Entrepreneurship as Social Infrastructure: Fostering Innovation and Economic Growth in Emerging Markets

Pratham Naik[1], *Research Student, Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India*. Email: *naikpratham2003@gmail.com*
Jaydev Dhanak[2], *Research Student, Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India*.
Hetal Prajapati[3], *Research Student, Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India*.

Journal of Applied Management and Multisectoral Research
ISSN:
Pp: 29-48
ISSN:
Volume 1, Issue 1
Received: 12, June, 2025
Revised: 24 August, 2025
Accepted: 9 December 2025
Published: 20 December 2025

Abstract

This paper is an investigation into entrepreneurship as a social infrastructure and how it enhances innovation and economic development of emerging markets. As compared to the traditional views that consider entrepreneurship as an individual business formulation, the conceptualization of the research deems entrepreneurship as a system of inter-related social, institutional, and technological networks that facilitate opportunity recognition, mobilization of resources and resilience in the ecosystem. The quantitative research design was adopted based on the survey data of 200 participants with a variety of demographics such as students, entrepreneurs, professionals, and academics. The descriptive statistics gave information about the age, gender and occupational distribution, whereas the ANOVA tests reflected the comparison of the perceptions between the groups. The results indicate a substantial agreement that entrepreneurship has a positive contribution towards societal wellbeing and economic progress, however, there is a lot of diversity on whether it is regarded as a social infrastructure, and to what extent universities can influence state advancement. The young people and women proved to be the key components of the entrepreneurial ecosystems highlighting the need to be inclusive and dynamic in generation. The findings indicate that entrepreneurship must take a place next to education and healthcare as cornerstones of development, which should be supported in strong institutional terms and have an intervention policy and collaborate with ecosystems. Finally, the paper establishes that entrepreneurship is a disruptive process that can be used to create sustainable, creative and inclusive economies in resource-bound emerging markets.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Ecosystems, Social Infrastructure, Innovation and Economic Growth, Emerging Markets, Social Capital

Introduction

The idea of entrepreneurship as social infrastructure provides a transformational prism along which to obtain innovation and economic growth in the developing economies(Castrogiovanni & Justis, 2002). As compared to the usual physical infrastructure, the mode of entrepreneurship operates as a system of inter-relationship of social, institutional, and technological networks that are all capable of mobilizing resources, recognizing opportunities and creating values at regional level (Mulgan, 2006). This view appreciates the fact that the world is not a place where

entrepreneurial activity emanates out of the independent action of individuals, but is created as the result of an intricate interaction between formal institutions, informal social networks, cultural practices and collective ecosystems that when combined form the underlying fabric upon which economies grow(Drayton, 2006).

Recent research shows that emergent economies have distinct institutional issues when weak state and market institutions pose both their constraint and opportunity to develop entrepreneurship and it requires a more comprehensive idea of the interaction between the social capital, resource dependency and ecosystem features to contribute to productive entrepreneurship (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). It is reflected in the entrepreneurial ecosystem literature that these systems internally act as the contested space and competing priorities are discussed by several stakeholders, environmental sustainability, economic development and social inclusion (Hoogendoorn et al., 2010). Resource dependence theory also defines an important understanding of how nascent entrepreneurial ecosystems in resource-constrained emerging markets utilize key bridging and buffering strategies to surmount environmental dependencies and develop systemic resilience (Seelos & Mair, 2005).

The bridging helps the ecosystems be linked to external resources and networks, and the buffering helps in providing slack internally and coordinating processes, which help ecosystems to absorb shocks and have a sense of coherence around common entrepreneurial values(Light, 2008). Such an interdependent mixture of diversity and coherence within the ecosystem defines the resilience capacity of the entrepreneurial infrastructure, especially when the markets are new and face the issue of institutional instability and resource dearthness.

Social capital comes out as an important element of entrepreneurial infrastructure with structural, relational and cognitive dimensions that provide different ventriloquistic processes of venture creation and expansion. The structural facet includes formal, as well as informal networks that open access to resources and knowledge spillovers, and relational social capital that is based on trust and interpersonal relations provides a possibility to collaborate and lower the transaction costs in a weak-institutionally regulated environment. The cultural basis of entrepreneurial behavior and taking risks is cognitive social capital in the forms of shared norms, values, and mutual

understanding. Yet, the comparative weight of these dimensions differs considerably in different cultural backgrounds, and in new markets, relational social capital is usually the determining factor when the lack of formal institutional settings is offset in the personality-based trust network.

The institutional environment has a significant impact on entrepreneurial performance in the interaction between form and informality rules that dictate economic action. In the emerging markets, the formal institutions like parties, legal systems, enforcement of property rights and regulation systems are usually weak and bring about doubts and additional costs of transacting amongst the entrepreneurs. As such, informal institutions such as cultural values, social norms, and unwritten codes of conduct are compensatory roles of promoting economic coordination and trust-building. The institution is either consistent or inconsistent with the formally and informally instituted institution, which generates diverse forms that either promote or limit the entrepreneurial activity, ramifications of which are how entrepreneurship can be productive, ineffective, or even destructive on its social and economic effects. Financial infrastructure in entrepreneurial systems goes beyond basic capital supply to include advanced systems to minimize information asymmetries and make resource allocation under uncertainty.

The literature shows that intellectual capital is used as a signaling mechanism that assists startups to address their financing limitations through the credible transmission of their innovation opportunity to investors. Likewise, educational level and human resources of entrepreneurial leaders have a major impact on investment cash flow sensitivity, which implies that managerial competency determines firm performance where market imperfections are experienced under the capital market conditions of emerging economies. The results indicate the importance of human and intellectual capital as the elements of social infrastructure in the mobilization and effective distribution of financial resources in entrepreneurial ecosystems. Lastly, the incorporation of both technology adoption and social impact measurement are the newly introduced facets of entrepreneurial infrastructure that would be of great interest to sustainable development in emerging markets.

Technology allows system change in social enterprises on both counts, develops channels of scaling solutions to underserved populations and simultaneously alters policy structures, economic

forces, and societal conventions. Nonetheless, the social impact is still not entirely measured, and unequal definitions and methods of the measurement hamper the accountability and learning in the entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Literature review

The theorization of entrepreneurship as social infrastructure can also offer the innovative angle in the light of which one can consider the process of innovation and economic growth in the developing markets (Carrick & Wapshott, 2023). Unlike physical infrastructure that is traditional, entrepreneurship is a dependent system of social, institutional and technological networks, that marshal resources, find opportunities and generate values on a regional scale (Oladele et al., 2024). It is the complex relationship between formal institutions, informal social ties, culture, and cooperative ecosystems which is the fundamental framework of economic development according to this point of view, rather than individual activity which brings about the entrepreneurial action (Ribeiro et al., 2024). Recent research finds that there are unique institutional issues to the emerging economies, where poor state and market institutions can offer both obstacle and opportunities to the growth of an entrepreneurship that need both better understanding of how social capital, reliance on resources and features of ecosystems interact to generate productive entrepreneurship (Roundy et al., 2019).

The entrepreneurial ecosystem literature shows that these systems are present in terms of a contested space where different stakeholders bargain divergent issues depending on the sustainability of the environment, economic development, and social inclusion(Sobhan & Haque, 2024). The resource dependence theory enables key influence on the means through which emergent entrepreneurial ecosystems in ecologically constraining emerging economies embrace strategic bridging in addition to buffering designs to satisfy the environmental dependence together with evolve systemic resilience. The strategies that bridge all ecosystems to external resources and networks are called bridging strategies and the internal slack and coordination systems that enable ecosystems to survive shock and to discover coherence around shared entrepreneurial ideals are called buffering strategies (Boucher et al., 2024). This equilibrium between the heterogeneity and homogeneity of the ecosystem determines the resilience capability in the entrepreneurial

infrastructure particularly when it comes to new markets and an institutional mobility and scarcity of resources (Kruse & Guo, 2024).

The social capital as a significant component of the entrepreneurial infrastructure emerges as a vital component with structural dimension, relational dimension and cognitive dimension all of which offer various mechanisms of creating and growing the venture (Chiodo & Della Corte, 2024). Structural dimension incorporates formal and informal networks that allow the access to resources and spillovers of knowledge and relational social capital that is built on the foundation of trust and interpersonal relations that lead to collaboration and low transaction costs in the situation of weak institutional implementation (Muñoz-Mora & García, 2022). The cultural basis of entrepreneurial behavior and risk-taking is that cognitive social capital manifests through the common norms, values and mutual understanding. However, individuals assign vast disparities in the sufficient impact of these dimensions in the different cultural backgrounds where relational social assets are likely to be more definite within the non-developed markets where personal trust systems are to be replaced with the less developed institutional facilities (Bárcena-Martín et al., 2021).

The interaction of formal and informal rules that explain the economic behavior provides the institutional environment with a considerable amount of influence on the entrepreneurial performance. Formal institutions such as legal institutions, property rights and laws enforcement are normally weak in the emerging markets and bring about uncertainties and increase the cost of transactions to the efforts of the entrepreneurs (Alfaro, 2017). The fact that such informal institutions like cultural values, social norms and unwritten code of conduct offset the other factor in that they would aid in coordinating the economies and establishing trust (Alkhafaji, 1991). Mismatch or match between formal and informal institutions creates different types of configurations either enhancing or restricting the entrepreneurial activity and the result of this mismatch is either the entrepreneurship will become productive, unproductive and even destructive in terms of social and economic impacts (Arora & Singh, 2020).

Entrepreneurial systems provide financial infrastructure, which includes financial capital, as well as complicated information asymmetry reduction and resource allocation processes in situations of uncertainty (Ayedh et al., 2021). Evidence studies reveal that intellectual capital is an instrumentation tool that has the potential to propel start ups to new levels beyond the financing

boundaries due to their persuasive ability to inform their investors about their potential to be innovative (Castellas et al., 2018). Similarly, the educational level and human capital of entrepreneurial heads also play a significant role in the investment sensitive cash flows, i.e. the managerial capability has conditional impact on the performance of the firm under the capital market imperfections of the emerging economies (Eldomiaty et al., 2019). These findings reveal the contributions of human and intellectual capital as factors of social infrastructure that enable mobilization of financial resources and best allocation during the operating processes of the entrepreneurial ecosystems.

The inclusion of the adoption of technology and social impact measurement are the new aspects of entrepreneurial infrastructure which would be particularly applicable in the context of sustainable development in emerging markets(Ngek, 2012). The technology that enabled social enterprise change systems provides channels of scaling solutions across the underserved people and simultaneously changes in policy frameworks, market forces and social values. However, the social impact is still a haphazard concept with varied definitions and methods limiting accountability and learning in entrepreneurial ecosystems (Coleman, 2019). This is the significance of well-crafted measurement frameworks that can gauge the multidimensional effects of entrepreneurship as a social infrastructure to be in a position to establish evidence-based policy-making and ecosystem management tending to emerging markets in the realms.

Research Methodology

The research design in this paper was quantitative since it aimed at evaluating the importance of entrepreneurship as social infrastructure to enhance innovation and economic development in an emerging market. Two hundred of them, who are the representatives of various demographics as students, entrepreneurs, professionals, and academics, participated in the survey through a structured questionnaire. The survey was aimed at attitudes towards the perceived contribution to society of entrepreneurship, whether people consider it as a social infrastructure, and the success of local entrepreneurial infrastructure. The demographic variables were analyzed by descriptive statistics and tested their hypotheses on differences in perceptions on a group level through the application of inferential statistics and in specific cases, ANOVA.

Research objectives

- To examine the role of entrepreneurship as a form of social infrastructure in fostering innovation and supporting economic growth in emerging markets.
- To assess the effectiveness of local entrepreneurial ecosystems (investors, institutions, policies) in overcoming challenges faced by entrepreneurs in emerging markets**.**

Hypothesis

H1: Entrepreneurship, when perceived as social infrastructure, has a significant positive impact on innovation in emerging markets.
H2: A strong local entrepreneurial ecosystem significantly enhances the growth prospects of entrepreneurs in emerging markets.

Analysis

Table 1: Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18 - 24	128	64.0	64.0	64.0
	25 - 34	51	25.5	25.5	89.5
	35 - 44	21	10.5	10.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

In terms of age, it is seen that most of the respondents (64% of all people) are aged 18-24, then 25-34 (25.5%), then 35-44 (10.5%). This means that the study is highly youth-oriented portraying the viewpoints of people with a budding career or education program. The presence of younger demographics in the sample is essential because the younger demographics are usually the most entrepreneurial as they have a higher risk appetite, flexibility, and innovation openness. It brings

out a point that young markets might be more dependent on the younger generations to stimulate the economic growth in their economies through entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, the absence of older groups implies less experience of the older professionals who might have a different attitude to entrepreneurship, which might be more focused on the sustainability and institutional frameworks. Therefore, the results mainly reflect the attitudes of the youth, which agree with literature that young populations would be innovation drivers and catalysts of ecosystem creation in the outcome economies.

Table 2: Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	116	58.0	58.0	58.0
	Female	84	42.0	42.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Gender distribution shows that the respondents are mainly male (58) and female (42). Notwithstanding the prevalence of male overrepresentation, it is comparatively balanced, and the views of both sexes are presented in the study. This balance is crucial due to the fact that gender is a key factor of entrepreneurial opportunities, challenges, and strategies. Women in most of the emerging markets experience structural barriers like inaccessibility to finance, mentorship and networks. The fact that women constitute almost 50 per cent of the sample is highly informative in creating comparisons on how gender impacts on the overall perception of entrepreneurship as a social infrastructure. The female voice is an addition to the traditional entrepreneurial dominance of the male, which focuses on the social and community-based aspects of entrepreneurship. This inclusivity has been consistent with the literature discussion that emphasizes the need to have equitable participation in order to achieve sustainable and resilient entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Table 3: Current Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Student	111	55.5	55.5	55.5
	Entrepreneur /Startup founder	28	14.0	14.0	69.5
	Corporate Professional	30	15.0	15.0	84.5
	Academic / Researcher	13	6.5	6.5	91.0
	Government Employee	8	4.0	4.0	95.0
	Free Lancer / Self Employed	6	3.0	3.0	98.0
	Other	4	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

According to the occupation data, the most common group of respondents is students (55.5%), then there are corporate professionals (15%) and entrepreneurs/startup founders (14%). Smaller segments are academics, government employees and freelancers among others. This bias in terms of the high representation of students implies that the data is a reflection of the dreams and visions of the kind of people who can become successful entrepreneurs in the future and not just of settled professionals. Their opinions matter most as they will help understand the perspectives of the emerging generations regarding entrepreneurship as an instrument of social and economical progress. In the meantime, the presence of corporate executives and startup entrepreneurs brings in practical thinking balancing hope and reality. It is a rich dataset as it is diverse regarding occupations, which guarantees the variety of perspectives on the role of entrepreneurship in society. Significantly, the smaller but still extant categories (academics and government employees) point to the emphasis placed on entrepreneurship observed not only as the process of

business formation but as a subset of broader institutional and policy discourse. This is in line with the studies of positioning entrepreneurship as a multi-stakeholder social infrastructure.

Table 4: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What do you think entrepreneurship mainly provides to society?	Between Groups	5.791	6	.965	1.675	.129
	Within Groups	111.229	193	.576		
	Total	117.020	199			
How important is entrepreneurship for economic growth in emerging markets?	Between Groups	2.310	6	.385	.359	.904
	Within Groups	207.110	193	1.073		
	Total	209.420	199			
Which of the following best describes the role of entrepreneurship in society?	Between Groups	4.147	6	.691	.724	.630
	Within Groups	183.200	192	.954		
	Total	187.347	198			
Do you 2 that entrepreneurship should be considered a form of social infrastructure (like education or healthcare)?	Between Groups	14.976	6	2.496	3.880	.001
	Within Groups	124.144	193	.643		
	Total	139.120	199			

Do you believe 1 entrepreneurship (from universities/colleges) can drive national growth?	Between Groups	26.522	6	4.420	6.117	<.001
	Within Groups	139.478	193	.723		
	Total	166.000	199			

The findings of the ANOVA bring out both agreement and disagreement in the perception of the role of entrepreneurship in society and economic development. In the case of questions like: What do you believe are the primary benefits that entrepreneurship brings society? (p =.129), "What matters is entrepreneurship in economic growth in emerging markets? (p =.904) and "Which of the following is the best that can be said about the position of entrepreneurship in society? The intergroup differences are not significant, (p =.630) implying that there is a unanimous opinion, which is backed and generalized that regardless of the demographic background and occupation the introduction of entrepreneurship is a positive factor in the welfare of the society and its economic growth. That said, there is a notable difference in the views about entrepreneurship as social infrastructure (p =. 01) and whether entrepreneurship outside of universities and colleges can benefit growth in a country (p <. 001). These findings point to the fact that the respondents tend to agree that entrepreneurship is important, although there are more acute differences when putting its meaning in the context of such a basic system as education or healthcare, or when evaluating the institutional contribution of the academic world to the development of entrepreneurial ecosystems and the national progress.

Table 5: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What do you think entrepreneurship mainly provides to society?	Between Groups	1.737	2	.869	1.484	.229
	Within Groups	115.283	197	.585		

	Total	117.020	199			
How important is entrepreneurship for economic growth in emerging markets?	Between Groups	.434	2	.217	.205	.815
	Within Groups	208.986	197	1.061		
	Total	209.420	199			
Which of the following best describes the role of entrepreneurship in society?	Between Groups	1.802	2	.901	.952	.388
	Within Groups	185.545	196	.947		
	Total	187.347	198			
Do you 2 that entrepreneurship should be considered a form of social infrastructure (like education or healthcare)?	Between Groups	4.857	2	2.429	3.563	.030
	Within Groups	134.263	197	.682		
	Total	139.120	199			
Do you believe 1 entrepreneurship (from universities/colleges) can drive national growth?	Between Groups	11.892	2	5.946	7.601	<.001
	Within Groups	154.108	197	.782		
	Total	166.000	199			

The final results of the ANOVA associated with the second test present an understanding of the perception of local entrepreneurial ecosystems, including investors, institutions, and policies, in overcoming the problems of entrepreneurs operating in the new markets. The results indicate that answers to questions on what entrepreneurship brings to the society (p =.229), whether it is significant to the economic growth(p =.815), and its general impact on the society (p =.388) are statistically irrelevant implying a general agreement across groups. This means that irrespective of the demographic or work-related background, when it comes to the role of entrepreneurship in the society and the economy, there is a great deal of collective opinion amongst the participants. Nevertheless, one can observe some considerable distinctions in the question of whether entrepreneurship counts as a type of social infrastructure (p =.030) and whether entrepreneurship made by university or college can contribute to national development (p <.001). These findings reveal that although there is general consensus on the importance of entrepreneurship, there is a split in perceptions on the issue once institutional and policy-related variables get factored. Others highly identify entrepreneurship with vital infrastructure and are seen as a system that necessitates policy backing such as health or education and others are still only hesitant. On the same note, the scoring by the respondents on the effectiveness of academic institutions as entrepreneurial development sources is drastically split, as some groups are sure that these institutions are capable of developing ecosystems, and some are skeptical of their influence. In general, the findings indicate that although the societal and economic impacts of entrepreneurship are unanimously accepted, the discussions around the effectiveness of the local ecosystems and institutional structures to transform entrepreneurial activity in a sustainable national development continue to be widespread.

Table 6: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What do you think	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.001	.982

entrepreneurship mainly provides to society?	Within Groups	117.020	198	.591		
	Total	117.020	199			
How important is entrepreneurship for economic growth in emerging markets?	Between Groups	.820	1	.820	.778	.379
	Within Groups	208.600	198	1.054		
	Total	209.420	199			
Which of the following best describes the role of entrepreneurship in society?	Between Groups	1.593	1	1.593	1.690	.195
	Within Groups	185.754	197	.943		
	Total	187.347	198			
Do you 2 that entrepreneurship should be considered a form of social infrastructure (like education or healthcare)?	Between Groups	.315	1	.315	.450	.503
	Within Groups	138.805	198	.701		
	Total	139.120	199			
Do you believe 1 entrepreneurship (from universities/colleges) can drive national growth?	Between Groups	.067	1	.067	.079	.778
	Within Groups	165.933	198	.838		
	Total	166.000	199			

The Table ANOVA results indicate that there is a great agreement among respondents concerning the role of entrepreneurship in enhancing innovation, economic growth and serving society in the emerging markets. On all variables, tested, what entrepreneurship is offering to society (p = .982), how it matters to the development of an economy (p = .379), what role it continues to play in society (p =.195), its value as a type of social infrastructure (p =.503) and the contribution of universities and colleges to national growth (p =.778), no statistically significant differences were seen between groups. This homogeneity shows that the respondents, irrespective of their demographic or career experience, have similar views of the importance of entrepreneurship. The results support the idea that entrepreneurship is generally viewed as an essential element of an economic and social system, as a facilitator of opportunity, innovativeness as well as group advancement. Also, the findings point out that entrepreneurship is becoming gradually not only as a business practice but also as a critical kind of infrastructure that has the potential to align the future development patterns of emerging markets. Although we should not overlook the fact that given the lack of group-level variation, this seems to be a widely recognized fact, it is also indicative that there is still much to learn about local ecosystem issues, institutional loopholes, and unequal experiences among the stakeholders that might not be well represented by the data that is already available. On the whole, this discussion indicates that in emerging settings, entrepreneurship is always viewed as a core of the resilient, inventive, and inclusive economies.

Conclusion

The results of this study reveal that in the context of social infrastructure, entrepreneurship becomes central in terms of innovation and sustainable economic development in the emerging markets. The research will show that entrepreneurship is no longer about the business creation, but rather more of an interrelational system of social capital, institutional assistance, financial processes and cultural values, which combine to allow recognition of opportunity, mobilization of resources, and survival in the unpredictable world.

Demographic analysis highlights that the youth is the leader in entrepreneurial ambitions as it is more flexible, risk-taking, and is at the centre of ecosystem growth, whereas the balanced gender

representation underlines the increasing inclusiveness and diversity enhancing innovation abilities. This occupational diversity in the sample further shows that the field of entrepreneurship is not only accepted by the students and future founders but also by the practitioner, scholars, and policymakers, further validating the fact that it is a multi-stakeholder phenomenon. The outcomes of the ANOVA show that there is both agreement and deviation in perceptions: generally, people seem to agree about the beneficial contribution of entrepreneurship in society and economy, but there is also a significant difference in how it is perceived as a social infrastructure and how the universities impact entrepreneurship development.

The results of this have highlighted the importance of institutional fortification, sound education structures and policy enablers to incorporate entrepreneurship within the national development. Besides, the analysis establishes that entrepreneurship must be perceived in the same terms as education and healthcare as a system of mutually influencing the state of well-being and resilience in the known communities in toto in emergent markets. This study does not only support the hypothesis that entrepreneurship promotes innovation and growth but by connecting social capital, institutional structures, and ecosystem diversity with each other, the study clearly shows the dire need to invest in changeable, policy-instructed ecosystems enhancing youthful talent, enabling women, and increasing institutional trust. Finally, entrepreneurship is revealed as an important key to turning the emerging markets into active, stable, and innovative economies.

References

- Acs, Z. J., Desai, S., & Hessels, J. (2008). Entrepreneurship, economic development and institutions. Small Business Economics, 31(3), 219–234. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-008-9135-9
- Alfaro, L. (2017). Multinational activity in emerging markets: How and when does foreign direct investment promote growth? In Geography, Location, and Strategy (Vol. 36, pp. 429–462). Emerald Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0742-332220170000036012
- Alkhafaji, A. F. (1991). Management challenges: A worldwide perspective. Management Decision, 29(6). https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000000074
- Arora, N., & Singh, B. (2020). Determinants of oversubscription of SME IPOs in India: Evidence from quantile regression. Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration, 12(3/4), 349–370. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJBA-05-2020-0160
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 30(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00107.x

- Autio, E. (2017). Strategic entrepreneurial internationalization: A normative framework. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 11(3), 211–227. https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1264
- Ayedh, A., Echchabi, A., Battour, M., & Omar, M. (2021). Malaysian Muslim investors' behaviour towards the blockchain-based Bitcoin cryptocurrency market. Journal of Islamic Marketing, 12(4), 690–704. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-04-2019-0081
- Bárcena-Martín, E., et al. (2021). Economic regulation, opportunity-driven entrepreneurship and growth. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 27(5), 1183–1206. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-05-2020-0321
- Bornstein, D. (2007). How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas. Oxford University Press.
- Boucher, S., Urban, B., & Steenkamp, A. (2024). Culture, entrepreneurial intention and evidence from Nelson Mandela Bay, South Africa. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 16(4), 1183–1208. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-05-2022-0151
- Bruton, G. D., Ahlstrom, D., & Obloj, K. (2008). Entrepreneurship in emerging economies: Where are we today and where should the research go in the future. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 32(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2007.00213.x
- Carrick, O. J., & Wapshott, R. (2023). Entrepreneurial ecosystems as contested spaces: A case study. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 15(6). https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-08-2021-0325
- Castellas, E. I.-P., Ormiston, J., & Findlay, S. (2018). Financing social entrepreneurship. Social Enterprise Journal, 14(2), 130–155. https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-02-2017-0006
- Castrogiovanni, G. J., & Justis, R. T. (2002). Strategic and contextual influences on firm growth: An empirical study of franchised systems. Journal of Small Business Management, 40(2), 98–108. https://doi.org/10.1108/14626000210427356
- Chiodo, V., & Della Corte, V. (2024). Disentangling tech-enabled system change in social enterprises. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 16(5). https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-07-2023-0303
- Coleman, L. (2019). Four-component model of equity pricing. In New Principles of Equity Investment (pp. 23–56). Emerald Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78973-063-020191003
- 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
- Dees, J. G. (1998). The meaning of social entrepreneurship. Stanford University Draft Report.
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences. Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 1(1), 32–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420670903442053
- Drayton, B. (2006). Everyone is a changemaker: Social entrepreneurship's ultimate goal. Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization, 1(1), 80–96. https://doi.org/10.1162/itgg.2006.1.1.80
- Eldomiaty, T. I., Andrikopoulos, P., & Bishara, M. K. (2019). Financial decisions and growth of the firm under high and low levels of information asymmetry. In Essays in Financial Economics (Vol. 35, pp. 19–51). Emerald Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0196-382120190000035002

- Elkington, J., & Hartigan, P. (2008). The power of unreasonable people: How social entrepreneurs create markets that change the world. Harvard Business Press.
- Gupta, G., Mahakud, J., & Verma, V. (2021). CEO's education and investment–cash flow sensitivity: An empirical investigation. International Journal of Managerial Finance, 17(4), 589–618. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMF-01-2020-0020
- Hoogendoorn, B., Pennings, E., & Thurik, R. (2010). What do we know about social entrepreneurship? An analysis of empirical research. International Review of Entrepreneurship, 8(2), 71–112.
- Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. (1997). Why focused strategies may be wrong for emerging markets. Harvard Business Review, 75(4), 41–54. https://hbr.org/1997/07/why-focused-strategies-may-be-wrong-for-emerging-markets
- Kruse, P., & Guo, S. (2024). Do good and measure well! Examining the validity of two impact measurement tools in social entrepreneurship. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 16(5), 1298–1318. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-07-2023-0303
- Light, P. C. (2008). The search for social entrepreneurship. Brookings Institution Press.
- Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. Journal of World Business, 41(1), 36–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002
- Minniti, M., & Lévesque, M. (2008). Recent developments in the economics of entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Venturing, 23(6), 603–612. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.01.001
- Mulgan, G. (2006). The process of social innovation. Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization, 1(2), 145–162. https://doi.org/10.1162/itgg.2006.1.2.145
- Muñoz-Mora, J. C., & García, J. (2022). From immigrants to local entrepreneurs: Understanding the transition. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 28(9), 78–99. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-05-2020-0321
- Naudé, W. (2010). Entrepreneurship, developing countries, and development economics: New approaches and insights. Small Business Economics, 34(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-009-9198-2
- Ngek, N. B. (2012). Entrepreneurial competencies and venture performance: Evidence from South Africa. International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business, 15(3), 259–281. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2012.046613
- Nicholls, A. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change. Oxford University Press.
- Nigam, N., Mbarek, S., & Boughanmi, A. (2021). Impact of intellectual capital on the financing of startups with new business models. Journal of Knowledge Management, 25(1), 227–250. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2019-0657
- Oladele, S., Eresia-Eke, C., & Iwu, C. G. (2024). How strong is your social capital? Interactions in a non-transparent entrepreneurial ecosystem. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 16(3), 602–625. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-05-2022-0151
- Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. Journal of World Business, 41(1), 56–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.007
- Ribeiro, F., Justo, R., & de Backer, M. (2024). Recommendations for entrepreneurial ecosystem development. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 16(6). https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-12-2022-0386

- Roundy, P. T., Brockman, B. K., & Bradshaw, M. (2019). To bridge or buffer? A resource dependence theory of nascent entrepreneurial ecosystems. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 11(4), 550–575. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-06-2018-0064
- 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
- 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
- Shane, S. (2009). Why encouraging more people to become entrepreneurs is bad public policy. Small Business Economics, 33(2), 141–149. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-009-9215-5
- Sobhan, N., & Haque, A. (2024). The effect of institutional environment on entrepreneurship in emerging economies. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 16(1), 12–32. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-12-2022-0386
- Urban, B. (2018). Effect of culture on entrepreneurship intention. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 10(2), 219–233. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-01-2018-0004
- Weerawardena, J., & Mort, G. S. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. Journal of World Business, 41(1), 21–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.001
- Wright, M., & Stigliani, I. (2013). Entrepreneurship and growth. International Small Business Journal, 31(1), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242612467359
- Yunus, M. (2007). Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism. PublicAffairs.
- 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