UNIT 6 SOCIAL ENTERPRENEURSHIP FRAMEWORK

Structure

6.0 Objectives

6.1 Introduction

6.2 Defining Social Entrepreneurship

6.3 The emergence of social entrepreneurship

6.4 Need for policy development- Global Perspective

6.5 India's social enterprise landscape

6.6 Framework for social enterprises in India

6.7 Entrepreneurship promotion in India

6.8 Conceptual Framework of Social Entrepreneurship Policy

6.9 Conclusion

6.10 References and Further Readings

6.11 Check your progress possible answers

6.0 OBJECTIVES

You will be able to:

After completing this Unit, you should be able to:

- define social entrepreneurship.
- discuss the development of social entrepreneurship.
- Need of policy development for social entrepreneurs.
- Understand Framework of Social Entrepreneurship Policy
- Entrepreneurship promotions in India.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

One of the most significant developments in contemporary international non-governmental organizations is the rise of social entrepreneurship. Although many of the activities and approaches associated with this term (such as social enterprises' use of business models to generate income to support social programs) are not new, the emergence of a distinct organizational field for such action does represent a significant structural shift in the institutions of social activity. Although the concept of a "social entrepreneur" has been around since at least the 1970s, it is only in the last twenty years that the phrase has begun

to acquire momentum in several different but related discourses in the public, commercial, and non-profit sectors.

Entrepreneurs with a social purpose refuse to give up on finding solutions to pressing social issues. In their pursuit of the mission's realization, social entrepreneurs will rest once they have successfully brought their ideas to life. Using social entrepreneurship as an example, 2006 Nobel Peace Prize laureate Mohammad Yunus has improved the lot of the world's poor. He established the "Grameen Bank" to help underprivileged women in rural regions start their businesses by lending them modest amounts of money. Indeed, individuals engaged in social entrepreneurship are those with innovative proposals to address social issues on a regional, national, or even global scale.

6.2 DEFINING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Bornstein, D., 2004 defined it as a path breaker with a powerful new idea, who combines visionary and real-world problem-solving creativity, who has a strong ethical fibre, and who is 'totally possessed' by their vision for change.

Martin, R. L. &Osberg, S., 2007 defined that the social entrepreneur should be understood as someone who targets an unfortunate but stable equilibrium that causes the neglect, marginalization, or suffering of a segment of humanity; who brings to bear on this situation their inspiration, direct action, creativity, courage, and fortitude; and who aims for and ultimately affects the establishment of a new stable equilibrium that secures permanent benefit for the targeted group and society at large.

According to Dacin et al., there are 37 distinct definitions of social enterprises and social entrepreneurs. These definitions included innovativeness, social change creation, embeddedness in a particular community, adoption of virtuous entrepreneurial practices, distributed ownership, and financial sustainability as essential features of this new phenomenon. The only thing these 37 different points of view have in common is the description of social entrepreneurs and enterprises as being able to mobilize resources primarily to create a positive social and environmental impact, as well as the association of social entrepreneurship with optimism and social change.

Many have tried to define social entrepreneurs, but one of the most popular ones comes from Dees (1998, revised 2001):

"Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector by:

- Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value),
- Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission,
- Engaging in the process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning,
- Acting boldly without being limited by resources

Based on these descriptions, we may deduce that social entrepreneurship entails locating a significant social issue and developing an original strategy for addressing it. Social entrepreneurship aims to increase people's participation in solving social problems, particularly in neglected places. In contrast to traditional for-profit businesses, the central focus of a social initiative is on satisfying unmet social needs and solving social issues. On the other hand, traditional entrepreneurship is driven only by financial gain and not by a desire to improve society.

6.3 THE EMERGENCE OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The concept of a social entrepreneur is still novel. The last several decades have seen its rise to prominence. It has, however, been used by people at various times. Several businesspeople have launched nonprofits to fix society's ills or make it a better place. These individuals may include Vinoba Bhave, the man responsible for starting the Land Gift Movement in India; Robert Owen, the man responsible for creating the cooperative movement; and Florence Nightingale, the woman responsible for starting the first nursing school and developing modern nursing practices. In the 19th century, long before the notion of Social Entrepreneurship was applied to management, these groups and foundations were founded.

Researchers have come up with various viewpoints and arguments on the origin and evolution of social entrepreneurship, which has remained a controversial term (Austin et al., 2006; El Ebrashi, 2013; Short et al., 2009b). The evidence does not point to a singular evolution route; instead, it points to a dilemma determined by several dimensions.

The evolution of social entrepreneurship may be summarised as follows over its many decades of existence.

Around 1970, social entrepreneurship evolved as a management expertise supporting entrepreneurial and corporate activities while also addressing social issues. In 1980 Social entrepreneurship was recognized as a business practice, and different organizations stepped forward to recognize the *social* way of entrepreneurial practice. As of 1990, the concept of "social entrepreneurship" referred to the efforts of a nonprofit to generate social prosperity. In 2000, "social entrepreneurship" was officially acknowledged as a distinct field of academic research for the first time. With its application in the form of a proliferation of nonprofit social companies providing solutions to social issues in various nations, social entrepreneurship has garnered widespread prominence in recent years. Multidimensional academic research enhanced the topic of social entrepreneurship in 2010, with connections to several other fields. The era witnessed the emergence of for-profit social enterprises. The current period sees a remarkable upsurge in the study and the development of hybrid social enterprise business models, marking the continuation of revolutions in social entrepreneurship.

Check your progress 1

1. Define Social Entrepreneurship

   ……

   ……

   ……

   ……

2. Explain the evolution of social entrepreneurship.

   ……

   ……

   ……

   ……

6.4 NEED FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT-GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

Many countries in and outside of Europe give SEs much weight in their policy debates. To give European SEs a formal name, the European Union launched several social entrepreneurship initiatives, such as the "Social Business Initiative" and others. For European policymakers and others invested in socially conscious enterprises, this represented a significant step forward.

The Global Social Entrepreneurship Framework encompasses various initiatives and models that support social enterprises worldwide. One key initiative is the Global Alliance for Social Entrepreneurship, led by the World Economic Forum, which fosters collaboration among stakeholders to drive social impact through entrepreneurship.

Another relevant framework is the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM), which examines how social, cultural, political, and economic contexts influence entrepreneurial activity, including social entrepreneurship. It highlights factors such as societal values, individual attributes, and business lifecycle stages that shape social enterprises.

Additionally, the Global Innovation Index 2024 explores how innovation can unlock the potential of social entrepreneurship, providing insights into global trends and strategies.

The Corporate Leadership Council: Established in 2023, the Corporate Leadership Council brings together social innovation leaders of corporate members in the Global Alliance. The council is on track to emerge as the premier engagement platform for social innovation in the private sector. As such, it engages with public sector actors, sets the direction for social

innovation in the private sector and supports the development of cross-sector initiatives.

The Policy Leadership Council on social Economy and social innovation brings together policy leaders from international organisations, government, academia and business to see the potential of the social economy unlocked through effective policies. The Council is an evolution of the Social Economy Working Group, which was established by the Schwab Foundation and the World Economic Forum in 2021.

Public Sector Engagement - Data informing policymakers about the contribution of social enterprise towards sustainable development, and priorities to improve the enabling conditions for the sector.

The Innovative Finance initiative by the Schwab Foundation, in partnership with the World Economic Forum, SK Group's Centre for Social Value Enhancement Studies, and an advisory group of 100+ leading organizations explores how companies can use innovative finance **mechanisms to address social issues at scale and how tradeable impact** - social outcomes that are economically valued, sold and exchanged - can positively shape the global economy and unlock growth.

Evidence shows that social entrepreneurs work in various industries (health, education, agriculture, energy, etc.). They stockpile a variety of goods and services for underprivileged people in society. The government needs to be more efficient at serving these market segments, and they have been identified as the least lucrative of SEs. Thus, S-ENT efforts are often viewed as riskier than conventional businesses due to the unpredictability of their financial returns on investment. Value chains, market access, and even new markets must constantly be developed from scratch. Instead, they face some of the world's most complex challenges (Dees, 1994) in trying to serve a larger population on a smaller budget. In the process, they adopt new ways of running their businesses, as well as new ways of arranging their internal structures. SEs' revenue models can range anywhere from purely profit-driven to philanthropically motivated. Unlike the latter, the former can finance its operations through private sector income. However, other SEs have been found to use a more complex hybrid structure. Most of their operations are charitable, while the rest are for profit. However, making money is only one of the primary goals of these kinds of projects (Bornstein, 2004; Dees, 1994; OECD, 1999; SEL, 2001b).

Social enterprises help solve social, economic, and environmental issues by promoting inclusive growth, social cohesion, local social capital, democratic participation, and high-quality services. During the financial crisis, they created more jobs than they lost. These are all excellent reasons why policies should support social enterprise creation and development, not to mention studies that show how public money spent to support job creation or the provision of goods and services by social enterprises is a more efficient use of resources. Therefore, public policies supporting social enterprises help

governments address employment and other issues more effectively and efficiently while improving public spending.

Even though having access to resources has been identified as crucial for SEs, SEs face more obstacles in gaining admission to resources than their commercial counterparts (Austin et al., 2006), and SEs are expected to compete with commercial counterparts for help in the future (Johnson,2000). As a result, SEs can't function independently. A wide variety of people and organizations—including entrepreneurs, members of civil society, academics, state actors, funders, incubators, etc.—are essential to their launch and ongoing operation. Based on their primary function, current developmental stage, and existing resources, SEs have varying needs for external support. In order for SEs to realise their potential for not only creating jobs but also addressing a range of social and economic issues for a more inclusive and cohesive growth of communities, it is essential that a policy environment favourable to SEs be put in place.

6.5 INDIA'S SOCIAL ENTERPRISE LANDSCAPE

Across the country of India, entrepreneurial endeavours or activities that plant the seeds of social concern are being established and managed in a wide variety of geographical contexts and organisational forms. These activities and ventures can carry the seeds of social concern in a variety of ways. These contexts and forms can be discovered in various locations across the country. Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in India do not receive adequate recognition in their respective industries, and the concept of an S-ENT does not appear to have won over the majority of Indians just yet. As a direct consequence of this, social enterprises (also known as SEs) in India do not have access to any kind of regulatory framework or formal recognition system. The overwhelming majority of India's social entrepreneurs do not have access to formal sectoral benefits like tax breaks or incentives of varying kinds. This is the case in India.

In India, SEs take on various organizational forms, and more uniform definitions must be given (Satar& John, 2016). Defining and delimiting the boundaries of SE operations can be difficult due to the complex nature of social ventures and the wide range of approaches taken to social problem-solving in India. There has been some interest from academics and government officials in India's SEs. Even less is understood about their administration and structure, and their procedures must be clarified. A policy framework for developing, maintaining, and administrating exclusively for SEs has yet to be developed. Typically, SEs in India can take the following legal forms: Non-profits- or Charitable Organizations- can register themselves under the Indian Trusts Act (1882); section 25 of the Companies Act (1956); or State Society registration. Surprisingly, most social entrepreneurial initiatives in India fail to achieve even modest success. Due to a lack of coordination and recognition from various parties, they must be more organized and largely invisible. They continue to have problems making ends meet as self-employed people.

The Government of India (GOI) stands a good chance of being a pivotal player in the growth of SEs in India. The Indian government is taking a more active role in developing policies for the administration of Micro, Small, and Medium-Sized Businesses (MSMEs) due to its renewed focus on treating entrepreneurship in public policy. Even though it does not have a direct effect on SEs, it does have an indirect effect on how well regional SEs operate. National policies (in the form of public-private partnerships) like the "India Inclusive Innovation Fund-IIIF" administered by the "National Innovation Council" have been implemented to encourage social innovation. The "National Innovation Council" has taken the initiative further by creating "State Innovation Councils" (e.g., Bihar Innovation Forum sponsored by Bihar Government in collaboration with World Bank). In addition, there are councils like "Sectoral Innovation Councils" that are not devoted solely to social innovation but do back innovations that aim to address any crucial national development issue. The government's twelfth Five-Year Plan (2012-2017) emphasizes the importance of SEs and new forms of thinking. As a result, businesses that embrace these ideas are given high rankings on the national policy agenda. Thus, both the Government of India and foreign policymakers interested in India are eager to foster the growth of such businesses as a crucial part of the solution to India's developmental challenges. Thus, discussions about encouraging innovation among MSMEs and expanding social businesses are becoming part of the policy push (GIZ, 2012).

6.6 FRAMEWORK FOR SOCIAL ENTERPRISES IN INDIA

In contrast to many other countries, businesses operating in India do not have a wide variety of choices available to them in terms of the legal structures they can implement. In general, social enterprises (SEs) in India can adopt one of the following legal forms:

1. Charitable Organizations, also known as Non-Profit Organizations, have the ability to self-register in accordance with the Indian Trusts Act (1882), section 25 of the Companies Act (1956), or State Society registration. Examples include "Digital Green," "Teach for India," and "Akshaya Patra," amongst others.

2. Businesses that are organised for profit have the option of forming themselves as sole proprietorships, partnerships, limited liability partnerships, private firms, or cooperatives.

3. Hybrid structures, which simultaneously incorporate characteristics of both of the aforementioned types of structures. E-g; "Fractal Foundation," "Head Held High Foundation," and so on and so forth.

Although each structure has a unique set of benefits to offer, they are not exempt from any drawbacks. For instance, the traditional organizational model for non-profit organizations makes it possible for businesses to receive tax benefits and foreign donation benefits under the Income Tax Act (1961) and

the Foreign Contribution Regulation Act (2010), respectively; however, the legal structure also requires these businesses to raise funds continuously. As a result, they need help recruiting and retaining top talent and investing in cutting-edge infrastructure and technology. As a result, non-profit organizations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in India are increasingly converting to a for-profit mode or adopting some profit-generating avenues partially as a measure of self-sustainability.

It may be difficult for social enterprises (SEs) in a country to have their dual activities (social and economic) recognized, or they may be subjected to inappropriate legal and regulatory frameworks if there is no legal framework. The regulatory challenges that restrict players in the SE ecosystem may include, for example, a lack of legal structure, equity investment regulations, restrictions on blended capital, restrictive laws on foreign capital flow, and so on (GIZ, 2012).Building a solid foundation for social enterprises (SEs) in India would be accomplished by establishing an appropriate legal framework tailored to meet the contextual requirements and particularities of Indian SE culture. Such a legal framework at the national and state levels would be helpful in many ways, including the ways to create a national social entrepreneurial milieu, especially in a context where one does not exist; in clarifying the SE definition and missions; in opening up opportunities for fiscal incentives/relief; in providing access to public resources and support; in developing measures for social impact evaluation etc. depending on their core activity, the stage of development, etc.

6.7 ENTREPRENEURSHIP PROMOTION IN INDIA

The Government of India, through its many institutions (primarily financial, such as SIDBI and NABARD; capacity building through academic institutions, such as Entrepreneurship Development Institutions- EDIs), works to empower entrepreneurship by shaping policies, programs, and attitudes towards micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) and civil society. Despite this, it does play a part, albeit a minor one, in ensuring the smooth operation of regional SEs. In addition, a variety of organizations, such as Indian industry bodies and CII, have emerged as enablers of the sustainable energy sector by participating in a variety of activities connected to S-ENT.

In addition, there has been a noticeable rise in the participation of various stakeholders across the social business landscape in India. In this regard, a growing number of new initiatives from private players have either taken shape or are on the agenda of several multi-lateral stakeholders of the sustainable energy ecosystem within India (GIZ, 2012). As a direct result of this, the Indian Central Government and state governments have shown a greater interest in collaborating with the private sector to find solutions to several the challenges facing the nation's development. As an illustration, the participation of the private sector in the provision of emergency medical services in several states through the utilization of the public-private partnership (PPP) model, etc.

Furthermore, increasing "impact investors" interested in supporting businesses with social and environmental impacts are entering the Indian SE landscape. Some examples of these investors include the DFID-SIDBI Partnership, The Millennium Alliance - USAID and FICCI, and the GIZ Small and Growing Social Businesses support program (ADB report, 2012).SEs represents a paradigm shift because they lead a renewed bottom-up approach to development, in contrast to the traditional top-down method of achieving development goals. Their beneficiaries are comprised of the underprivileged and the marginalized, and the choices made by these groups of people become the primary reference points used by SEs in their planning and decision-making processes. One of the most important objectives of the S-ENT industry is the establishment of social enterprises, in addition to developing a new culture of social enterprise that is primarily geared towards incorporating underrepresented groups into that culture through their participation in its activities. As a result, it is an encouraging solution to the vast disparities between the rich and the poor.

SEs are increasingly being recognized as exemplifying a socially progressive and environmentally responsible model of future development for the world (Leadbeater, 1997; Oatley, 1999). This potential of SEs emerges not only for its capacity to create jobs but also as their pivotal role in social capacity building, responding to unmet needs, creating new forms of work (Amin, 2005), promoting local development, fostering integration, defining new goods and services, consolidating local assets, improving the attractiveness of an industry and locality (ECOTEC, 2001), and also fighting a variety of other social issues (Alvord et. el., 2004; Dees and Elia (OECD, 2013).

6.8 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP POLICY

Many parallels between S-ENT and business management and entrepreneurship are proposed (Granados et al., 2011; Satar et al., 2016). Therefore, there is great relevance in applying, explaining, and developing this field using the various management domain approaches (Satar& John, 2016). Given the preceding, it seems reasonable to investigate and assess the various elements of policies and approaches to entrepreneurship before developing a framework for S-ENT policies.

Second, S-ENT is still a contested concept, with varying definitions depending on whom you ask (Dees, 1998; Mair & Marti, 2006). Over time, numerous researchers have attempted to analyse the S-ENT from various angles and perspectives. Nonetheless, the present study takes a process-oriented perspective on the S-ENT in order to develop a framework for it, and it is argued that the S-ENT is more than just the work of social entrepreneurs; it is, at its core, a systemic process, activities, and social phenomenon that emerges within the broader social, economic, and political context and involves a wide variety of actors.

It has been determined that social entrepreneurs are the ones who address the issues that the government still needs to be able to resolve. In this scenario, the government can play an influential role if it can successfully collaborate with the SE sector. In order to address insurmountable social issues, the government has the potential to act as a strategic partner to the social enterprise sector. However, the intersection of policy and the SE field needs to be established on some sound governing mechanisms before it can be considered successful. The following types of S-ENT policy actions may be taken at the meso level, but this list is not exhaustive:

- Encouraging new ideas from the ground up and fostering social innovation in the business world.
- The establishment of a national coordinating body for social enterprise networking
- Streamlining the protection of ideas and inventions.
- Social enterprise framework, including labour market and taxation policy.
- Facilitating the dissemination and commercialization of technology.
- Critical success factors of SEs should be identified and analysed regularly, and this should be done concerning specific industries.

At the macro level, the artifact of the study shifts to include the entire national economy and the regulation that governs it. In this context, "policy thoughtfulness" refers to considering a wide variety of environmental factors, including technological, economic, cultural, and other regulatory factors, all of which can either promote or inhibit the growth and movement of S-ENT within the country.

The macrolevel policy interventions could take place under the following headings:

- "Ease of doing business" indicators are mostly government-controlled. According to World Bank reports, "measures of regulations for starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, accessing credit, protecting investors, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts, and resolving insolvency" are indicators (World Bank, 2013). These indicators regulate businesses and determine how easy it is to start and run a business in an economy.
- National protective measures by regulatory authorities could help SEs compete with the well-established private sector. SEs can be regulated to promote fair competition and access to relevant markets to scale their social impacts and penetrate more national developmental areas.

- SE policy framework must advocate legal recognition of SEs. The formal recognition as a sector would help clarify the SE definition and missions, open up fiscal incentives/relief, provide access to public resources and support, develop social impact evaluation measures, and more, depending on their core activity, stage of development, and internal capacities. Sector-specific new laws or MSME act amendments could accomplish this.

The government can get involved on a regional scale by taking measures that directly promote S-ENT within that area. An enabling government policy plays a pivotal role in developing an S-ENT ecosystem at the macro level. Thus, macro-level policies can be the actions taken to encourage more social entrepreneurship across a given region. Activities like producing and disseminating information, knowledge, education, and awareness, and presenting S-ENT as a viable career or employment option, are examples of the kinds of promotion that could be taken. Having easy access to the Internet and social media is a crucial component of the modern S-ENT infrastructure, and as such, should be given a higher priority.

The framework promotes a principle called "regular evaluation" of the impact of new and existing policies and interventions on the S-ENT ecosystem. Considering the broader interests of the S-ENT sector/communities at hand, the evaluation principle seeks to determine how well the stated policy supports fair treatment and engagement of all stakeholders. Thus, the principle aims to maintain the adaptability of the institutional framework through periodic evaluations of programs and interventions to detect new challenges and rapidly respond early.

6.9 CONCLUSION

Throughout the world, there have been hardly any policy framework worries for S-ENT because its development is still in its infancy. There has been a rise in the number of initiatives aimed at solving S-ENT policy problems in many developed nations (e.g., the United States and the United Kingdom), but much work remains to be done. In addition, most developing nations, including India, have experienced minimal to no such worries. There is a pressing need for the creation of a positive policy framework, as governments in both developed and developing nations are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of S-ENT in resolving pressing social problems and advancing other sustainable development goals.

In order to promote, regulate, and ensure the orderly growth of social businesses in India, the current framework advocates the specific interventions of the Government and other actors at the above four levels, in line with the existing models of entrepreneurship. The framework's goal was to unify India's disparate discussions of business and charity. This framework will serve as a jumping-off point for discussions about the value and potential consequences of revaluating current and future national initiatives to promote and regulate S-ENT.

Check your progress 2

1. Why should policies support social enterprise creation?
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

2. What are the existing policies governing Social entrepreneurship?
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

3. What is policy thoughtfulness?
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

4. What are the macrolevel policy interventions?
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS

- Noya, A., and Clarence, E. (2007). The social economy: building inclusive economies. Publications de l' OCDE.
- CIRIEC (2012), The Social economy in the European Union, N°. CESE/contract CES 18.106 – 2012, The European Economic and Social Committee (EESC).
- Leviner, N., Crutchfield, L. R., and Wells, D. (2007). Understanding the impact of social entrepreneurs: Ashoka's answer to the challenge of measuring effectiveness. Research on Social Entrepreneurship and Contributing to an Emerging Field, 89-103.
- Ireland, R. D., Hitt, M. A., Camp, S. M., and Sexton, D. L. (2001). Integrating entrepreneurship and strategic management actions to create firm wealth. The Academy of Management Executive, 15(1), 49-63.

- ECOTEC. (2001). External evaluation of the Third System and Employment Pilot Action, Ecotec Research and Consulting Limited, Final Report, August. Referred to in OECD 2003.
- Karnani, A. (2007). Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid: A Mirage, How the Private Sector Can Help Alleviate Poverty, Stephen M. Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan Working Paper. the California Management Review, 1-42.
- Oatley, N. (1999). Developing the social economy. Local Economy, 13(4), 339-345.
- Leadbetter, C. (1997) The rise of social entrepreneurship. London: Demos.
- Amin, A. (2005). Local community on trial. Economy and society, 34(4), 612-633.

7.1 CHECK YOUR POSSIBLE ANSWERS

Check your progress 1

1. Many have tried to define social entrepreneurs, but one of the most popular ones comes from Dees (1998, revised 2001):

   a. "Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector by:

   b. - Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value),

   c. - Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission,

   d. - Engaging in the process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning,

   e. - Acting boldly without being limited by resources

2. The evolution of social entrepreneurship may be summarised as follows over its many decades of existence. Around 1970, social entrepreneurship evolved as a management expertise supporting entrepreneurial and corporate activities while also addressing social issues. In 1980 Social entrepreneurship was recognized as a business practice, and different organizations stepped forward to recognize the *social* way of entrepreneurial practice. As of 1990, the concept of "social entrepreneurship" referred to the efforts of a nonprofit to generate social prosperity. In 2000, "social entrepreneurship" was officially acknowledged as a distinct field of academic research for the first time. With its application in the form of a proliferation of nonprofit social companies providing solutions to social issues in various nations, social entrepreneurship has garnered widespread prominence in recent years.

Multidimensional academic research enhanced the topic of social entrepreneurship in 2010, with connections to several other fields. The era witnessed the emergence of for-profit social enterprises. The current period sees a remarkable upsurge in the study and the development of hybrid social enterprise business models, marking the continuation of revolutions in social entrepreneurship.

Check my progress 2

1. Social enterprises help solve social, economic, and environmental issues by promoting inclusive growth, social cohesion, local social capital, democratic participation, and high-quality services. During the financial crisis, they created more jobs than they lost. These are all excellent reasons why policies should support social enterprise creation and development, not to mention studies that show how public money spent to support job creation or the provision of goods and services by social enterprises is a more efficient use of resources. Therefore, public policies supporting social enterprises help governments address employment and other issues more effectively and efficiently while improving public spending.

2. In general, social enterprises (SEs) in India can adopt one of the following legal forms:

    a. Charitable Organizations, also known as Non-Profit Organizations, have the ability to self-register in accordance with the Indian Trusts Act (1882), section 25 of the Companies Act (1956), or State Society registration. Examples include "Digital Green," "Teach for India," and "Akshaya Patra," amongst others.

    b. Businesses that are organised for profit have the option of forming themselves as sole proprietorships, partnerships, limited liability partnerships, private firms, or cooperatives.

    c. Hybrid structures, which simultaneously incorporate characteristics of both of the aforementioned types of structures. E-g; "Fractal Foundation," "Head Held High Foundation," and so on and so forth.

3. “Policy thoughtfulness" refers to considering a wide variety of environmental factors, including technological, economic, cultural, and other regulatory factors, all of which can either promote or inhibit the growth and movement of S-ENT within the country.

4. The macrolevel policy interventions could take place under the following headings:

    a. "Ease of doing business" indicators are mostly government-controlled. According to World Bank reports, "measures of regulations for starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, accessing credit, protecting investors, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts,

and resolving insolvency" are indicators (World Bank, 2013). These indicators regulate businesses and determine how easy it is to start and run a business in an economy.

b. National protective measures by regulatory authorities could help SEs compete with the well-established private sector. SEs can be regulated to promote fair competition and access to relevant markets to scale their social impacts and penetrate more national developmental areas.

c. SE policy framework must advocate legal recognition of SEs. The formal recognition as a sector would help clarify the SE definition and missions, open up fiscal incentives/relief, provide access to public resources and support, develop social impact evaluation measures, and more, depending on their core activity, stage of development, and internal capacities. Sector-specific new laws or MSME act amendments could accomplish this.

ignou THE PEOPLE'S UNIVERSITY