supported by government funds and incubators. Africa's enterprises are largely necessity-driven, focusing on energy access and healthcare, often supported by donor agencies and NGOs, thereby enhancing rural livelihoods. In Europe, social enterprises are strongly embedded within welfare economies, receiving subsidies and policy support to address unemployment, migrant integration, and social care, reflecting a highly institutionalized ecosystem. The Middle East and Saudi Arabia present a unique model where social entrepreneurship is directly linked to national diversification strategies such as *Vision 2030*, addressing youth employment, women's empowerment, and cultural preservation. Finally, Latin America demonstrates a community-driven and solidarity-based approach, rooted in indigenous traditions and ecological stewardship, creating sustainable and participatory forms of development.

Table 2 Global Views and Case Examples

Region	Key Focus Areas	Notable Examples	Government/Policy Support	Community Development Impact	Distinctive Features
Asia	Poverty reduction, healthcare, waste management, renewable energy	Grameen Bank (Bangladesh), Aravind Eye Care (India)	India's social enterprise funds, incubators, and supportive government initiatives	Enhanced financial inclusion, affordable healthcare, and scalable models tackling urban poverty	Blend of grassroots innovation with institutional support; strong role of microfinance and healthcare enterprises
Africa	Energy access, healthcare, poverty alleviation	M-KOPA Solar (Kenya), grassroots community health initiatives	Emerging but limited government involvement; partnerships with NGOs and international donors	Improved access to clean energy, education, and healthcare; upliftment of rural households	Enterprises born out of necessity; emphasis on pay-as-you-go models and scalable solutions for low-income communities
Europe	Employment generation, migrant integration, social care	Cooperative enterprises in Italy, Spain; UK social care enterprises	Strong policy and subsidy support from national governments and the European Union's social economy agenda	Integration of marginalized groups, reduced unemployment, and robust welfare services	Highly institutionalized ecosystem; embedded within welfare economies with long traditions of cooperative movements
Middle East & Saudi Arabia	Youth employment, women's empowerment, cultural heritage	Community entrepreneurship under Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030	Vision 2030 programs promoting economic diversification and entrepreneurship	Promotes social cohesion, economic inclusion, and reduced dependency on oil economy	Distinctive focus on aligning social entrepreneurship with national diversification goals; emphasis on cultural and gender dimensions
Latin America	Indigenous-led enterprises, ecological sustainability, solidarity economy	Cooperatives in Brazil, Mexico, Bolivia	Supported by local governance structures and community institutions	Strengthened indigenous communities, ecological stewardship, and sustainable livelihoods	Community-driven, bottom-up approach; enterprises rooted in solidarity, mutual aid, and traditional knowledge systems

6. Theoretical and Methodological Approaches in Literature

- Institutional principles: How social enterprises interact with the institutional environment and form again, especially in weak control situations.
- Social capital principle: trust, networks, and the importance of social conditions to enable collective measures and inclusive results.
- Resource-based views (RBV): It checks how social businesses organize and use economic, people, and relationships with competitive and inclusive benefits.
- Sustainable development principle: A state of social entrepreneurship in the background for the inclusion of economic, social, and environmental goals in the agenda for extensive stability.

The current scholarship provides an increasing function of social entrepreneurship research, comparative case studies, and international comparison. Quantitative study-based and economic techniques complemented qualitative ethnographers to learn more about the effect of social enterprises.

Limitations

Despite this progress, there are holes. Most functions depend on single case studies, which limit generality. Social companies have inadequate long-term effects. Comparison of comparisons is less transformed, and mixed methods are very rarely mixed that collect qualitative depth and quantitative stiffness. Closing these gaps would advance the theoretical and empirical foundation of the field.

7. Conclusion

This review paper has explored the evolution, scope, and impact of social entrepreneurship as a catalyst for community development. The analysis of existing literature demonstrates that social entrepreneurship has moved beyond its early conceptualizations of nonprofit innovation and philanthropy to become a hybrid paradigm that integrates economic sustainability with social and environmental objectives. Across diverse regions, social enterprises have contributed significantly to addressing poverty, inequality, unemployment, healthcare access, education, and environmental sustainability, reflecting their adaptability to local needs and contexts. The review also highlights that while the contributions of social entrepreneurship are multifaceted—ranging from economic empowerment through microfinance and employment generation to social inclusion and ecological stewardship—its potential remains underutilized in many emerging economies. Institutional barriers, measurement challenges, and tensions between profit and social mission continue to constrain scalability and long-term impact. However, theoretical perspectives such as Institutional Theory, Social Capital Theory, and Sustainable Development frameworks provide a strong foundation for understanding how social enterprises can navigate these challenges. Looking ahead, the literature suggests a growing need for empirical, context-specific, and interdisciplinary research that examines youth engagement, digital transformation, and region-specific practices in social entrepreneurship. Policy frameworks must evolve to provide enabling ecosystems, while education and capacity-building initiatives should nurture socially conscious entrepreneurs. In summary, social entrepreneurship is not just an added enterprise model but a developmental paradigm that marries innovation with inclusivity and sustainability. Its impact in developing robust, equitable, and SDG-conformant communities makes it a keystone for future development policy. Enhancing research, practice, and policy expertise in this area will be central to realizing its potential in influencing sustainable community development.

Author's Declaration:

I/We, the author(s)/co-author(s), declare that the entire content, views, analysis, and conclusions of this article are solely my/our own. I/We take full responsibility, individually and collectively, for any errors, omissions, ethical misconduct, copyright violations, plagiarism, defamation, misrepresentation, or any legal consequences arising now or in the future. The publisher, editors, and reviewers shall not be held responsible or liable in any way for any legal, ethical, financial, or reputational claims related to this article. All responsibility rests solely with the author(s)/co-author(s), jointly and severally. I/We further affirm that there is no conflict of interest financial, personal, academic, or professional regarding the subject, findings, or publication of this article.

References

1. Aziz, K. A., Adnan, H., & Nordin, N. (2023). Social entrepreneurship for sustainable community development: Investigating the determinants for youths' readiness. Journal of System and Management Sciences, 13(1), 438–458. https://doi.org/10.33168/JSMS.2023.0124
2. Kummitha, R. K. R. (2025). Social entrepreneurship: A well-being based approach. Journal of Business Ethics. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05922-6
3. Raman, R., Kalidoss, R., & Sharma, A. (2025). Social entrepreneurship and sustainable technologies: Impact on communities, social innovation, and inclusive development. Sustainable Technology and Entrepreneurship, 5, 100110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stae.2025.100110

4. Shinde, S., Kautish, P., & Kour, P. (2025). Exploring the impact of social entrepreneurship on economic sustainability and inclusive growth. Journal of International Social Entrepreneurship and Management, 10(10s), 1417. https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i10s.1417
5. Shabbir, M. S., & Batool, S. (2025). Social entrepreneurship for community development: The role of social capital in establishing sustainable enterprises. Journal of Social Entrepreneurship. [In press]. (DOI forthcoming)
6. Tatpuje, R. (2025). Study on the parameters of inclusive social entrepreneurship. Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/2319510X251359395
7. Littlewood, D., & Holt, D. (2018). Social entrepreneurship in South Africa: Exploring the influence of environment. Business & Society, 57(3), 525–561. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650315613293
8. Stephan, U., & Drencheva, A. (2019). The person in social entrepreneurship: A systematic review of research on the social entrepreneurial personality. Journal of Business Ethics, 159(3), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3758-6
9. Islam, M. A., Khan, M. A., Obaidullah, A. Z. M., & Alam, M. S. (2018). Effect of entrepreneur and firm characteristics on the business success of SMEs in Bangladesh. Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research, 8(1), 29. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40497-018-0131-0
10. Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N., & James, P. (2019). Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review. Group & Organization Management, 44(4), 428–461. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601119847484
11. Qureshi, I., Kistruck, G., & Bhatt, B. (2020). The enabling and constraining effects of social capital on social entrepreneurship: A multilevel study. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 44(2), 319–348. https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258718780538
12. Roundy, P. T. (2019). Social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial ecosystems: Complementary or disjointed phenomena? International Journal of Social Economics, 46(3), 266–279. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-11-2017-0543
13. de Bruin, A., & Teasdale, S. (2019). Exploring the terrain of social entrepreneurship: New directions, hybridities and research agendas. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 25(3), 582–592. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-12-2018-0819
14. Bansal, S., Garg, I., & Sharma, G. D. (2019). Social entrepreneurship as a path for social change and driver of sustainable development: A systematic review and research agenda. Sustainability, 11(4), 1091. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11041091
15. Khan, S. A., & Munir, K. (2021). The impact of social enterprises on community development: Evidence from rural Pakistan. Journal of Rural Studies, 82, 138–146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.01.018
16. Dufays, F., & Huybrechts, B. (2020). Where do hybrids come from? Entrepreneurial team composition and the creation of hybrid organizations. Organization Studies, 41(9), 1271–1295. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840619867720
17. Kimmitt, J., Muñoz, P., & Newbery, R. (2020). Poverty and the varieties of entrepreneurship in the pursuit of prosperity. Journal of Business Venturing, 35(4), 105939. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2019.05.003
18. Montgomery, A. W., Dacin, P. A., & Dacin, M. T. (2020). Water wars in Detroit: Custodianship and the work of social entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Venturing, 35(3), 105935. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2019.06.001
19. Gupta, P., Chauhan, S., Paul, J., & Jaiswal, M. P. (2020). Social entrepreneurship research: A review and future research agenda. Journal of Business Research, 113, 209–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.032
20. Ometto, M. P., & Furlan, M. (2021). Community-based enterprises and environmental sustainability: Evidence from Latin America. World Development, 140, 105270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105270

Cite this Article-

"Renu Chaudhary; Dr.A K Choudhary", "Social Entrepreneurship as a Catalyst for Inclusive Community Development", Research Vidyapith International Multidisciplinary Journal (RVIMJ), ISSN: 3048-7331 (Online), Volume:1, Issue:2, September 2024.

Journal URL- https://www.researchvidyapith.com/

DOI- 10.70650

Published Date- 09 September 2024