




“Social entrepreneurship and networking challenges: Impact on sustainable development in South Africa”

AUTHORS	Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh  Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya 
ARTICLE INFO	Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh and Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya (2022). Social entrepreneurship and networking challenges: Impact on sustainable development in South Africa. <i>Problems and Perspectives in Management</i> , 20(4), 195-209. doi: 10.21511/ppm.20(4).2022.15
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20(4).2022.15
RELEASED ON	Thursday, 17 November 2022
RECEIVED ON	Friday, 26 August 2022
ACCEPTED ON	Tuesday, 18 October 2022
LICENSE	 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
JOURNAL	"Problems and Perspectives in Management"
ISSN PRINT	1727-7051
ISSN ONLINE	1810-5467
PUBLISHER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”
FOUNDER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

77



NUMBER OF FIGURES

0



NUMBER OF TABLES

3

© The author(s) 2023. This publication is an open access article.


BUSINESS PERSPECTIVES


LLC "CPC "Business Perspectives"
Hryhorii Skovoroda lane, 10,
Sumy, 40022, Ukraine
www.businessperspectives.org

Received on: 26th of August, 2022

Accepted on: 18th of October, 2022

Published on: 17th of November, 2022

© Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh, Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya, 2022

Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh, Ph.D.,
Department of Entrepreneurial
Studies and Management, Faculty
of Management Sciences, Durban
University of Technology, South Africa.
(Corresponding author)

Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya, Ph.D.,
Department of Entrepreneurial
Studies and Management, Faculty
of Management Sciences, Durban
University of Technology, South Africa.



This is an Open Access article,
distributed under the terms of the
[Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits
unrestricted re-use, distribution, and
reproduction in any medium, provided
the original work is properly cited.

Conflict of interest statement:

Author(s) reported no conflict of interest

Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh (South Africa), Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya (South Africa)

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND NETWORKING CHALLENGES: IMPACT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Abstract

The overwhelming complexity of achieving sustainable development globally, including in South Africa, requires the networking and partnerships of all stakeholders. This paper reports networking challenges affecting social entrepreneurship's contribution to sustainable development. The study aimed to investigate and analyze the impact of networking challenges on social entrepreneurship contribution to sustainable development in the townships in KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) province. The study is quantitative and was conducted in three KZN township communities. The sample consisted of 90 social entrepreneurs selected using a snowball sampling technique. The respondents completed a self-administered close-ended questionnaire (employing a five-point Likert scale). The data were analyzed using SPSS (27.0 version). Cronbach's Alpha of 0.808 indicated the reliability of the questionnaire as a measuring instrument for this study. The study revealed that lack of partnerships and networking with other social entrepreneurs, insufficient networking and partnership with corporate organizations, absence of networking and partnerships with government, and lack of platform use for social networking, affect social entrepreneurs' activities. A chi-square test also revealed that all the tested variables were statistically significant, with a p-value = .000.

Keywords

social entrepreneurship, sustainable development, social networking, townships, KwaZulu-Natal province

JEL Classification

L31, Q01

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the importance of networking for business growth and survival cannot be overemphasized. Networking is considered crucial for entrepreneurs, regardless of their context, as it brings stability regarding access to information, finances, knowledge, and market insight. It also aids moral support (Subrahmanyam, 2019; Oprica, 2013). These networking characteristics could be instrumental for business performance globally, especially for social entrepreneurs who use small-scale, flexible, and local efforts to address social issues and human needs (Bansal et al., 2019). Scholars have argued that through necessary interfaces among stakeholders, social entrepreneurs can create good social value and enhance their contribution to sustainable development (Seelos & Mair, 2004). For instance, large organizations are engaging in activities through their corporate social responsibility (CSR) that could potentially meet the needs of people in local communities. However, these efforts may not reach the poor people who really need them. This emphasizes the need for networking and partnership with social entrepreneurs with better knowledge of their local communities. Existing data show that social entrepreneurs cannot be self-sustained in this rapidly increasing environmental uncertainty.

Instead, they need to be interconnected and share their ideas and resources, as well as with other stakeholders (Javed et al., 2019). This will enable social entrepreneurs to adequately utilize their innovative and creative ways to address social issues.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

The ever-changing business environment globally, including in SA, has made networking a crucial concept. In addition, networking has become an important aspect of business growth and survival for small and medium enterprises (SMEs), including social enterprises (SEs). It is generally accepted that enterprises require access to investors to grow and should establish and nurture relevant contacts through networking, which affects business success positively through improved market reach. Most studies have mentioned the importance of networking for business success, particularly for SEs. For instance, Hassan et al. (2022) highlighted that forming a viable network with multiple stakeholders can help bridge gaps, improve SE growth, produce social benefits, and answer major social issues that will continuously improve societies, economies, and the environment. However, empirical level studies on networking challenges remain insufficient, especially from a KZN township perspective. According to Bignotti and Myres (2022), the lack of networking and partnership for SEs can create some level of disconnect. It may result in them struggling to obtain the necessary assistance to achieve their local communities' goals and objectives.

Despite many scholars highlighting the practical importance of networking to social entrepreneurs, in SA, networking that will enhance social entrepreneurs' activities and their contribution to sustainable development is limited and lacks coordination (Moreno & Agapitova, 2017a). Fifty percent of SEs in SA have limited access to investors (no relevant contacts) because of a lack of networking (Lovasic & Cooper, 2020).

In the past, many authors attempted to define the concept of networking. For example, Bandgar (2014) and Bhagwat and Goutam (2013) described networking as the direct or indirect interactions developed by individuals and businesses through shared activities, perspectives, or backgrounds.

Likewise, Atsan (2019, p. 233) described networking as adopting "an innovative approach and creative use of resources and contacts to satisfy the needs the state welfare and private system cannot or will not meet." In other words, networking is a necessary part of social entrepreneurs' activities, which allows the creation of social value to address societal challenges the state and private sector have been unable to deal with. Nevertheless, networking could also signify the establishing, nurturing, and maintaining long-term relationships with people and businesses that will enable both parties to thrive from each other (Sargenton, 2021; Chukuakadibia & Chijioke, 2018). Hence, a strong network is considered critical in differentiating between social entrepreneurs who can successfully achieve their social mission and those who fail.

According to Borgatti and Ofem (2010), the web of relationships developed within a social environment significantly influences the ability to identify a business opportunity. Individuals can form networks based on their different social interactions that can be instrumental in developing a business idea or expanding an already existing business (Desta, 2015). This view is supported by Písař and Tomášková (2020). They marked that relationships built through networking ensure businesses, including SEs, function effectively and enhance their competitiveness. In other words, the relationships among actors in a particular social environment could drive social entrepreneurs to contribute to sustainable development. With the help of networking, social entrepreneurs can identify social problems within local communities that can be developed into a lucrative profit-making business while creating social values.

Seelos and Mair (2004) highlighted the importance of interfaces between various contributors, such as corporate organizations, government, philanthropic foundations, and development grants, which can create a bridge that encourages networking and partnerships with SEs that will enhance their contribution to sustainable develop-

ment. The magnitude of resources these interfaces can generate may be why Atsan (2019) argues that social entrepreneurs need to be constantly connected and build networks to help them achieve better results as organizations and adequately create social values needed in society. In other words, the lack of networking can affect SEs access to resources from various contributors within their social environment and may negatively affect their activities.

Networking is vital to SEs, since engagement and activity in networking could enable managers, including those in SEs to overcome numerous barriers within their business environment (Konrad, 2013). Further to this, Kasemsap (2014, p. 184) adds that “entrepreneurs in social networks with high loyalty level among members are able to reduce entrepreneurial risks, specifically in those environments with high uncertainty level.” This is supported by Turkina (2018, p. 1), who asserts that “social networks can stimulate business growth by reducing transaction costs, creating business opportunities, and generating knowledge spill-over.” This means networking can be vital in helping SEs overcome the various challenges hindering their activities in local communities such as townships.

Weber and Kratzer (2013, p. 217) found that social entrepreneurs’ social and financial success is “influenced by their social network, mobilized through network quantity, spread and diversity.” Furthermore, networks can provide SEs with the necessary support required during the difficult early phase of conceptualizing their business ideas (Folmer et al., 2018), especially in uncertain environments like local communities. Networks provide social entrepreneurs access to other connections and skills while enabling them to achieve success through their ability to transcend their

limitations through others (Oprica, 2013). Hence, a network is a precious resource that will enable social entrepreneurs to overcome challenges, enhance their activities and improve their sustainability in local communities, such as townships in KZN. Table 1 shows the definition of networking from the perspective of different authors.

The definition of social entrepreneurship has been a heated debate among scholars because of the increasing interest and overlapping contributions from various disciplines, such as sociology or economics (Matsimela, 2017). For example, Saebi et al. (2019, p. 72) mentioned that many authors have based their description of social entrepreneurship on the actions of social entrepreneurs, the balancing of social value creation and profit generation of the SE, or the method used in the creation of social value. However, Nicolls and Collavo (2019) highlighted the hybrid nature of social entrepreneurship that makes it a context-based phenomenon that can function in different sectors of an economy.

In the South African context, Visser (2011, p. 236) describes social entrepreneurship as the “collaboration of different practices that effectively solves (and can solve) social problems.” Chipeta et al. (2020) describe social entrepreneurship as the drive to develop opportunities and create positive effects from socio-economic challenges within society. In addition, Watters et al. (2012, p. 2) stated that “a social enterprise’s primary objective is to address social problems through a financially sustainable business model where surpluses (if any) are mainly reinvested for that purpose.” However, according to Barnard (2019, p. 3), “the majority of social enterprises in SA are extremely small, i.e., micro-social enterprises; they are typically informal and operate purely locally – in a single town-

Table 1. Definitions of networking

Source	Definition
Manello et al. (2020, p. 331)	A self-reported activity that may refer to very different kinds of interactions and different levels of corporations, spanning from those that are quite formal in nature, to those formalized through specific contractual agreements.
De Klerk (2010, p. 37)	It is the underlying determination of an individual to acquire what he or she needs/desires from the other person.
Forret and Dougherty (2001, p. 284)	It is individuals’ attempts to develop and maintain relationships with others who have the potential to assist them in their work or career.
Chisholm (1998, p. xxi)	It is a set of autonomous organizations that come together to reach goals that none of them can reach separately. It represents a comparatively new and increasingly important form of organization – one that reflects the environmental conditions in which organizations operate.

ship or suburb; they have a median of 53 beneficiaries and 8 employees and have a total annual income of less than R300 000 (about US \$25 000).” Obviously, there is a need for networking if social entrepreneurship is to thrive and grow in SA.

Despite many studies, such as Littlewood and Holts (2018), Kerrin et al. (2018), and Watters et al. (2012), highlighting social entrepreneurship as a critical tool that can help address some of the social ills affecting South Africa and contribute to its sustainable development, challenges with regards to networking could be a major hindrance.

Effective networking between social entrepreneurs is crucial to their survival and growth. Networking between entrepreneurs enables them to share knowledge gained from one another, which, according to Mary et al. (2019), will serve as a benefit for business and personal growth, gaining referral, motivation and confidence, and learning from knowledge and experience from like-minded people. Networking and partnering with each other can help social entrepreneurs increase their social impact, share the cost of doing business, as well as growing stronger together (Masi, 2021). However, in SA, professional network access between like-minded social entrepreneurs remains a significant challenge, affecting access to mentors for appropriate guidance, financial resources, business expansion, and other opportunities that linking with each other can bring (Fatoki & Garwe, 2010; van Vuuren, 2022). A study conducted in the Free State by the International Labour Organization (ILO) (2013) highlighted that social entrepreneurs do not have a network among themselves, limiting their ability to work together to create more social value. This means the lack of networking between social entrepreneurs can affect their contribution to sustainable development. In addition, the lack of networking among social entrepreneurs makes it difficult for them to find information about different available financial services and products while also making the application process onerous and time-consuming (ILO, 2016). This networking between entrepreneurs becomes a social capital that Subrahmanyam (2019, p. 121) explains as containing “information, ideas, business opportunities, financial capital, emotional support and many more.” Hence, for social entrepreneurs to successfully contribute to sustainable devel-

opment, they need to embrace networking with each other as it affects the movement of valuable information, serves as a vital path for reward or punishment, and helps trust to emerge (Dufays & Huybrechts, 2014; Sesale & Seeletse, 2017).

Social entrepreneurship and CSR are two alternative paths that, according to Niño (2015), aim at the same goal of social value creation and creating a better life for the marginalized in local communities; nonetheless, they use different approaches, but both are required. On the other hand, Saebi et al. (2019) maintain that CSR comprises initiatives that fall within the profit-maximizing objectives of the firm and are directed toward shareholder value appropriation. Nevertheless, Mitra and Borza (2012) believe it is possible for companies to not only be a factor that triggers social entrepreneurship but also create cross-collaboration between companies and social entrepreneurs, which will enhance the potential of positively impacting the social problem-solving process. Moreover, Mitra and Borza (2012, p. 111) state that those companies that promote social entrepreneurship “will gain notoriety and a positive image, with good results in economic activities.”

In SA, however, a lack of networking and partnership with corporate organizations affects social entrepreneurs in terms of access to knowledge, finance, and social capital, which are typically crucial for venture start-ups (Littlewood & Holt, 2018). In addition, the lack of large corporations networking and partnering with SEs limits their ability to address the various environmental challenges they face when they develop and sustain their business models (Park et al., 2018). It is emphasized by Mitra and Borza (2010) that social involvement is often based on networking, collaboration, and partnerships, and the lack of these affects CSR policies, as companies need to identify an operating partner (businesses, social mission organizations) in the community with experience and knowledge of the problems affecting the community. This supports Seelos and Mair (2005) that a promising model to ensure sustainable development is achieved by creating a link between social entrepreneurship and CSR programs. Since social entrepreneurs have a better understanding of their local environment and can identify opportunities that require interventions to better their commu-

nities, this network, collaboration, and partnerships will help companies engage in real projects that address relevant needs.

The insufficient resources available within the environment where social entrepreneurs' activities take place require that they may put their faith in collaborations and networking to mobilize resources and generate adequate social capital to achieve their social mission for their communities (Griffiths et al., 2013). An increasing overlap and collaboration exist between social entrepreneurs, IOs, NGOs, and development institutions, which Seelos and Mair (2005) maintain as crucial for value creation support to sustainable development. This makes it important for public institutions such as the government to cooperate and network with social entrepreneurs to conquer more social problems by directing supportive regulatory mechanisms and policies to facilitate and stimulate further development of the SE ecosystem (Gigauri & Damenia, 2020).

Nevertheless, there are limited state resources and support in SA, as well as an absence of a dedicated legal status for SEs, which remains a major challenge affecting social entrepreneurs' contribution to sustainable development (Littlewood & Holt, 2018; Kerrin et al., 2018; Dzomonda, 2021). Furthermore, ILO (2013) revealed a strained relationship between social entrepreneurs and the government because of insufficient ground activities in government departments, complicating funding access. In addition, the lack of this network prevents social entrepreneurs from acquiring business skills, such as proposal writing, usually developed during government-organized training sessions (ILO, 2013). To enhance the network and partnerships with government, countries such as France, the United Kingdom, Canada, and parts of the United States have developed measures to stimulate investments in the social economy, including establishing specialized banks to support SEs and providing guarantees on investor capital to support innovative financial structures. The Covid-19 pandemic was overwhelming and devastating for many social entrepreneurs. As such, the lack of network and partnership with the government needs to be addressed with urgency in order for social entrepreneurs to thrive and grow (Hosking, 2021). The networking and partnership between social entrepreneurs and public institutions

are mentioned by Prasetyo et al. (2021, p. 2566) as a "new model of innovation that is capable of optimizing resources use, overcoming socio-economic problems and poverty, and productivity, in addition to strengthening mechanisms to promote public and private institutional policy implementation."

The world's biggest commercial social networking platforms, for example, Facebook, can generate bridging and linking connections to provide comprehensive informational support to social entrepreneurs (Oprica, 2013). For better results and long-lasting initiatives, there could be tremendous benefits to social entrepreneurs from the audience, reach, as well as potential virality of the vast array of social networking platforms (Abi-Aad, 2015). Nevertheless, to build audience and participation mostly happens on networking platforms, Vijayann (2013) mentioned that any form of digital disconnect would create a massive challenge for social entrepreneurs to interact with their audience. Thus, the evolution of technology and ubiquitous digital technologies, such as social media and social networking platforms, has created a much more simplistic way for social entrepreneurs to build close relationships with one another, along with building other forms of partnerships and collaborations; the lack of its practical use will have a damaging effect on the SE (Islam & Chitran, 2019). Furthermore, Scutto et al. (2017) and Assensoh-Kodua (2016) suggested that the lack of social networking platform use can limit entrepreneurs from actively interacting with relevant stakeholders, which can equip them with critical skills needed for generating innovation.

In SA, it is believed that despite the government and private sector programs available to support SMMEs, including social entrepreneurs, their failure rate remains high because of the lack of the use of social networking platforms (Chimucheka et al., 2019). The use by social entrepreneurs of networking on social platforms, such as those most used, including Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram, and Twitter, can help improve their social value creation. Several stakeholders within an environment have key roles to play in order to achieve sustainable development. Therefore, it becomes necessary for all stakeholders to identify ways of improving their networks and partnerships for greater success in addressing social ills.

The main aim of this paper was to investigate social entrepreneurs' awareness of networking challenges affecting their contribution to sustainable development in the KZN townships. In addition, this study raised the question of the perceptions of social entrepreneurs in the KZN townships regarding the impact of networking challenges on the contribution to sustainable development. Given the literature review, the hypotheses to be tested are:

- H1: *Lack of networking and partnership among social entrepreneurs affects their contribution to sustainable development in the KZN townships.*
- H2: *Lack of networking and partnership with corporate organizations affects social entrepreneurs' contribution to sustainable development in the KZN townships.*
- H3: *Lack of networking and partnership with the government affects social entrepreneurs' contribution to sustainable development in the KZN townships.*
- H4: *Lack of the use of social networking platforms affects social entrepreneurs' contribution to sustainable development in the KZN townships.*

2. METHODOLOGY

A quantitative study was used as it refers to a set of strategies, techniques, and assumptions used to study social and economic processes through exploring numerical patterns (Coghlan, 2014), which includes methodologies such as questionnaires, structured observations, or experiments. For this study, a questionnaire was developed with which primary data were collected from 90 social entrepreneurs in three townships in the province of KZN, South Africa. These townships include Inanda, Ntuzuma, and KwaMashu. The desired sample was obtained through non-probability sampling, namely snowball sampling. Cohen and Arieli (2011, p. 424) explained that “the sample group grows like a rolling snowball as one participant introduces the researcher to another participant who fits the research criteria, which in turn

introduces the researcher to a third participant, etc.” Snowball sampling was used because SEs are an emerging venture in SA and, as such, there is a lack of a specific regulatory framework for SEs as a sector or subsector (Kerrin et al., 2018; Kajiita & Kang’ethe, 2020; Dzomonda, 2021). Hence, their population is unknown, and no specific database exists for social entrepreneurs in SA from which to constitute a sampling frame. The inclusion criteria used in similar studies, such as that of Dzomonda (2021), included that the social entrepreneur had been running the business for at least the previous 12 months, is working toward addressing a social issue without personal gain, was either listed or hoping to, shortly, register on the Social Development Department’s database, and is involved in an income generating venture.

The measurement instrument developed from reviewed literature as a source of information comprised a questionnaire with closed-ended questions, which was self-administered. The validity of the content and construct were evaluated using a questionnaire and was piloted with a smaller sample similar to the population. Collected data were analyzed using SPSS 27.0 version. Statistical testing for this study found it a good fit for all the items in the questionnaire (Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.808) > 0.75. This shows an acceptable reliability score for this study. The demographic information of respondents is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Demographic information of surveyed social entrepreneurs

Variables	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Educational background	Matric	10	11.1
	Diploma/Certificate	31	34.4
	Degree	19	21.1
	Honors	17	18.9
	Masters	10	11.1
	PhD	2	2.2
	Others	1	1.1
Age group	18-25	16	17.8
	26-32	33	36.7
	33-39	25	27.8
	40-49	9	10.0
	More than 50	7	7.8
Gender	Male	39	43.3
	Female	51	56.7
Location	Inanda	30	33.3
	Ntuzuma	30	33.3
	KwaMashu	30	33.3

Table 2 (cont.). Demographic information of surveyed social entrepreneurs

Variables	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Type of social enterprise	Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)	16	17.8
	Not-for-Profit Organizations (NPOs)	26	28.9
	Hybrid	13	14.4
	Profit oriented	33	36.7
	Others	2	2.2
How is the social enterprise owned?	Partnership	16	17.8
	Manager and sole owner	42	46.7
	Manager and jointly owned	19	21.1
Years of operation	Others	13	14.4
	1-2 years	14	15.6
	3-5 years	35	38.9
	6-8 years	28	31.1
	9-11 years	4	4.4
	More than 11 years	9	10

Table 2 shows that the highest qualification of most participating social entrepreneurs surveyed was a diploma/certificate (34.4%), while 21.1% had obtained a degree. Most SEs are operated by women (56.7%), with men owning/managing 43.3%. Considering participants' age, those between 26 and 32 constituted the highest percentage (36.7%), followed by participants aged 33 to 39 (27.8%). Most of the SEs (33 or 36.7%) are profit-oriented, with 26 (28.9%) operating as NPOs, while a total of 16 (17.8%) are NGOs, and 13 (14.4%) SEs are hybrid. While the majority of the SEs (42 or 46.7%) is solely owned, 19 (21.1%) are jointly owned. In terms of years of operation, most SEs (35 or 38.9%) have been operating for three to five years, with 28 (31.1%) operating for six to eight years. The collection of this information was considered crucial to the field of social entrepreneurship because Kerrin et al. (2018) show that the characteristics of social entrepreneurs contribute to their ability to be innovative and creative.

3. RESULTS

The frequency distribution, descriptive and inferential statistics (chi-square test) regarding the outcome of insufficient networking, where the contribution by social entrepreneurship to sustainable development in KZN townships is concerned, are shown in Table 3.

A total of 90 social entrepreneurs were made allowance for in the study. In terms of the lack of social entrepreneurs' networking and partnership with other social entrepreneurs having an impact on their activities, 24 (26.7%) and 36 (40.0%) agreed with the statement. There were 11 (12.2%) respondents who were unsure whether they agreed or not, while disagreement with the statement was indicated by 13 (14.4%) and 6 (6.7%) respondents. The use of a chi-square test ascertained whether the networking and partnership lack among social entrepreneurs affects their activities and contribution to sustainable development in the KZN townships where the study was conducted. The null hypothesis was developed on the basis that the expected responses to the question are uniform. Results indicate that $\chi^2 = 32.111$; $df = 4$; $P = 0.000$ for this variable, indicating that the responses observed differed statistically from the expected responses. In other words, the null hypothesis is rejected, and this study concludes that a lack of networking and partnership with other social entrepreneurs affects their activities.

In terms of the lack of networking and partnership with corporate organizations impacting social entrepreneurs' activities, 32 (35.6%) and 36 (40.0%) agreed with the statement. In comparison, 12 (13.3%) of the respondents were neutral, with 7 (7.8%) and 3 (3.3%) respondents disagreeing with the statement. These findings are supported by a chi-square test, performed to determine if insufficient networking and partnership with corporate organizations affect social entrepreneurs' activities and their contribution to sustainable development in the KZN townships under study. The results for this variable indicate that $\chi^2 = 50.111$; $df = 4$; $P = 0.000$, signaling that the networking and partnership lack by corporate organizations significantly impact social entrepreneurs' activities and, as such, negatively affect their contribution to sustainable development. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Concerning the lack of networking and partnership with the government, 33 (36.7%) and 32 (35.6%) agreed with the statement, with 13 (14.4%) neutral respondents, and 7 (7.8%) and 5 (5.6%) disagreed. A chi-square test was conducted to ascertain whether insufficient networking and govern-

Table 3. Frequency distribution, descriptive statistics, and chi-square statistics of the networking challenges

Statement		Frequency Distribution						Descriptive Statistics		Chi-square Statistics			N
		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	% Agree/Strongly Agree	Mean	Std Dev	χ^2	df	p-value	
Social entrepreneurs' activities are affected by a lack of networking and partnership with other social entrepreneurs	Count	24	36	11	13	6	60	2.3444	1.21008	32.111	4	0.000	90
	%	26.7	40.0	12.2	14.4	6.7	66.7						
Social entrepreneurs' activities are affected by a lack of networking and partnership with corporate organizations	Count	32	36	12	7	3	68	2.0333	1.05415	50.111	4	0.000	90
	%	35.6	40.0	13.3	7.8	3.3	75.6						
Social entrepreneurs' activities are affected by a lack of networking and partnership with the government	Count	33	32	13	7	5	65	2.1000	1.15194	40.889	4	0.000	90
	%	36.7	35.6	14.4	7.8	5.6	72.2						
Social entrepreneurs' activities are affected by the lack of use of platforms for social networking	Count	20	39	12	12	7	59	2.4111	1.19826	35.444	4	0.000	90
	%	22.2	43.3	13.3	13.3	7.8	65.6						

ment partnership affect social entrepreneurs' activities. For this variable, the results show that $\chi^2 = 40.889$; $df = 4$; $P = 0.000$, which points to the lack of networking and partnership with the government affecting social entrepreneurs' activities and their contribution to sustainable development in the selected KZN townships. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Considering the lack of use of social networking platforms, 20 (22.2%) and 39 (43.3%) respondents agreed with the statement, while 12 (13.3%) were unsure and remained neutral, 12 (13.3%) and 7 (7.8%) disagreed. A chi-square test was performed to show whether the lack of social networking platforms' use affects social entrepreneurs' activities. It was revealed by the results that $\chi^2 = 35.444$; $df = 4$; $P = 0.000$, signaling that social entrepreneurs' activities and their contribution to sustainable development in the KZN townships are affected by the lack of use of social networking platforms. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

4. DISCUSSION

This paper reported on an investigation into the impact networking challenges have on social entrepreneurs' contribution to sustainable development in selected townships in KZN. The study findings showed that SA social entrepreneurs have to manage networking challenges affecting their ability to effectively and sufficiently create social values intended to deal with socio-economic problems in local communities. Other existing findings collaborated with the study findings.

For example, resources brought by networks, such as "information, ideas, business opportunities, and financial capital, as well as emotional support, may remain hidden or inaccessible when the network is not well-built or managed" (Subrahmanyam, 2019, p. 121). Considering the specific impact networking challenges have on social entrepreneurs in KZN townships, most respondents believed that the lack of social networking platform use had a significant impact on social entrepreneurs. As indicated by the results, most (65.6%) of the surveyed social entrepreneurs agreed that insufficient use of social networking platforms affects their activities.

It is noteworthy that social networking platforms have become crucial for entrepreneurs to share information with their customers, interact with wider society and cooperate with other businesses. Hence, not having access to these resources impedes social entrepreneurs from achieving their objectives.

These findings support other existing studies. For instance, Lekhanya (2013), in a study conducted in KZN, concluded that most SMMEs use social media and social networks to socialize with friends and families instead of using them for business purposes. During a crisis, such as the Covid-19 pandemic, Fubah and Moos (2022) assert that the lack of use of social networking platforms will affect not only the online presence of SMEs in SA, but their general operations. In addition, Al Harrasi et al. (2022) found that the inability to adequately understand the dynamic nature of social media and social networks makes many businesses shy away from it, while its primary purpose is to enhance business brands, market goods, and services, as well as networking. To that effect, many social entrepreneurs are challenged to access information, finance, markets, and insights, as they lack the ability to promote their businesses and services or receive moral support.

Lack of networking and partnership with other social entrepreneurs was regarded to have a significant impact on social entrepreneurs. Respondents (66.7%) agreed it was a challenge that significantly impacted social entrepreneurs' activities and their contribution to sustainable development in the KZN townships. This supports the findings by Dodd and Keles (2014). Thus, a lack of networking and partnership with other entrepreneurs increases the danger of an entrepreneur becoming isolated, hindering multiple benefits from warm and trusting interaction, limiting entrepreneurial learning and knowledge-sharing, and affecting the expansion of the entrepreneurs' latent resource base. In addition, Mary et al. (2019) established a significantly positive relationship between networking and functions of social entrepreneurs, along with insufficient networking and partnering with each other can affect their marketing, risk management, their sustainability, and social value creation. This is because social entrepreneurs need each other, and a collective effort will increase the level of social ills they address.

Other scholars believe that a lack of networking and partnership with other social entrepreneurs may affect new firm creation and growth and access to resources directly or indirectly (Zhang, 2010). Networking and partnering with other social entrepreneurs create the opportunity to be mutually dependent and beneficial to all parties. According to Bjärsholm (2018), this helps social entrepreneurs to reduce their dependence on financial support. This dependence is usually a burden to social entrepreneurs. Building strong relationships with other social entrepreneurs is not only for short-term gains but also for an outlook in the long-term and other benefits is crucial for social entrepreneurs (Mthembu & Barnard, 2019). Zimmer and Pearson (2019) note that funding pressure often fosters competition between social entrepreneurs instead of collaborations, potentially affecting their impact on the communities they serve.

Lack of networking and partnership with the government was considered to have an impact on social entrepreneurs' activities, with the majority of the respondents (72.2%) agreeing that this affects contribution to sustainable development in the townships in KZN. The findings support other current surveys in SA and other environments. Inadequate support from the government remains a critical factor, which Dzomonda (2021) found to affect social entrepreneurs in SA. Despite SMMEs, including social entrepreneurs, being considered drivers of economic growth and job creation in SA, more outstanding networking and partnership with the government are still required for the country's entrepreneurs to operate at full capacity (Breytenbach, 2016). Social entrepreneurs use innovative and creative ways to address social ills the government has been unable to address. However, the relationship between the government and social entrepreneurs in SA should not be a trade-off. Instead, it is a relationship best understood as synergistic (Barnard, 2019).

According to Moreno and Agapitova (2017b), in developing countries, including SA, the government's lack of a supportive ecosystem or enabling environment affects social entrepreneurs' growth and their contribution to achieving sustainable development goals. To that effect, in developing countries, including SA, policymak-

ers may comprehend the critical contribution to sustainable development that social entrepreneurs could make. However, the support and networking systems necessary to encourage individual perceptions to embrace social entrepreneurship and help the sector to grow have not been strengthened (Kerrin et al., 2018; Gigauri & Damenia, 2020).

Lack of networking and partnership with corporate organizations significantly influenced social entrepreneurs' contribution to sustainable development in the KZN townships, with 75.6% of the respondents agreeing. In this regard, it is pertinent to understand that social entrepreneurs require the help of corporate organizations with their daily activities. Although Park et al. (2018) have highlighted that networking and partnerships between social entrepreneurs and corporate organizations are not always straightforward, as there are many obstacles, consisting of whom to partner with, the risk involved, and the management of unforeseen crises. It is maintained by the Acumen (2015) report that support and partnership from corporate organizations can help social entrepreneurs achieve large-scale impact in more sustainable ways. Nonetheless, significant scaling, pacing, and risk tolerance issues still need to be overcome.

The need for networking and partnership from corporate organizations in enhancing social entrepreneurs' contribution to sustainable development cannot be overemphasized. This is because the scale and complexity of today's social and environmental challenges require comprehensive and lasting solutions that are often beyond one organization, which means collaboration and partnership become essential (Zakaras, 2021). In addition, social entrepreneurs need this partnership and network as corporate organizations are efficient, highly knowledgeable, have extensive and international networks, and can get things done (Hope, 2022). Networking and partnership with corporate organizations can be a catalyst for change, providing the means for social entrepreneurs to access finance, strengthen their market position, build up their network, improve their scale, and attract management commitment (Urmanavičienė et al., 2021).

CONCLUSION

It has been noted that a pivotal part is played by networking in the contribution of social entrepreneurs to sustainable development in KZN townships. This study attempted to understand the impact of networking challenges on social entrepreneurs and their contribution to sustainable development. The result of this paper indicates that networking challenges remain a setback for social entrepreneurs' value creation. Lack of networking and partnership among social entrepreneurs increases their chances of being isolated and not accessing adequate information. This study also revealed that a lack of networking and partnership with corporate organizations prevents social entrepreneurs from accessing finance and the technical know-how to help them grow and thrive. Lack of networking and partnership with the government is considered a critical hindrance to a supportive ecosystem or conducive environment for a social entrepreneur's success. In addition, this study shows that the lack of the use of social networking platforms limits social entrepreneurs from reaching their customers and potential investors. The study findings also support social network theory, where the web of relationships within a social environment is essential for business growth and development, including SEs.

Therefore, the networking issue needs to be addressed by social entrepreneurs to function at maximum capacity and produce social value that will have any form of impact on the KZN township communities. Based on the above findings, it is recommended that social entrepreneurs utilize social networking websites and other social media platforms. In addition, corporate organizations should identify and partner with social entrepreneurs because of their better understanding of the social challenges affecting their communities. The government can also provide all necessary support, such as funds and resources, and collaborate with social entrepreneurs to identify and address the pressing issues affecting township communities. Finally, social entrepreneurs need to have a thorough knowledge of their market environment and know or at least be aware of other social entrepreneurs operating in their community to collaborate and partner with them to improve their mutual social value. Further study may be conducted with a larger sample size in other townships across SA, to ascertain whether these findings are representative of other townships.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh, Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya.

Formal analysis: Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh, Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya.

Investigation: Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh.

Methodology: Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh, Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya.

Resources: Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh, Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya.

Supervision: Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya.

Writing – original draft: Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh.

Writing – review & editing: Emmanuel Inalegwu Akoh, Lawrence Mpele Lekhanya.

REFERENCES

1. Abi-Aad, G. (2015, August 16). *Social media for social entrepreneurship*. Entrepreneur Middle East. Retrieved from <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/249379>
2. Acumen. (2015). *Social enterprises and global corporations collaborating for growth with impact*. Retrieved from https://acumen.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/1502_AcumenSummitReport_092115Finalv2_pgs.pdf
3. Al Harrasi, N., Hakro, A. N., Srinivasan, V., Christina, B., & Al Jabri, M. (2022). Social media and entrepreneurship challenges in the Sultanate of Oman. *Hong Kong Journal of Social Sciences*, 58, 765-774.
4. Assensoh-Kodua, A. (2016). Social purchasing and the influence of social networking: a conceptual view. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 11(3), 44-57. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/bbs.11\(3\).2016.05](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/bbs.11(3).2016.05)
5. Atsan, N. (2019). Utilizing social networks in social entrepreneurship. In N. Iyigun

- (Ed.), *Creating business value and competitive advantage with social entrepreneurship* (pp. 233-250). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-5687-9.ch011>
6. Bandgar, B. M. (2014). The role of social network in recent era. *International journal of research in computer science and management*, 1(1), 22-26.
 7. Bansal, S., Garg, I., & Sharma, D. G. (2019). Social entrepreneurship as a part for social change and a driver for sustainable development: A systematic review and research agenda. *Sustainability*, 11(4), 1091. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11041091>
 8. Barnard, H. (2019). From the editors: The social side of international business policy – mapping social entrepreneurship in South Africa. *International Journal of Business Policy*, 2, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s42214-018-00018-1>
 9. Bhagwat, S., & Goutam, A. (2013). Development of social networking site and their role in business with special reference to Facebook. *IOSR Journal of business and management*, 6(5), 15-28. Retrieved from <https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jbm/papers/Vol6-issue5/B0651528.pdf?id=5322>
 10. Bignotti, A., & Myres, K. (2022). A typology of social entreprenuring models continued: Empirical evidence from South Africa. *African Journal of Management*, 8(3), 324-346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322373.2022.2071576>
 11. Bjärsholm, D. (2018). Networking as a cornerstone within the practice of social entrepreneurship in sport. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 19(1), 120-137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2018.1546753>
 12. Borgatti, S. P., & Ofem, B. (2010). Overview: Social network theory and analysis. In A. J. Daly (Ed.), *The ties of change: Social network theory and application in education* (pp. 17-29). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.
 13. Breytenbach, M. (2016, July 22). *South Africa waking up to entrepreneurship, but coordinated strategy still lacking*. Engineering news. Retrieved from https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/south-africa-waking-up-to-entrepreneurship-but-coordinated-strategy-still-lacking-2016-07-22/rep_id:4136
 14. Chimucheka, T., Chinyamurindi, W. T., & Dodd, N. (2019). The effects of the use of social networks on the performance of immigrant entrepreneurs operating SMEs in the Eastern Cape Province, South Africa. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 25(4).
 15. Chipeta, E. M., Kruse, P., & Surujlal, J. (2020). Effects of gender on antecedents to social entrepreneurship among university students in South Africa. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 12(1), 18-33. Retrieved from https://www.sobiad.org/eJOURNALS/journal_IJBM/archives/IJBM_2020-1/e-m-chipeta.pdf
 16. Chisholm, R. F. (1998). *Developing network organizations: Learning from practice and theory*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
 17. Chukuakadibia, E. E., & Chijioke, O. (2018). The nexus of social capital, coping ability and employment creation in African immigrant-owned small businesses. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 16(3), 311-323. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16\(3\).2018.25](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16(3).2018.25)
 18. Coghlan, D. (2014). *The SAGE encyclopedia of action research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446294406>
 19. Cohen, N., & Arieli, T. (2011). Field research in conflict environments: Methodological challenges and snowball sampling. *Journal of peace research*, 48(4), 423-435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343311405698>
 20. De Klerk, S. (2010). The importance of networking as a management skill. *South African Journal on Business Management*, 41(1), 37-49. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7c29/a403310e82d-b7bf87ad114cdf1373004428f.pdf>
 21. Desta, N. T. (2015). *Networking as a growth initiative for small and medium enterprises in South Africa*. University of the Free State.
 22. Dodd, S. D., & Keles, J. (2014). *Expanding the network of disadvantaged entrepreneurs*. OECD Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs and Local Development. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Expanding%20the%20networks%20of%20disadvantaged%20entrepreneurs.pdf>
 23. Dufays, F., & Huybrechts, B. (2014). Connecting the dots for social value: A review on social networks and social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 5(2), 214-237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2014.918052>
 24. Dzomonda, O. (2021). Demystifying the challenges faced by social entrepreneurs in pursuit of their social mission in South Africa. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal (AEJ)*, 27(4), 1-17. Retrieved from <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/demystifying-the-challenges-faced-by-social-entrepreneurs-in-pursuit-of-their-social-mission-in-south-africa-11824.html>
 25. Fatoki, O., & Garwe, D. (2010). Obstacles to the growth of new SMEs in South Africa: A principal component analysis approach. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(5), 729-738. Retrieved from https://academicjournals.org/article/article1380715803_Olawale%20and%20Garwe.pdf
 26. Folmer, E., Nederveen, C., & Schutjens, V. (2018). Network importance and use: Commercial versus social enterprises. *Social enterprise journal*, 14(4), 470-490. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-01-2018-0007>
 27. Forret, M. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (2001). Correlates of networking behaviour for managerial and professional employees. *Group & Organisation Management*, 26(3), 283-311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601101263004>

28. Fubah, C. N., & Moss, M. (2022). Exploring COVID-19 challenges and coping mechanisms for SMEs in the South African entrepreneurial ecosystem. *Sustainability, MDPI, 14*(4), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14041944>
29. Gigauri, I., & Damenia, N. (2020). Cooperation between social entrepreneur and government to develop solution to social problems. *Business and economic research, 10*(3), 116-136. Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/a/mth/ber888/v10y2020i3p116-136.html>
30. Griffiths, M. D., Gundry, L. K., & Kickul, J. R. (2013). The socio-political, economic, and cultural determinants of social entrepreneurship activity: An empirical examination. *Journal of small business and enterprise development, 20*(2), 341-357. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14626001311326761>
31. Hassan, H. M. K., Igel, B., & Shamsuddoha, M. (2022). Entrepreneurship Education and Social Entrepreneurial intentions: The mediating effects of entrepreneurial social network. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.860273>
32. Hope, B. (2022, April 6). *How companies can benefit from working with social enterprises*. Sustainability. Retrieved from <https://sustainabilitymag.com/sustainability/how-companies-benefit-from-working-with-social-enterprises-csr-social-impact>
33. Hosking, M. (2021, April 6). *The importance of social entrepreneurship for economic regeneration in a post-Covid world*. BizCommunity. Retrieved from <https://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/851/214665.html>
34. International Labour Organization (ILO). (2013). *The potential of non-profit organizations in the Free State Province to adapt a social enterprise approach*. Retrieved from https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---africa/---ro-abidjan/---ilo-pretoria/documents/publication/wcms_227651.pdf
35. International Labour Organization (ILO). (2016). *Access to finance for social entrepreneurs in South Africa*. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---africa/---ro-abidjan/---ilo-pretoria/documents/publication/wcms_474847.pdf
36. Islam, M. D. N., & Chitran, V. (2019). Social media and social entrepreneurship. In G. Bowen & W. Ozuem (Eds.), *Leveraging Computer-Mediated Marketing Environments* (pp. 104-123). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-7344-9.ch005>
37. Javed, A., Yasir, M., & Majid, A. (2019). Is social entrepreneurship a panacea for sustainable enterprise development? *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS), 13*(1), 1-29. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/196185>
38. Kajjiita, R. M., & Kang'ethe, S. M. (2020). The prospects of social entrepreneurship in South Africa: Lessons for social development practitioners. *Journal of human ecology, 69*(1-3), 95-106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31901/24566608.2020/69.1-3.3202>
39. Kasemsap, K. (2014). The role of social networking in global business environment. In P. Smith & T. Cockburn (Eds.), *Impact of emerging digital technologies on leadership in global business* (pp. 183-201). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-6134-9.ch010>
40. Kerrin, M., Mamabolo, A., Mugadza, N., & Jankelowitz, L. (2018). *Social enterprises in South Africa. Discovering a vibrant sector*. Gordon Institute of Business Sciences (GIBS), Bertha Centre for Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship, the Government of Flanders and the SAB Foundation. Retrieved from <https://trialogeknowledgehub.co.za/index.php/social-enterprise-in-south-africa/942-social-enterprises-in-south-africa-discovering-a-vibrant-sector>
41. Konrad, E. D. (2013). Cultural entrepreneurship: The impact of social networking on success, *Creativity and innovation management, 22*(3), 307-319. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12032>
42. Lekhanya, L. M. (2013). The use of social media and social network as the promotional tool for rural Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises in KwaZulu-Natal. *International journal of scientific and research publication, 3*(7), 1-7. Retrieved from <https://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-0713/ijsrp-p1909.pdf>
43. Littlewood, D., & Holt, D. (2018). Social entrepreneurship in South Africa: Exploring the influence of environment. *Business & Society, 57*(3), 525-561. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650315613293>
44. Liu, U., Sidhu, A., Beacon, A. M., & Valente, T. W. (2017). Social network theory. In *The international encyclopaedia of media effects* (pp. 1-12). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118783764.wbieme0092>
45. Lovasic, L., & Cooper, A. (2020). *Creative and social enterprise in South Africa*. British Council & DICE. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org.za/sites/default/files/surveying_creative_and_social_enterprise_in_sa.pdf
46. Manello, A., Cisi, M., Devicienti, F., & Vannoni, D. (2020). Networking: a business for women. *Small Business Economics, 55*(2), 329-348. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00300-3>
47. Mary, I. V. A. I., Anthuvan, L. V. M., & Christie, P. (2019). Networking for social enterprises: A quintessential aspect. *International Journal of Research in Engineering, IT and Social Sciences, 9*(01), 122-128. Retrieved from http://indusedu.org/pdfs/IJREISS/IJREISS_2622_99847.pdf
48. Masi, R. (2021). *Social enterprise and the Malawian economy*. Social Enterprise Academy. Retrieved from <https://www.socialenterprise.academy/malawi/social-enterprise-and-the-malawian-economy>

49. Matsimela, R. (2017). *Social capital and the process of social innovation: A case study of technology-based social enterprises in South Africa*. University of Witwatersrand. Retrieved from <https://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/28558>
50. Mitra, C., & Borza, A. (2010). The role of corporate social responsibility in social entrepreneurship. *Management & marketing challenges for knowledge society*, 5(2), 63-76.
51. Mitra, C., & Borza, A. (2012). Social entrepreneurship and corporate social responsibilities. *International business research*, 5(2), 106-113. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v5n2p106>
52. Moreno, C. N., & Agapitova, N. (2017a). *Social Enterprise Ecosystem Country Profile South Africa*. Washington, DC: The World Bank. Retrieved from https://www.innovationpolicyplatform.org/www.innovation-policyplatform.org/system/files/South%20Africa%20country%20profile_Apr14/index.pdf
53. Moreno, C. N., & Agapitova, N. (2017b). *Emerging social enterprise ecosystem in East and Southern African countries*. Washington, DC: The World Bank. Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/26672/115052-WP-P152203-PUBLIC-AfricaS-EEcosystemMay.pdf>
54. Mthembu, A., & Barnard, B. (2019). Social entrepreneurship: Objectives, Innovation, Implementation and Impact on Entrepreneurship. *Expert Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 147-177. Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/a/exp/bsness/v7y2019i1p147-177.html>
55. Nicolls, A., & Collavo, T. (2019). *The concept of social entrepreneurship*. Retrieved from https://www.socialinnovationatlas.net/fileadmin/PDF/einzel/01_SI-Landscape_Global_Trends/01_04_Concept-of-Social-Entrepreneurship_Nichills-Collavo.pdf
56. Niño, A. C. S. (2015). Social entrepreneurship and Corporate Social Responsibility: Differences and points in common. *Journal of business and economic policy*, 2(2).
57. Oprica, R. (2013). Social networking for social entrepreneurship. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 92, 664-667.
58. Park, J., Hwang, K., & Kim, S. J. (2018). Forming a social partnership between small social enterprises and a large corporation: A case of the joint platform, H-JUMP. *Sustainability*, 10(10), 3612. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103612>
59. Písař, P., & Tomášková, A. (2020). The importance of social networks for the SMEs innovation potential in industry 4.0. *Innovative Marketing*, 16(3), 48-61. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/im.16\(3\).2020.05](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/im.16(3).2020.05)
60. Prasetyo, P. E., Setyadharma, A., & Kistanti, N. R. (2021). The collaboration of social entrepreneurship and institution for sustainable regional development security. *Open journal of business and management*, 9(5), 2566-2590. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2021.95141>
61. Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., & Linder, S. (2019). Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises. *Journal of management*, 45(1), 70-95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318793196>
62. Sargenton, S. (2021, February 15). *Business networking for social entrepreneurs*. The Community Entrepreneur. Retrieved from <http://sites.stedwards.edu/ssargent/2021/02/15/business-networking-for-social-entrepreneurs/>
63. Scuotto, V., Del Giudice, M., & Carayannis, E. G. (2017). The effects of social networking sites and absorptive capacity on SMES' innovation performance. *The Journal of Technology transfer*, 42, 409-424. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-016-9517-0>
64. Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2004). *Social entrepreneurship the contributions of individual entrepreneurs to sustainable development* (Working Paper No D/553). IESE Business School. Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/p/ebg/iesewp/d-0553.html>
65. Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business model to serve the poor. *Business horizon*, 48(3), 241-246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2004.11.006>
66. Sesale, E. L., & Seeletse, S. M. (2017). Marketing fortification of business through crowdfunding and social responsibility: focus on South African SMEs. *Environmental Economics*, 8(1), 18-25. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ee.08\(1\).2017.02](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ee.08(1).2017.02)
67. Subrahmanyam, S. (2019). Social networking for entrepreneurship. *International journal of Commerce and Management Research*, 5(1), 117-122. Retrieved from <http://eprints.tiu.edu.iq/709/>
68. Turkina, E. (2018). The importance of networking to entrepreneurship: Montreal's artificial intelligence cluster and its born-global form element AI. *Journal of small business & entrepreneurship*, 30(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2017.1402154>
69. Urmanavičienė, A., Chantzi, K., & Tambari, B. (2021). Challenges of cross-sectional collaboration of social enterprises in Baltic states. *European Journal of Social Impact and Circular Economy*, 2(2), 59-75. <https://doi.org/10.13135/2704-9906/5487>
70. Van Vuuren, J. J. (2022, January 12). *Five of the most common challenges faced by South African entrepreneurs*. GVI. Retrieved from <https://www.gviafrica.co.za/blog/5-of-the-most-common-challenges-faced-by-south-african-entrepreneurs/>
71. Vijayann, M. (2013, May 23). *Five social media tips for social entrepreneurs*. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/small-business-blog/2013/may/23/social-media-five-lessons-entrepreneurs>
72. Visser, K. (2011). Social Entrepreneurship in South Africa: Context, Relevance and Extent.

- Industry and Higher Education*, 25(4), 233-247. https://doi.org/10.5367/ihe.2011.0050_
73. Watters, K., Willington, L., Shutte, T., & Kruh, R. (2012). Social entrepreneurship – Individuals with vision hold unlimited potential to alleviate poverty: The UnLtd South Africa model. *Towards Carnegie III Conference Paper*.
74. Weber, C., & Kratzer, J. (2013). Social entrepreneurship, social networks and social value creation: A quantitative analysis among social entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial venturing*, 5(3), 217-239. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEV.2013.055291>
75. Zakaras, T. (2021, December 29). *Why companies partner with social enterprises*. Resonance. Retrieved from <https://www.resonanceglobal.com/blog/why-companies-partner-with-social-enterprises>
76. Zhang, J. (2010). The problems of using social network in entrepreneurial resource acquisition. *International small Business Journal*, 28(4), 338-361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242610363524>
77. Zimmer, K., & Pearson, K. (2019). *This is what is still holding social entrepreneurs back*. World Economic Forum (WEF). Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/07/this-is-what-holds-social-entrepreneurs-back/>