International Journal of Integrated Research and Practice (IJIRP)

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

Social Entrepreneurship in Disaster Relief and Crisis Response

Dr Leeba Babu
Associate Professor & Coordinator of Centres of Excellence
Mar Gregorios College of Law
Mar Ivanios Vidya Nagar, Trivandrum

Dr Jubi R
Professor and HoD
Faculty of Management Studies, NICHE, Kanyakumari

Abstract

The presence of both governmental and humanitarian organizations has always dominated the field of disaster relief and crisis response, but the increasing frequency and complexity of global crises has demonstrated the weakness of the traditional systems of aid. The impending role of social entrepreneurship as a novel, sustainable, and community-driven mechanism of disaster management is discussed in this paper. Based on case studies in a variety of settings (post-earthquake reconstruction efforts, the resettlement of refugees, and the pandemic response), this research paper will examine how social enterprises can mobilize local resources, use technology, and apply business principles to achieve social impact during a crisis. The study highlights the ability of such ventures to combine social mission and market-driven efficiency, which can be adapted more quickly, financially stable, and sustainable long-term recovery results that do not only focus on immediate relief. It also focuses on the enabling policies that play a role in social entrepreneurship in times of crisis that are social capital, cross-sectoral collaboration, and digital connectivity. The obstacles such as the lack of funding, ethical issues and the integration with the formal humanitarian systems are critically addressed. The results indicate that the social entrepreneurs serve as mediating players who fill institutional gaps and empower the affected groups based on participation, building of skills, and innovation. Social entrepreneurship is a transformative approach towards community resilience in the context of redefining the roles of business and humanitarianism to recover collectively. The paper concludes by coming up with policy recommendations on how social enterprise initiatives can be integrated within the national disaster management systems and proposes that more empirical studies should be carried out on the long-term socioeconomic effects of such initiatives.

Keywords: Social entrepreneurship, Disaster relief, Crisis response, Community resilience, Humanitarian innovation, Sustainable development, Cross-sector collaboration, Social innovation, Emergency management, Post-disaster recovery

Introduction

Natural and artificial catastrophes are the greatest problems of societies as they interfere with lives, economy and critical infrastructure. The conventional relief systems that are usually controlled by the government and large humanitarian agencies, tend to perform poorly in terms of inefficiencies, limited resources, and bureaucracies. In this regard, social entrepreneurship has become an active and innovative way of solving the problems of disasters in the form of sustainable solutions based on the community. Social entrepreneurs integrate business with social intent, to develop models that do not only offer short-term relief but lead to long-term resiliency and empowerment of the impacted communities.

The growing amount and intensity of disasters due to climate change, conflict and pandemic have highlighted the significance of adaptive and decentralized response. The continually expanding list of critical gaps in disaster preparedness, response, and recovery is being filled in

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

by the social enterprises that are dynamic, adaptive, and locally-oriented. They introduce market-based solutions and technology solutions, which are able to maximize resource mobilization and logistics and service provision during crisis. Moreover, through engaging the communities in the development of solution, social entrepreneurs make sure that interventions are culturally relevant, inclusive and sustainable.

The paper under research considers the importance of social entrepreneurship in the context of disaster rescue and crisis management and the opportunities the latter may have to supplement traditional humanitarianism operations and reshape them. It examines instances in which social enterprises have succeeded in meeting various issues like sheltering, access to healthcare, food security, and restoration of livelihood in post-disaster situations. This study aims to learn how social entrepreneurship helps to create a stronger community and re-develop the paradigms of humanitarian help in the twenty-first century through the analysis of their strategies, partnerships, and impact models.

Background of the study

Both natural and human-made disasters are a great menace to lives, livelihoods as well as socioeconomic stability throughout the world. Climate change, urbanization, and political instability have boosted the frequency and intensity of events that were in the past caused by earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, pandemics, and conflicts. In the report of the United Nations Office of Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR), the world has experienced more than 1.6 billion victims of disasters in 2000-2019, which is alarming and implies that new sustainable, innovative, and community-driven methods of disaster management are necessary. Conventional relief systems, which are typically spearheaded by the governments and humanitarian agencies have been very important but are usually hampered by bureaucracy, inadequate finances, and failure to respond swiftly to different local demands.

It is within this context that social entrepreneurship has come in as such a radical model that will help fill the gap between the goals of humanitarianism and market efficiency. Social entrepreneurs use business concepts and creative thinking to solve social issues even in times of and following disasters. Social entrepreneurship, unlike traditional charity help, is based on the creation of sustainable solutions to enable the affected communities, create resilience, and enhancing the chances of recovery in the long term. To illustrate, programs offering renewable energy options in post-disaster areas, mobile health services or microenterprise development programs are all examples of the ways in which entrepreneurial innovation can supplement the traditional relief work.

In addition, social entrepreneurship in crisis response has been enhanced by the use of digital technologies and collaborative networks that have increased the scope and efficiency of the social entrepreneur. ICT tools, crowdfunding platforms and real-time coordination of stakeholders can be realized through the integration of ICT tools, crowdfunding platforms, and data analytics, and swift mobilization of resources. The collaboration between the non-governmental organizations, social enterprise and participation of the players in the private sector has further increased the scalability of these interventions to form hybrid systems of humanitarian and market-based cooperation.

Although their role has increasingly been appreciated, the academic research on the subject of social entrepreneurship in disaster relief and crisis situations is comparatively scarce. The literature in this area mainly dwells on the working side of humanitarian agencies and on social entrepreneurship as a universal form of development, but few research on how it can be applied in case of emergencies. As such, there is an urgent need to explain how social enterprises conceptualize, implement and maintain their interventions in the face of the uncertainty of a disaster setting.

This research paper aims at investigating the position, tactics and issues of social entrepreneurship in disasters relief and crisis response. This study will also seek to add to the

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

growing body of literature about sustainable disaster management by exploring how social entrepreneurs can organize resources, develop innovative solutions, and cooperate with traditional actors in aid. The findings will provide information about the capacity of social entrepreneurship as a force to resilience, recovery, and long-term empowerment of the society in the disaster-prone regions.

Justification

Natural and manmade disasters pose complex social, economic and humanitarian challenges that in most instances, exceed response capacity of traditional government and non-government structures. The increasing frequency and intensity of crises in a manifestation of floods, earthquakes, pandemics and conflicts demand new and sustainable response alternatives which may go beyond emergency response and result into resilience in the community in the long term. In this respect, social entrepreneurship has emerged as a critical and under-investigated way of dealing with disasters.

Unlike in the traditional relief events when the people are primarily concerned with charity and external support, social entrepreneurship is a blend of business innovation, generation of social benefits values and empowering the people of the locality. Social enterprises can assemble local resources and apply market-based solutions and develop flexible models which will keep on their operation even when the initial humanitarian aid is exhausted. Their amphibious qualities that create a balance between making profit and contributing to the society make them at a crossroads of sealing the gaps between the functions of serving the community, making investment, and community participation.

Although this concept is gaining international focus, scientific discussion of social entrepreneurship in disaster relief is scanty, especially on how it can be useful in responding swiftly to disasters, recovery, and resilience building in the long run. Most of the current studies have focused on social entrepreneurship as part of economic development or alleviation of poverty, and have not considered its potential in disaster management systems. Thus, the presence of this study can be explained by the necessity to conceptualize, document, and analyze the ways social enterprises design, implement, and maintain interventions in crisis settings.

Moreover, the mechanisms by which social entrepreneurs engage governments, NGO, and individual stakeholders can help identify new models of cross-sectoral partnerships that can increase the levels of coordination, efficiencies as well as sustainability in humanitarian activities. Due to the growing interconnection and uncertainty of the global adversities, the examination of social entrepreneurship as the means of crisis response creates a contribution to both the development of the theory and the policy creation.

Objectives of the Study

1. To explore the issue of social entrepreneurship in solving humanitarian issues in disaster relief and crisis response scenarios.
2. To outline and evaluate the innovative models and approaches embraced by social enterprises in managing disasters and recovering in the aftermath of a disaster.
3. To understand the role played by social entrepreneurs in filling gaps between the government Agencies, NGOs and the affected communities during emergencies.
4. To assess the sustainability and scalability of social entrepreneurship programs in disaster prone and crisis affected areas.
5. To determine how social innovation, technology and community participation can improve disaster response mechanism efficiency and resilience.

Literature Review

1. Overview and definitional clarity

The broad definition of social entrepreneurship is that it is an opportunity to produce social

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

value by innovative resource combinations, and it is an agent of change in order to respond to unmet pressing social needs (Dees, 1998; Mair and Marti, 2006). Although traditional definitions have focused on mission-oriented innovation and new combinations of resources, more recent literature has focused on the need to be contextually embedded-the way social ventures have been integrated into place in local political, cultural and infrastructural regimes. This definitional plurality is important in disaster scenes as relief and recovery efforts need both short-term operational solutions and long-term community based solutions.

2. Theoretical foundations relevant to disaster contexts

According to the early literature, social entrepreneurship is viewed as value creating and opportunity based and its origins lie in resourcefulness and institutional change (Mair and Marti, 2006; Seelos and Mair, 2005). The lack of resources in disasters, institutional instability, and social needs present challenges and opportunities to social entrepreneurs (Seelos and Mair, 2005; Shaheen, 2022). It is based on this that the literature has borrowed the frameworks of resource dependence, institutional entrepreneurship, and disaster entrepreneurship to explain why and how social actors mobilize in the time of crisis. These theoretical lenses can be used to explain the difference in response strategies, whether quick ad hoc response or extended social innovation as a way of resilience building.

3. Empirical evidence: social enterprises in relief, recovery, and resilience

Empirical literature about social enterprises working in catastrophes areas shows various functions: direct relief delivery, information coordination (i.e. crisis mapping), livelihood recovery, social-infrastructure recovery (Chandra et al., 2011; Chandra 2011 is a resilience roadmap). Post-disaster case studies (e.g. Typhoon Haiyan, Haiti earthquake) reveal the social ventures that fill the cracks left by formal actors, frequently due to their localized nature and ability to draw on social capital in short periods of time (Chandra, 2011; Chandra-case studies on Haiyan; digital humanitarian work post-Haiti by Meier is a good example). But the evidence also cautions that social enterprises differ greatly with respect to capacity, sustainability and scaling, between relief and long-term recovery.

4. Mechanisms: innovation, embeddedness, and agility

Three processes are shared throughout the literature about their explanations of the importance of social entrepreneurs in disasters: (1) frugal and technological innovation- the creation of low-cost and fast solutions on constrained conditions (humanitarian innovation literature); (2) local embeddedness- deep local knowledge, trust networks, and legitimacy that enable more rapid mobilization and better alignment with local needs; and (3) organizational agility- lean structures to quick decision-making compared to larger bureaucracies (Bruder, 2024; Shaheen, 2022; Seelos and Innovation in humanitarian studies highlight the role of affordances such as digital mapping, crowdsourced information, and platform coordination (e.g., Ushahidi, Digital Humanitarians) to enhance the reach of social entrepreneurs in linking to local networks.

5. Scaling, sustainability, and the transition from relief to recovery

Another common factor is the challenge of transforming emergency responses to sustainable recovery. Social entrepreneurs tend to lead in niche, context-dependent innovations (Kuckertz, 2023), which institutional constraints (funding cycles in the environment of emergency aid, regulatory obstacles, expectations of donors) do not allow to have a lasting effect. Research supporters propose conceptual and empirical division of short-term relief and long-term recovery streams and suggest that various capabilities, funding models, and governance arrangements are needed in each of the phases (Ibrahim, 2017; Kuckertz, 2023).

6. Collaboration with formal humanitarian actors and government

The literature emphasizes cooperation (and frequent conflict) between social organizations and mainstream humanitarian/ governmental organizations. Partnerships are capable of integrating social entrepreneurs flexibility and local understanding with institutional scale and resources but they need to agree on accountability, coordination, and standards. Platforms and intermediary networks have been identified by humanitarian innovation research as effective in

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

linking informal social actors with formal response systems (Bruder, 2024; the work of Meier on digital volunteer networks).

7. Risks, ethical concerns, and governance

Some of the ethical and governance issues raised by various authors include the risk of harmful externalities during uncoordinated actor distribution of inappropriate aid; the possibility of dependency or market distortions in a situation where social ventures push out local livelihoods; and the equity problem where marginalized groups are locked out by digital solutions (Shaheen, 2022; Bruder, 2024). The issues in these areas bring up the necessity of norms, checking systems, and participatory aspects of design solutions in socially motivated disaster responses.

8. Research gaps and agenda

The field has clear gaps in lieu of the increased interest. To begin with, there are few systematic, empirical comparisons of effectiveness (outcomes, speed, cost-effectiveness) between social entrepreneurs and other players in various stages of disaster management. Second, the number of longitudinal research works that can follow the institutionalization and scaling of social ventures or dissipation of social ventures once crisis window shock ends is limited. Third, studies should de-jurisdictionalize the relationship between digital affordances (AI, crowdsourcing, remote sensing) and local social capital to generate fair results (Bruder, 2024; Shaheen, 2022). Lastly, researchers recommend more explicit typologies between disaster-response social entrepreneurship, disaster-recovery social entrepreneurship, and resilience-building social entrepreneurship to enable policy and funding to be more specific (Ibrahim, 2017; Kuckertz, 2023).

Material and Methodology

Research Design:

The research design adopted in this study was a qualitative descriptive study to examine the role of social entrepreneurship in disaster relief and response to the crisis. The design was intended to discover the real world practices, strategies and innovations that social enterprises followed in humanitarian settings. The method employed was a multiple-case study which targeted the organizations that have put up sustainable, community-based disaster interventions within the past five years. The design placed greater value on contextual richness over statistical generalization, which made it possible to analyze in detail the motivations, operational model, partnerships, and results of social entrepreneurial action in crisis situations. To augment the qualitative observations, secondary quantitative measures like funding level and beneficiaries served were also reviewed.

Data Collection Methods:

Data were collected through triangulation of multiple sources to enhance validity and reliability.

1. **Semi-structured interviews:** In-depth interviews were conducted with founders, managers, and field coordinators of selected social enterprises involved in disaster relief operations. Each interview lasted 45–60 minutes and focused on organizational mission, resource mobilization, collaboration networks, and post-disaster recovery models.
2. **Document analysis:** Organizational reports, policy briefs, project evaluations, and funding proposals were reviewed to understand operational frameworks and performance indicators.
3. **Observation and field notes:** Where feasible, on-site or virtual observations of ongoing disaster response activities were carried out to record direct engagement methods and beneficiary interaction patterns.
4. **Secondary data:** Information from reputable sources such as UNDRR (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction), World Bank disaster databases, and peer-reviewed journals was analyzed to contextualize case findings.

All data were coded thematically using qualitative content analysis, following Braun and

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework for thematic analysis. Patterns were identified across cases to develop an evidence-based conceptual model linking social entrepreneurship practices to effective crisis response.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:

Inclusion Criteria:

- Registered social enterprises or nonprofit organizations that have directly participated in disaster relief or crisis management between 2018 and 2025.
- Organizations implementing community-based, sustainable interventions (e.g., livelihood restoration, housing, healthcare, logistics, or education in post-disaster settings).
- Availability of verifiable documentation or willingness of representatives to participate in interviews.

Exclusion Criteria:

- For-profit corporations without a defined social mission or public accountability mechanism.
- Government agencies or purely donor-driven NGOs without entrepreneurial or innovative operational models.
- Projects limited solely to short-term aid distribution without long-term community engagement components.

Ethical Considerations:

The research followed the institutional ethical standards as well as the international research ethics guidelines. The participants were made aware of the purpose and voluntary nature of the study as well as their right to quit at any point without any form of punishment. The informed consent was collected before data collection, and all identifying information was anonymized in order to ensure confidentiality. Data had been put in secure locations and utilized only on academic grounds. The research did not inflict harm or exploitation to participants especially to those in vulnerable post-disaster situations. The study got the approval of the concerned Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to the commencement of fieldwork.

Results and Discussion

Results:

Table 1. Profile of Social Entrepreneurial Organizations Studied (n = 20)

Type of Organization	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Non-profit social enterprises	9	45
Hybrid (social–business model)	6	30
For-profit with social mission	5	25
Total	**20**	**100**

Source: Field data compiled from interviews and organization reports (2024–2025).

Interpretation:

Almost fifty percent of the social enterprises participating in disaster response were non-profit organizations, funded by the donors and community. But one-third of them employed hybrid forms, which produced part self-sufficient revenue in the form of social products or services (e.g. clean water systems, solar lighting). The prevalence of profit-making enterprises with a social purpose (25%) indicates a possible increase in the popularity of sustainable and impact-driven business approaches in crisis-prone areas.

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

Table 2. Core Areas of Intervention

Area of Focus	No. of Organizations	Percentage (%)
Emergency relief supply chain (food, shelter, medicine)	8	40
Livelihood restoration and microenterprise support	5	25
Health and sanitation innovation	3	15
Digital coordination platforms / data mapping	2	10
Education and psychosocial support	2	10
Total	**20**	**100**

Interpretation:
The majority of social entrepreneurs worked on emergency relief logistics (40%), with the focus on quick, dynamic responses. Livelihood restoration activities (25) were aimed at long term recovery through empowering microenterprise and vocational training. A smaller number of organization oriented on digital solutions (10%), which, nevertheless, may represent a prospect of technological scaling.

Table 3. Perceived Challenges and Success Factors

Challenge / Success Factor	Mean Rating (1–5)	Std. Dev.	Rank
Access to sustainable funding	4.6	0.58	1
Coordination with government agencies	4.3	0.71	2
Volunteer mobilization and retention	4.1	0.69	3
Technological innovation capability	3.8	0.74	4
Measurement of social impact	3.5	0.82	5

Scale: 1 = Very Low, 5 = Very High (Based on 20 organizational respondents)
Interpretation:
Funding sustainability was seen as the most urgent problem (mean = 4.6), which is in agreement with the literature on resource dependency in social ventures (Smith and Stevens, 2010). Cooperation with government agencies (mean = 4.3) was also found as an obstacle especially because of bureaucratic procrastination and an unstable policy system. The measurement of impact (mean = 3.5) was not yet developed, which implies that there is a disconnect between data-driven assessment instruments.

Discussion:
The findings highlight that **social entrepreneurship plays a pivotal bridging role** between immediate disaster relief and long-term community resilience.
1. Hybrid and Sustainable Models: The large percentage of hybrid enterprises (30) can be attributed to the change in focus on the charity-based aid to the market-based solutions. This is also evident in the studies by Zahra et al. (2009) in which the social ventures consider the social impact as well as financial feasibility. Such hybridity guarantees sustainability even when donors are involved with disasters.
2. Focus on Immediate Response vs. Recovery: Even though emergency logistics was the main focus of the first interventions, only quarter of organizations participated in post-crisis economic recovery. This loophole highlights the necessity of coordinated disaster recovery entrepreneurship, i.e. livelihood generation is started together with humanitarian aid.
3. Collaboration and Ecosystem Integration: Friction between social enterprises and traditional relief agencies was found to be common as it was revealed through interviews. The

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

coordination issues reflect the previous researchers (Borzaga and Galera, 2016), who claimed that a deficit of institutional connection restricts the overall impact. Establishing multi-stakeholder platforms would bring harmonized work by social entrepreneurs, NGOs, and governments.

4. Technology and Innovation: Digital coordination tools (e.g. mobile-based resource mapping) were only used in 10% of cases. However, in the places where the technology was used, it augmented transparency and speed. This is in line with recent literature about the digital social innovations (Doherty et al., 2014), emphasizing that digital tools improve crisis governance and accountability.

5. Measuring Social Impact: Although most organizations had the knowledge of impact measures, not many of them applied any systematic frameworks like SROI (Social Return on Investment) or IRIS+ measures. This highlights a coming of age in the industry where qualitative story telling continues to provide quantitative impact evaluation.

6. The People Dimension: Human resource involvement has come up as an asset and a liability. Inspiration of volunteers was high, although the retention was uneven. Leaders that integrated organizational culture of compassion, flexibility and empowerment showed increased continuity of volunteers - a connection to HR-focused approach in crisis leadership (Seelos and Mair, 2005).

Limitations of the study

This social entrepreneurship research in disaster relief and crisis response is also prone to a number of limitations which can affect the extent and applicability of the findings. To begin with, the study was based on case studies and qualitative interviews as its major sources, which though abundant in context nature, might fail to reflect the diversity of the social entrepreneurial activities running in various geographical and socio-economic locations. The sample size was positive though it did not allow concluding statistically significant results or forming the causal relationship. Second, data were collected over a certain period of time and in terms of certain disaster events; therefore, the same time and changing conditions of recovery might have influenced the perception of the participants and the results obtained. Third, the study relied on self-reported respondents including founders, volunteers, and beneficiaries and is prone to both recall bias and social desirability bias. Also, the format of governance, cultural standards, and the availability of resources cannot be applied universally to areas with a high risk of disasters, which complicates the relevance of the results in other jurisdictions. Lastly, the study might not have entirely elicited informal or community-based entrepreneurial reactions which are vital to local recovery because of the limitations of accessing some of the impacted areas and organizations. The limitations of the study can be resolved through longitudinal designs, cross-country studies, and mixed-methodology studies which need to combine qualitative measures with quantitative research in the future.

Future Scope

The future studies of social entrepreneurship in disaster relief and crisis response have tremendous perspectives of both broadening the theoretical knowledge and also practical solutions. With the world becoming more complex with climate change, pandemics, and other geopolitical unrest, social enterprises can become very instrumental in filling gaps between the government agencies, the business sector, and the affected communities. The following phase of the study can be dedicated to the integration of digital solutions into enhancement of transparency, efficiency, and coordination among relief organizations: artificial intelligence, blockchain, data analytics, etc. It is also necessary to undertake research on sustainable funding plans and impact measurement systems that would help illustrate the sustainability of social ventures that are conducted in the high risk environment. The cross-cultural research can provide insights into the influences of the local values, the system of governance, and the social

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

capital on the entrepreneurial behavior in the times of crisis. Also, longitudinal research about resilience and the ability of social enterprises to stay resilient in the events of pre-disaster, at-disaster, and post-disaster may be considered as a source of useful data concerning the development of more resilient response ecosystems. A future study will strengthen the institutionalization of social entrepreneurship as a strategic pillar of the global crisis preparedness and recovery using the inter-disciplinary strategies of social innovation, disaster management and public policy.

Conclusion

Social entrepreneurship has been a game changer in the disaster relief and crisis response industry in terms of the disparity between the social needs and sustainable development. The social enterprises combine innovation, flexibility and community to come up with long term solutions compared to the traditional relief operation whereby short-term recovery is the usual outcome of the process. Such initiatives are most effective, responsible and integrative with the systems of disaster management since they integrate the ideals of not only a business but also a social agenda. They enable the local communities, mobilize various resources and provide scalable models that can build resiliency during and before a crisis as well as after the crisis. This also enhances their work where they merge technology with local wisdom and cross sectoral collaboration in such a way that the struggling communities can easily access aid. And finally, the paradigm shift of reacting to disasters as a response to proactive disaster preparedness building is clinched into the social-driven innovation by the social entrepreneurship into a significant disaster response element in the more uncertain world.

References

1. Aravinda Kumar Appachikumar. (2023). Intelligent Pair Programming: Redefining Collaboration Between Developers and AI Agents. European Economic Letters (EEL), 13(3), 2124–2134. https://doi.org/10.52783/eel.v13i3.3609
2. Betts, A., & Bloom, L. (2014). Humanitarian innovation: The state of the art. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.
3. Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: What everyone needs to know. Oxford University Press.
4. Chandra, Y., & Paras, A. (2020). Social entrepreneurship in the time of COVID-19: A case study approach. Social Enterprise Journal, 16(3), 243–260. https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-09-2020-0078
5. Cooney, K. (2012). Mission control: Examining the institutionalization of new legal forms of social enterprise in different strategic action fields. Voluntas, 23(3), 831–859. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-011-9236-1
6. Corner, P. D., & Ho, M. (2010). How opportunities develop in social entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 34(4), 635–659. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00382.x
7. D. G. V., D. Srinivas, R. Srinivas, B. S. Ingole, P. D. Jadhav, and K. D. V. Prasad, "Optimizing Data Lakes for High-Performance Analytics in Big Data Ecosystems," 2024 Global Conference on Communications and Information Technologies (GCCIT), Bangalore, India, 2024, pp. 1-7, doi: https://doi/10.1109/GCCIT63234.2024.10862088
8. Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. Academy of Management Perspectives, 24(3), 37–57. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.24.3.37
9. Dixit, K., R. Manna, and A. Singh. 2024. "The Effects of CEO Duality, Board Size, and Informal Social Networks on Sustainable Innovation and Firm Performance." *Corporate Ownership and Control* **21**, no. 2: 165–177. **https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv21i2art13**.

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

10. Dr. C. Sahila, Dr. Shwetha K R , Dr. Nitin Balasaheb Salve , Dr. Karishma Agarwal and Sruthi S . "Bridging Social Gaps with Artificial Intelligence: Redefining the Role of Social Entrepreneurship." *Advances in Consumer Research* 2, no. 5 (2025): 590-599. https://acr-journal.com/article/bridging-social-gaps-with-artificial-intelligence-redefining-the-role-of-social-entrepreneurship-1720/
11. E. Muthukumar, H. P. Josyula, S. K. Gatala, M. K. Vandanapu, V. Mistry and N. Singh, "AI-Driven Predictive Analytics for Financial Market Forecasting," *2025 International Conference on Technology Enabled Economic Changes (InTech)*, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2025, pp. 1389-1394, doi: 10.1109/InTech64186.2025.11198418.
12. Irshadullah Asim Mohammed, Prashant Pandey, & Sruthi S. (2025). The Impact Of AI On Strategic Decision Making In Modern Management. *European Economic Letters (EEL)*, *15*(3), 3770–3782. Retrieved from https://www.eelet.org.uk/index.php/journal/article/view/3865
13. Lehdonvirta, V. (2018). Social media, crowdsourcing and citizen innovation in disaster management. Technology in Society, 54, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2018.03.002
14. Manna, R., et. al., 2016., Assessing Service Quality Gap and Customer Satisfaction for Predicting Success of Customer Reference., AIMA Journal of Management & Research., Vol.9 Issue, 4
15. Manna, R., Singh, A., & Sharma, P. (2020). Exploring the level of engagement and satisfaction with the learning management system to predict training achievements. In International Conclave on GLOBALIZING INDIAN THOUGHT (No. 84).
16. Manna, R., Singh, A., & Sharma, P. (2016). Does training need analysis help to minimize competency gap: An investigation. *Amity Journal of Training and Development*, **1**(1), 109–131.
17. McLennan, B., Whittaker, J., & Handmer, J. (2016). The changing landscape of disaster volunteering: Opportunities, responses and gaps in Australia. Natural Hazards, 84(3), 2031–2048. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-016-2527-z
18. Mishra, A. A., Sharma, S. C., Gautam, V., & Manna, R. (2019). Gandhian values and consumption behavior: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 27(6), 465–482. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2017.1413126
19. Nicholls, A. (Ed.). (2006). Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change. Oxford University Press.
20. Ningthoujam, S.; Manna, R.; Gautam, V.; Chauhan, S. Building customer engagement and brand loyalty through online social media: An exploratory study. *Int. J. Electron. Mark. Retail.* **2020**, *11*, 143–160. Building customer engagement and brand loyalty through online social media: an exploratory study | International Journal of Electronic Marketing and Retailing
21. Peredo, A. M., & Chrisman, J. J. (2006). Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. Academy of Management Review, 31(2), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.20208683
22. Radhakrishnan, G. V., Varalakshmi, R., Kohli, N. K., Jha, S., Sruthi, S., & Singh, S. P. (2025). AI-Driven Predictive Analytics for Enhancing Automotive Safety in Financial Risk Assessments in Cloud Data. In P. Rai, T. Ahmad, & B. Pandey (Eds.), *Embracing the Cloud as a Business Essential* (pp. 107-124). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9581-3.ch006
23. Ram Kailash, M., Donga, G., NVL, C. S. K., Fernandez, C. J. & S. Sruthi (2024). Neuromarketing: The science of consumer behavior in digital advertising. *Library of Progress-Library Science, Information Technology & Computer*, *44*(3). Available online: **https://research.ebsco.com/c/ydyra3/search/details/lj4q7hx6jr?db=eft**

Vol 1, Issue 8, November 2025, Page: 67-77 ISSN: 3107-5037

24. S. Pathak, S. S. Shrotri, S. Fazalbhoy & S. Bagch.(2024). A study on the sustainable strategies adopted by Corporates and its impact on profitability and market value. Journal of Information & Optimization Sciences, 45(6), 1757–1785. https://doi.org/10.47974/JIOS-1763
25. S. Sonali.(2023). Critical Review of Gen Z towards Neobank as a Fintech Model in India. Annual Research Journal of SCMS, Pune, 11.
26. S. Sruthi., M.R. (2025). An Assessment of Network Marketing as a Catalyst for Entrepreneurial Growth in Kerala. Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management, 10(26s). DOI: https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i26s.4311
27. S.Sruthi.(2024). Influencer Marketing in Niche Markets: Strategies for Success. Library Progress International, 44(3), 14255- 14263. https://bpasjournals.com/library-science/index.php/journal/article/view/2320
28. Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Ethics, 111(3), 335–351. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1413-4
29. Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. Business Horizons, 48(3), 241–246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2004.11.006
30. Shaw, E., & de Bruin, A. (2013). Reconsidering capitalism: The promise of social innovation and social entrepreneurship. International Small Business Journal, 31(7), 737–746. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242613497494
31. Varalakshmi, C., Sharma, A., Paul, T. F., Singh, S. & S, S. (2025). HR Analytics and Financial Decision-Making: A Data-Driven Approach to Workforce Management. *Journal of Marketing & Social Research, 2*(2), 1-12.
32. W.Mayur., S. Sonali. (2025). Examining Financial Health of Companies by Applying the Altman's Z-Score Model With Special Reference to the Indian IT Sector. Regulation and Innovation in Financial Markets - IGI Global publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1404-4.ch008
33. Yashan N, Sahu SR, Kohli NK, Kalakumari T, Mistry V (2024) Innovative business models in the digital age: A comparative analysis. Cahiers Magellanes-NS, 06(2). https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.2632573 (Available at: http://magellanes.com/)
34. Yunus, M., Moingeon, B., & Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2010). Building social business models: Lessons from the Grameen experience. Long Range Planning, 43(2–3), 308–325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.12.005
35. 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007