

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN PROMOTING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN PRESENT ERA

Dr. Satpal

(Associate Professor), Department of Management Studies, DCRUST, Murthal (Sonipat).

Abstract: The increasing prominence of social entrepreneurship in recent times has garnered considerable attention, offering a distinctive approach to tackling intricate societal issues. Social entrepreneurship is characterized by its commitment to generating both social and environmental impact while maintaining financial sustainability. It entails the application of entrepreneurial principles and strategies to devise innovative solutions for pressing social and environmental concerns. In the context of India, a developing nation grappling with a myriad of challenges such as poverty, limited access to education and healthcare, deficiencies in basic services, environmental degradation, and the looming threat of climate change, social entrepreneurship has emerged as a potent instrument for effectively addressing these issues. It not only seeks to provide solutions but also strives to create employment opportunities and foster sustainable development. The objective of this current study is to scrutinize the diverse challenges and opportunities inherent in the realm of social entrepreneurship in India.

Keywords: Opportunities, Challenges, Social Entrepreneurship, Environmental Degradation, Climate Change, Government Policy.

1. Introduction:

The concept of Social Entrepreneurship integrates business principles with sustainable social objectives, aiming to generate positive social outcomes for marginalized communities grappling with daily survival challenges (Agrawal & Hockerts, 2013). Social entrepreneurs are motivated by fervor to assist, empower, and address social, environmental, and economic issues while ensuring an overall positive impact on society. The objective is to enhance people's lives by delivering improved services. While entrepreneurship has traditionally been linked with business and economic pursuits, it is now being applied to solve social problems. Entrepreneurs, known for their willingness to take risks and embark on significant projects, are now leveraging their skills to discover new or improved approaches that contribute to economic advancement. Social entrepreneurs, in particular, have a clear and central social mission, actively seeking the most effective means to fulfill that mission. The key distinction between entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship lies in their respective value propositions. Entrepreneurs focus on creating financial profit by catering to markets with the capacity to afford their products or services comfortably. The development of entrepreneurship holds immense significance for a nation's economic progress and overall well-being. Social entrepreneurs prioritise social and environmental impact over profit maximisation and promote ethical and responsible business practices (Chell, 2007).

Social entrepreneurship is a rapidly growing phenomenon that has gained significant attention from policymakers, academics, and practitioners. Social entrepreneurs create innovative solutions to address social problems like poverty, inequality, and environmental degradation while generating economic value. The role of the government in promoting social entrepreneurship has been a subject of much debate and research. Previous studies have shown that government policies and initiatives can significantly impact social entrepreneurship. For example, government funding and support for social enterprises can increase their chances of success and sustainability (Mair & Marti, 2006). Similarly, government regulations and policies that support social innovation and entrepreneurship can foster an environment conducive to their growth (Dacin, Dacin, & Matear, 2010). Social Entrepreneurship has emerged as a critical economic growth and development driver. Social enterprises create new markets, generate employment opportunities, and contribute to the nation's GDP (Nicholls & Cho, 2006).

In developing countries, social entrepreneurship can address social and economic disparities and promote inclusive growth (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). Social entrepreneurship provides a significant contribution to society (Dees, 2001). Social entrepreneurial practices may prioritise social impact over the economic impact and demonstrate high social and economic proclivity (Maclean & Harvey, 2013). These practices also catalyse empowerment and address social issues and challenges (Huang & Cox, 2014; Rymza, 2015). Social entrepreneurship aims to achieve a harmonious equilibrium between generating positive social impact and achieving financial sustainability. It involves using business techniques and practices to solve social problems sustainably. Social entrepreneurs are enterprises dedicated to solving social problems, and their impact is significant. By studying social entrepreneurship, we can understand how innovative and sustainable solutions can be developed and implemented to address pressing social and environmental challenges (Dacin, Dacin, & Matear, 2010). Understanding the underlying motivations, challenges, and opportunities of social entrepreneurship can inform the development of effective strategies for promoting and supporting social entrepreneurship initiatives by policymakers and practitioners (Bacq & Janssen, 2011). Moreover, examining the transformative influence of social entrepreneurship on beneficiaries can enhance our understanding of its potential for creating positive change in society (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). Around the globe, many social entrepreneurs are starting or running businesses.

2. Literature Review:

Social entrepreneurship has recently gained significant attention for addressing pressing societal challenges and creating sustainable social impact (Mair & Martí, 2006; Nicholls, 2010). The notion of social entrepreneurship has evolved as a prominent topic of inquiry, study, and practise in recent decades. Despite the fact that women social entrepreneurs have shown significant promise via a reduced gender gap in social entrepreneurship, as opposed to commercial entrepreneurship, where the gender gap is proven to be large, there is little literature on women's social entrepreneurial enterprises. The author compares social entrepreneurship and women social entrepreneurship by evaluating the current research then evaluates the success factors in women's social entrepreneurship and addresses the problems. Two real-life case studies were used to establish a

relationship between the literature and practise. Social entrepreneurs use entrepreneurial skills to create innovative solutions for social and environmental problems (Dees, 2001). They operate in a space between the traditional business, government, and non-profit sectors, aiming to create social and economic value (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). While the potential benefits of social entrepreneurship are widely acknowledged, there are also significant challenges that social entrepreneurs face (Dacin, Dacin, & Matear, 2010; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). These challenges include limited access to funding, legal and regulatory barriers, and difficulties in measuring and communicating social impact (Mair & Martí, 2006; Nicholls, 2010). To fully understand the landscape of social entrepreneurship and its potential for impact, it is important to examine the opportunities and challenges social entrepreneurs face. Guha and Srivastava (2022) provide a literature review of the connection in between social entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation. The authors review existing studies to identify common themes, such as the potential of social entrepreneurship to create employment and income-generating opportunities and to promote access to essential services and resources in underserved communities. They also explore social entrepreneurs' unique challenges and opportunities in low-income contexts, such as limited access to funding and resources and the need for inclusive and participatory approaches. The paper concludes by highlighting the need for more research to understand the impact of social entrepreneurship on poverty alleviation. Mokaya and Bitange (2022) systematically reviewed the relation between SE and access to finance. Authors review existing literature to identify social entrepreneurs' challenges in accessing finance and the strategies developed to overcome these challenges. The paper concludes by highlighting the need for more research to understand better the complex relationship between social entrepreneurship and access to finance and to identify effective strategies for supporting and promoting social entrepreneurship activities. Ismail and Wan Ismail (2021) explored the impact of SE on social innovation in Malaysia. The authors use a mixed-methods research approach, including surveys and interviews with social entrepreneurs and stakeholders, to examine the association between social entrepreneurship and social innovation. The findings suggest that social entrepreneurship significantly promotes social innovation in Malaysia, particularly in addressing social and environmental challenges and promoting community development. The authors identify key factors contributing to the success of social entrepreneurship activities, such as access to funding and support networks, and highlight the need for more collaboration and knowledge-sharing between social entrepreneurs and other stakeholders. Mair and Marti (2021) comprehensively reviewed social entrepreneurship research's past achievements and future challenges.

The authors identify key themes and debates in the field, such as the definition of social entrepreneurship, the role of context and institutional factors, and the potential tensions between social and economic goals. They also explore emerging topics, such as the role of technology and innovation in social entrepreneurship and the need for more intersectional and inclusive approaches. Chikoko and Sajuyigbe (2020) review the works on social entrepreneurship and its association with community development. The authors identify several themes, such as the role of SE in creating social impact, the challenges social entrepreneurs face, and the importance of

alliance between social entrepreneurs and other participants in promoting communal growth. The paper concludes by emphasising the need for further research to understand the links between social entrepreneurship and community development and identify effective strategies for promoting social entrepreneurship in different contexts. Varghese, R. M., & Jaffer, N. M. (2020) analysed simple, easy and cost effective ways to implement the business excellence model of small and medium enterprises. The findings indicate that female entrepreneur is less often in the commercial sector. However, the potential for women entrepreneurs to succeed is very high compared to men. The results are based on the SME working in one industry only, which can be different in the case of other studies. Researchers analysed the empirical evidence in the different employment trends, statistical determinants, and the magnitude of structural transformation related to the developing economy. Findings suggest that the process of occupational transformation in India starts after the post-reformation period. Some anomalies related to such transformation are also defined in the study. The provisions related to poverty and unemployment that significantly impact social and structural transformation should be discussed. Dwivedi, A., & Weerawardena, J. (2018) examined Social entrepreneurship orientation (SEO) as an essential factor for the success of social entrepreneurship. Behavioural entrepreneurship will help to adjust the behaviour of the people. The displayed characteristics of a social entrepreneur are enthusiasm, dedication, high IQ, empathy, motivational skills, leadership skills, management skills, cooperative, trustworthiness, respect, pleasing personality, and others. Social entrepreneurs gain recognition in society because of the work they do. There are chances of market failure as well. Not all businesses need to survive and earn huge profits. Some businesses might fail and lead to business closure. Rawal, T. (2018) examined the social needs and social innovation position in India and the contribution of entrepreneurship. In economic and social growth, social entrepreneurship has become the most crucial force not only in India but also all over the world. In India concept of social entrepreneurship is rising for social welfare and improving the sight of society. The country's government focuses more on CSR so that all industries can benefit from improving economic and social conditions. It takes so many sources and time to identify the position for social needs and innovation state-wise in India, a research gap the researcher has faced. Thaker J. K., Chakrawalii, A. K., & Goyal, P. (2017), in the study compared different and innovative behaviours of entrepreneurs based on their economic background and educational qualifications. The results suggest that no considerable difference is noticed among different entrepreneurs of different industries based on innovation. However, there are differences in economic and educational backgrounds. Data is collected from the Saurashtra region of Gujarat; thus, results only apply to this state. Idris, N., & Tan, J. (2017) analysed the literature about women's entrepreneurship and the main benefits and challenges faced. Findings indicate several motivational factors available for women to get involved in entrepreneurship and business. No new suggestion or result is proposed in this paper. Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., & Tikoria, J. (2017) identified the intention of social entrepreneurship among undergraduate students in the Indian context. Findings indicate that the developed model in the study can explain social entrepreneurship intentions. Emotional intelligence cannot be applied in the case of SMEs Ault, J. K. (2016), analysed the institutional

perspective towards SE and the usefulness of non-profit vs. commercial methods of developing broad markets for the poor and low-level entrepreneurs. Findings indicate that the institutions affect the total number of entrepreneurs in a specific location and influence entrepreneurial actions and strategies. Samples are only collected from the finance sector organisations; thus, their implications can differ in other industries and sectors. Yalala, N. (2015) focused on analysing the benefits of the development of the radio community in facilitating women's empowerment in the Indian economy. Findings indicate that “Namma Dhvani Community” radio increased the participation of women entrepreneurs in creating awareness and program production among the women viewers related to their education, health, habits, food, and family system. There needs to be more primary and quantitative data; thus, the results and their accuracy cannot be ensured in all contexts. The results are limited to the students of Ukraine only. It also defines government efforts towards promoting innovative technologies for sustainable growth and entrepreneurship development. The findings indicate that the government has realised the causes of fundamental issues, especially in the economy, Labour, and administration..

The review highlights that social entrepreneurship's primary objective is to impact society while generating economic value positively. The literature review also identifies the motivational drivers of social entrepreneurship, such as personal values, social and environmental problems, and the desire for social change. The review also emphasizes the part that social entrepreneurship plays in the life of beneficiaries, such as marginalised communities and people with low incomes. Social entrepreneurship empowers these individuals by providing them employment opportunities, admittance to essential goods and services, and improved social and economic well-being.

3. Data and Methodology:

In any research study, data sets could be broadly divided into two distinct types: “Primary data sources and Secondary data sources”. Primary data refers to the information collected and structured by the researcher exclusively for the study. Secondary data, however, refers to data collected and compiled by someone else and used by the researcher for their study. Primary and secondary data sources were used in the current research on social entrepreneurship and its impact on society. For secondary data, an in-depth desk study was conducted using various sources such as government websites (e.g., NGO Darpan portal), books, and government reports, NGO report, website of ministry, printed journals, and published and unpublished reports. Collection of primary involves conducting surveys and interviews with selected NGOs and beneficiaries in Haryana, using structured questionnaires.

Descriptive statistics was used to describe the characteristics of the sample, while inferential statistics, such as correlation and regression analysis, were used to test the hypotheses. Therefore, by testing the hypotheses using inferential statistics. Data was collected from 320 beneficiaries of selected NGOs, to achieve this objective. The study uses exploratory factor analysis to identify specific government policies and initiatives associated with increased growth of social entrepreneurship and regression to estimate the effect of government support on social entrepreneurship growth while controlling for other relevant factors that may also influence

growth. This study aims to provide insights into the role of government in promoting the growth of social entrepreneurship. To test this objective, following hypothesis was formulated:

H1: Government policy plays a significant role in promoting the growth of social entrepreneurship.

4. Analysis and Discussion:

The study collected data from 320 beneficiaries of social entrepreneurs operating in Haryana to gain insight into their demographics, education, work experience, business operations, and funding sources. Results showed that most social entrepreneurs had been in business for over two years and were top officials within their organisations. Most respondents were male, in the 40 to 50 age group, and had a graduate degree. Social enterprises were primarily located in urban areas and focused on education, income generation, and employment generation. Funding sources were primarily in-kind donations and cash, with a smaller percentage relying on government contracts and grants or foundation grants. Overall, the study provides valuable information on the characteristics of social entrepreneurs in India and their role in promoting social transformation.

Table 4.1 Frequency analysis of the demographic profile of beneficiaries of selected social enterprises

Variable		Frequency	Per cent	χ^2	p-value
Gender	Male	173	54.1	2.113	0.146
	Female	147	45.9		
	Total	320	100		
Age group(years)	Less than 30	78	21.3	46.113	0.000
	30-40	81	22.2		
	40-50	88	24.4		
	50-60	51	13.4		
	60+	22	6.9		
	Total	320	100		
Area of living	Rural	117	36.6	23.113	0.000
	Urban	203	63.4		
	Total	320	100		

Source: Primary data analysis

The above table presents the frequency, percentage, chi-square (χ^2) and p-value of three variables: Gender, Age group, and Area of living. For the variable gender, out of 320 respondents, 173 (54.1%) were male, and 147 (45.9%) were female. The chi-square test indicates no significant association between gender and the respondents, with a p-value of 0.146.

For the variable Age group, the highest number of respondents belonged to the age group of 40-50 years (24.4%), followed by 30-40 years (22.2%) and less than 30 years (21.3%). The chi-square test indicates a significant association between the Age group and the respondents, with a p-value

of 0.000. The highest chi-square value of 46.113 suggests that the Age group variable strongly associates with the respondents.

For the variable area of living, 117 (36.6%) respondents were from rural areas, and 203 (63.4%) were from urban areas. The chi-square test indicates a significant association between the area of living and the respondents, with a p-value of 0.000. The chi-square value of 23.113 indicates that the area of living variable is moderately associated with the respondents. In summary, the results suggest that age group and area of living are significantly associated with the respondents, while gender is not. The Age group variable has a strong association, whereas the area of living variable has a moderate association with the respondents.

❖ Descriptive analysis of the role of government in promoting social entrepreneurship

Descriptive analysis is a type of statistical analysis that involves summarising and describing the main characteristics of a dataset or sample without attempting to draw inferences or make predictions. Descriptive analysis typically involves calculating measures of central tendency (such as the mean, median, and mode) and measures of dispersion (such as the range, standard deviation, and variance) for numerical data. For categorical data, the descriptive analysis might involve calculating frequencies and proportions for different categories and presenting this information in tables or graphs.

Table 4.2 Descriptive statistics for the perceived role of government in promoting social entrepreneurship

S. No.	Items/variables	Mean		Std. Deviation
		Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
1	Financial assistance through capitalsubsidies	3.11	0.11	1.13
2	Reduction in Regulations	2.57	0.11	1.21
3	Guaranteed lending from banks	3.33	0.09	0.99
4	Tax Reliefs	3.47	0.09	0.96
5	Proper publicity and implementation of various promotional schemes and policies	2.77	0.12	1.35
6	Promoting establishment of incubators	2.84	0.09	1.01
7	Creating conducive business environment	2.72	0.11	1.05
8	Physical infrastructure	3.07	0.09	0.99
9	Commercial and legal infrastructure	3.18	0.09	1.03

10	Social entrepreneurship education and Training	3.21	0.09	1.02
11	Entry Regulation	3.06	0.11	1.07
12	Cultural and social norms	3.08	0.09	1.02
13	Online and single window systems	3.23	0.09	0.95
14	Unified portals for registration	3.11	0.09	1.01
15	Marketing assistance	2.81	0.11	1.07
16	Loan at low interest	3.45	0.08	0.92
17	Government purchasing of products	3.21	0.11	1.05
18	Guarantee of Intellectual property	3.15	0.09	1.04
19	Easy access to Public sector contracts	3.11	0.09	1.02
20	Clear communication of the policies declared for SE	3.02	0.11	1.11
	Overall average	3.07	0.09	1.04

Source: Primary data analysis

The above table shows the mean and standard deviation values for 20 items related to the government's support for social entrepreneurship. The mean value for each item indicates the participants' average response regarding the effectiveness of each support measure, where the response ranged from 1 (not effective) to 5 (very effective).

Looking at the mean values, we can see that the top three effective measures for government support are tax reliefs with a mean value of 3.47, followed by loans at low interest with a mean value of 3.45, and guaranteed lending from banks with a mean value of 3.33. These three measures are rated above the overall mean of 3.07, indicating that they are perceived as adequate by the participants. On the other hand, the measures that were rated as less effective by the participants are entry regulation with a mean value of 3.06, creating a conducive business environment with a mean value of 2.72, and proper publicity and implementation of various promotional schemes and policies with a mean value of 2.77. These measures are rated below the overall mean, indicating that the participants do not perceive them as effective for supporting social entrepreneurship.

Overall, the average values suggest that government support measures such as tax reliefs, low-interest loans, and guaranteed lending from banks are perceived as effective in supporting social entrepreneurship. However, measures such as creating a conducive business environment and promoting the establishment of incubators are perceived as less effective. The government may need to improve these measures to support social entrepreneurship.

Reliability analysis is a statistical method used to assess the consistency and stability of a measurement or test. It involves evaluating the degree to which a measurement or test produces consistent and accurate results over time and across different conditions. The main goal of reliability analysis is to determine whether the results of a measurement or test are reliable and can be used with confidence. Reliability analysis can help researchers identify and correct sources of error or inconsistency in their data, improving the accuracy and validity of their findings.

Table 4.3 Reliability Statistics for the perceived role of government in promoting social entrepreneurship

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items	No. of Items/variables
.805	.810	20

Source: Primary data analysis

The above table provides reliability statistics for assessing the internal consistency of a scale measuring the perceived effect of government on social entrepreneurship. Cronbach's alpha coefficient is used to measure internal consistency, which indicates the degree to which the scale items measure the same underlying construct. In this case, Cronbach's alpha coefficient is reported as .805, indicating that the scale has high internal consistency and that the items in the scale measure the same underlying construct with a high degree of reliability. The scale includes 20 items used to measure the perceived effect of government on social entrepreneurship. The high Cronbach's alpha coefficients suggest that the scale is a reliable and valid measure of this construct and can be used confidently to assess the government's perceived effect on social entrepreneurship.

❖ **Exploratory factor analysis of the role of government in promoting Social Entrepreneurship**

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is a statistical technique used to identify underlying factors or dimensions that may be present in a set of variables. The goal of EFA is to determine the underlying structure of a dataset and identify relationships among variables. It is a useful tool for uncovering patterns and relationships in data and for generating hypotheses for further investigation.

Table 4.4 Results of KMO and Bartlett's Test for the perceived role of government in promoting social entrepreneurship

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.871
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2550.913
	D.f.	171
	Sig.	.000

Source: Primary data analysis

The suitability of the data for exploratory factor analysis was checked. This involved two tests, namely, Bartlett's test of sphericity to assess whether the correlation matrix is significantly

different from the identity matrix and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test to measure sampling adequacy. A KMO value greater than 0.6 and a significant Bartlett's chi-square test at a 5% level presented in Table is recommended for factor analysis. Based on the results of these tests, it was determined that the data met the assumptions required for applying exploratory factor analysis.

Outcomes of the Principal Component Analysis showed that the eigenvalues were above one for four variables. Hence, four latent factors can be extracted from the EFA test, which shows the role of the government in promoting social entrepreneurship. Further, table 4.5 shows that these four factors are causing 82 per cent variance in the "role of government in promoting social entrepreneurship", while the remaining 18 per cent is unexplained. The first factor explains 35.62 per cent variance, followed by the second and third factors, i.e. 20.81 per cent and 19.15 per cent, respectively. The last factor is causing the minor variance in the role of the government in promoting SE, i.e. 7.30, per cent.

In factor analysis, both the total variance table and scree plot are used to determine the number of factors to be retained in the final solution. The total variance table extracts variables created on the variance explained and the eigenvalues, whereas the scree plot visually represents the eigenvalues on the y-axis. The elbow of the scree plot indicates the cut-off point for extracting factors, and the point where the eigenvalues drop below one is considered the cut-off point. The elbow is formed at the fifth component in the scree plot, indicating that four factors should be extracted.

The rotated Component Matrix shows factor loadings after rotation. The statements that agglomerate on the same factor are aggregated under one. Four factors are extracted. Factor loadings for the four factors extracted through factor analysis, indicating the degree of association between each variable and the corresponding factor. These factors pertain to the role of the government in promoting SE. The first factor was found to be “**Infrastructure availability**”. This factor covers a total of eight statements from the factor analysis solution. The second factor was found to be “**Financial assistance**”. This factor covers a total of five statements. The third factor was found to be “**Regulations assistance**”. This factor covers a total of four statements. The fourth factor was found to be “**Marketing assistance**”. This factor covers a total of two statements.

❖ Growth Parameters of social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship has emerged as a growing and important phenomenon in recent years, with increasing recognition of its potential to contribute to social and economic development. The growth of social entrepreneurship can be measured through various parameters that provide insights into the scale, scope, and impact of social enterprises.

Table 4.6 Descriptive analysis of growth parameters of social entrepreneurship

Source: Primary data analysis

S. No.	Items	Mean		Std. Deviation
		Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
1	GR1 Recognition received from government/public authority	4.0636	.09515	.99795
2	GR2 Less staff turnover	4.0364	.09659	1.01301
3	GR3 Sustainable financial requirements	3.7545	.09767	1.02435
4	GR4 Received any award so far	4.0182	.08064	.84573
5	GR5 Transparent and fair operating Practices	3.9727	.08514	.89298
6	GR6 Clear spelt out the mission	4.1273	.09930	1.04143
7	GR7 Strong commitment to staff development	3.9909	.09878	1.03601
8	GR8 Faster decision-making process	3.9909	.10689	1.12107
9	GR9 Improved service quality	3.7273	.09828	1.03080
10	GR10 Proper utilisation of resources	3.6909	.09899	1.03822

The above table represents the statistical information related to ten items (GR1 to GR10) measured using a survey questionnaire. The mean and standard deviation values were calculated to describe the responses from 320 respondents who participated in the study.

Item GR1 refers to the **recognition received from government/public authority**, with a mean score of 4.06, indicating that respondents perceived that they received high recognition from the government/public authority. Item GR2 is related to **staff turnover** and has a mean score of 4.04, suggesting that respondents perceived staff turnover was relatively low in their organisations. Item GR3 measures the **sustainable financial requirements** of the organisation, and it has a mean score of 3.75, indicating that respondents had an average level of agreement on the sustainable financial requirements of their organisation. Item GR4 asks respondents whether they **received any awards so far**, and it has a mean score of 4.02, suggesting that respondents perceived that they received awards frequently. Item GR5 is related to **transparent and fair operating practices**. It has a mean score of 3.97, indicating that respondents perceived that their organisation had high transparency and fairness in its operating practices. Item GR6 refers to the **organization's clear and spelt-out mission**, and it has a mean score of 4.13, suggesting that respondents perceived that their organisation had a clear and well-defined mission.

Item GR7 measures the **strong commitment to staff development**, with a mean score of 3.99, indicating that respondents perceived that their organisation had a moderate commitment to staff development. Item GR8 is related to the **decision-making process**. It has a mean score of 3.99, indicating that respondents perceived that their organisation had a moderate level of efficiency in decision-making. Item GR9 measures the **improved service quality of the organisation**, and it

has a mean score of 3.73, indicating that respondents perceived that their organisation had an average level of service quality. Item GR10 is related to the **proper utilisation of resources**, and it has a mean score of 3.69, indicating that respondents perceived that their organisation had an average level of resource utilisation.

❖ **Reliability analysis of growth parameters of social entrepreneurship**

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
.804	10

The reliability of the section “Opinion about the growth parameters of a social entrepreneurship”, consisting of 10 statements, has been measured using the Cronbach’s alpha method, one of the widely used methods for reliability testing. The alpha value should be close to one, which indicates higher reliability, while an alpha value above 0.70 leads to acceptance of the reliability. In the study, Cronbach’s alpha value was found to be 0.804 for all 10 statements, which leads to acceptance of the instrument, and shows that the instrument is reliable. Further, tests on the data have been applied after testing for reliability, and results are given in subsequent sections, along with detailed interpretation.

5. Hypothesis testing

H1: Government plays a significant role in promoting the growth of social entrepreneurship.

The impact of government initiatives has been studied on growth parameters to study the effect of Govt. in promoting SE. In order to measure the role of the government in promoting social entrepreneurship overgrowth, multiple regression analysis has been used. In the multiple regression analysis, four input factors of the "role of government in promoting social entrepreneurship" as the independent variables, and growth parameters of SE were the dependent variable. The regression analysis results are given in detail in this section, along with the interpretation.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. error in the Estimate
1	.726 ^a	.527	.591	.14466
a. Predictors: (Constant), Marketing assistance, Regulations assistance, Financial assistance, Infrastructure availability				
a. Dependent Variable: Growth				
Source: Primary data analysis				

R-value measures the correlation strength and direction amongst the independent and dependent variables. When the value exceeds 0.4, it is considered significant for additional analysis. In this scenario, the value is .726, which suggests a strong correlation between variables. The R-square value signifies the proportion of variability in the dependent variable that can be accounted for by the independent variables. If the value is more significant than 0.5, it suggests a good fit model. In this instance, the R-square is .527, deemed satisfactory. In this case, the Adjusted R-square value is .591, close to the R-square value, indicating a well-fitting model. So, the model summary table is satisfactory to proceed.

Table 5.2 Results of the ANOVA test applied to show the impact of government on the growth of social entrepreneurship						
Model		Sum of Squares	D.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	48.213	4	12.053	576.024	.000
	Residual	2.323	111	.021		
	Total	50.536	115			
a. Dependent Variable: Growth						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Marketing assistance, Regulations and ease of business, Financial assistance, Infrastructure availability						
Source: Primary data analysis						

P-value/ Sig value: Generally, a 95% confidence interval or 5% significance level is chosen for the study. Thus the p-value should be less than 0.05. In Table 7.9 above, it is .000. Therefore, the result is significant. **F-ratio:** In Table 7.9 above, the value is 576.2, which is good. Based on the results, the p-value obtained from the ANOVA table is below the accepted significance level. This indicates sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis and move forward with further analysis.

Table 5.3 Regression coefficients of model showing the impact of government on the growth of social entrepreneurship

Items	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.	Hypothesis results
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	-0.097	0.074		-1.303	0.195	
Infrastructure availability	0.121	0.018	0.134	12.392	0.000	Accepted

Financial assistance	0.187	0.016	0.214	18.341	0.000	Accepted
Regulations assistance	0.185	0.016	0.208	11.566	0.000	Accepted
Marketing assistance	0.212	0.015	0.25	21.074	0.000	Accepted

Source: Primary data analysis

The regression coefficients table 7.10 provides the significance level, represented by the Sig. Value, which is the most critical value for interpretation. The study's significance level must be below 0.05 for a 95% confidence interval. If the Sig. Value is less than 0.05; the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating an impact. On the other hand, if the Sig. Value is more significant than 0.05; the null hypothesis is not rejected, indicating any impact.

In this study, the independent factors of infrastructure availability, financial assistance, regulations assistance, and marketing assistance were found to have a significant positive relationship with the growth factor. The ANOVA table indicates that the p-value is below the tolerable significance level, which suggests that the null hypothesis can be rejected in further analysis.

Table 5.4 Results of hypothesis testing

S. No	Hypothesis	nificanceValue	Result
1.	There is a significant impact of government on the growth of social entrepreneurship.	0.000	Accepted (p<0.05)

Source: Primary data analysis

6. Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the role of government in promoting social entrepreneurship and test the hypothesis that there is a significant impact of government on the growth of social entrepreneurship. The findings suggest that the government does play a crucial role in promoting social entrepreneurship, and the hypothesis is accepted. Four factors were extracted in the study using exploratory factor analysis: infrastructure availability, financial assistance, regulations assistance, and marketing assistance.

The statements that agglomerate on the same factor are aggregated under one. The factors identified in this study highlight the various ways in which the government can support social entrepreneurship.

India, as a developing country, faces a wide range of social and environmental challenges such as poverty, lack of access to education, healthcare, and basic services, environmental degradation,

and climate change. In this context, social entrepreneurship has emerged as a powerful tool for addressing these challenges, creating employment opportunities, and promoting sustainable development.

The first factor, infrastructure availability, highlights the importance of having access to physical and technological infrastructure that supports social entrepreneurship. The second factor, financial assistance, emphasises social entrepreneurs' need for financial support to start and grow their businesses. The third factor, regulations assistance, underscores the importance of a regulatory environment that supports social entrepreneurship and enables entrepreneurs to operate legally and efficiently. Finally, the fourth factor, marketing assistance, highlights the importance of marketing and promoting social entrepreneurship to raise awareness and attract investors and customers.

Overall, the findings of this study suggest that the government has a significant impact on the growth of social entrepreneurship. The government can play a crucial role in promoting social entrepreneurship by providing infrastructure, financial, regulatory, and marketing assistance.

7. References:

Agrawal, A., & Sahasranamam, S. (2016). Corporate social entrepreneurship in India. *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 5(2), 214–233.

Ault, J. K. (2016). An institutional perspective on the social outcome of entrepreneurship: Commercial microfinance and inclusive markets. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 47(8), 951–967.

Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei–Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both?. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 30(1), 1-22.

Bacq, S., & Janssen, F. (2011). The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(5-6), 373-403.

Chell, E., Spence, L. J., Perrini, F., & Harris, J. D. (2016). Social Entrepreneurship and Business Ethics: Does Social Equal Ethical? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133(4), 619–625. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2439-6>

Chepurensko, A. (2015). Entrepreneurship theory: New challenges and future prospects. *Форсайт*, 9(2 (eng)), 44-57.

Chikoko, C., & Sajuyigbe, A. S. (2020). Social entrepreneurship and community development: A review of literature. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 23(3), 1-13.

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.

Dees, J. G. (2001). The meaning of “social entrepreneurship.” Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship.

Dwivedi, A., & Weerawardena, J. (2018). Conceptualizing and operationalizing the social entrepreneurship construct. *Journal of Business Research*, 86(January), 32–40.

Guha, S., & Srivastava, A. (2022). Social entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation: A literature review. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 14(1), 1-19.

Huang, S. C., & Cox, J. L. (2016). Establishing a social entrepreneurial system to bridge the digital divide for the poor: a case study for Taiwan. *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 15, 219-236.

Idris, N., & Tan, J. (2017). Review of literature on women entrepreneurs. *Journal of Global Business and Social Entrepreneurship (GBSE)*, 1(3), 1-11.

Ismail, S., & Wan Ismail, W. K. (2021). The impact of social entrepreneurship on social innovation: Evidence from Malaysia. *Journal of Business and Social Sciences Research*, 6(2), 57-70.

Lumpkin, G. T., Moss, T. W., Gras, D. M., Kato, S., & Amezcua, A. S. (2013). Entrepreneurial processes in social contexts: how are they different, if at all?. *Small Business Economics*, 40, 761-783.

Macleane, M., Harvey, C., & Gordon, J. (2013). Social innovation, social entrepreneurship and the practice of contemporary entrepreneurial philanthropy. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(7), 747-763.

Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2021). Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future challenges. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 12(2), 159-183.

Mokaya, S., & Bitange, N. (2022). Social entrepreneurship and access to finance: A systematic review. *Journal of Business and Economic Development*, 7(1), 13-22.

Nair, S. R. (2023). To examine women social entrepreneurial ecosystems: Opportunities and challenges. *Research Anthology on Approaches to Social and Sustainable Entrepreneurship*, 944-963.

Nicholls, A. (2010). The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: Reflexive isomorphism in a pre-paradigmatic field. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 34(4), 611-633.

Nicholls, A., & Cho, A. H. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: The structuration of a field. *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change*, 34(4), 99-118.

Rawal, T. (2018). A study of Social Entrepreneurship in India. *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 5(01), 70-95.

Rymsza, M. (2015). The role of social enterprises in shaping social bonds. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 42(9), 830-840.

Thaker, J. K., Chakrawal, A., & Goyal, P. (2017). A Study of Innovative Attitude of Indian Entrepreneurs of Various Industries in the Context to Educational and Economic Background. *International Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3(6), 1-10.

Tiwari, P., Bhat, A. K., & Tikoria, J. (2017). Predictors of social entrepreneurial intention: an empirical study. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 6(1), 53-79. <http://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-04-2016-0032>

Varghese, R. M., & Jaffer, N. M. (2020). An Indian Perspective on Mainstream Entrepreneurship Narratives. *S No Paper & Author (s)*.

Yalala, N. (2015). The Role of Community Radio in Empowering Women in India. *Journal of Mass Communication & Journalism*, 05(02), 2-5.