

# Networking for Social Enterprises: A Quintessential Aspect

A. Irudaya Veni Mary<sup>1</sup>, M. Victor Louis Anthuvan<sup>2</sup>, and P. Christie<sup>3</sup>  
<sup>1,2,3</sup>(Loyola Institute of Business Administration, 1, Sterling Road, Nungambakkam, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India)

---

**Abstract:** This paper aims to describe the importance of networking for the 'social enterprises'. It seeks to prove importance of networking for the social enterprises by finding out the influence of networking on the different functions of social enterprises including marketing, financial self-sufficiency, human resource management, risk management, gaining people's participation, sustainability of the social enterprise and social value creation. A questionnaire with a combination of close and open ended questions was prepared to collect information. The study includes 63 social entrepreneurs from India. The findings show that, there is a positive and significant relationship between 'networking' and the 'functions' of social enterprises.

**Keywords:** Social enterprise, Social entrepreneurs, Networking, Social entrepreneurship

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

Networking is an important personal skill which is essential for entrepreneurs. Networking binds entrepreneurs and potential investors from different age groups, nationalities, field of interest, different experience levels and background and it helps them to build a strong relationship (Manda, 2014). Whether it is a commercial or social entrepreneurial venture, the human and financial resources are important for their success (Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern, 2012). Networking is one of the important route to access and exchange resources among organisations. It is an instrument to get access to valuable resources namely skills, technical advice and finances especially the start-ups (Malaki, 2015; Brady and Haugh, 2007)). While networking, an entrepreneur does not only seek resources like equipment, space and money but also advice, information and reassurance from the networking partners (Birley, 1985). It is essential for both the entrepreneurs to work with various stakeholders namely employees, managers, funders and other organisations (Austin et al., 2012). The members of the network may include friends, professionals and like-minded individuals (Haupt, 2015).

Networking is defined as "developing and using contacts made in business for purposes beyond the reason for the initial contact. (Entrepreneur India, 2018). While discussing about networking, the authors have discussed on inter and intra organisational networking. The inter-organisational networking denotes networking between two or more external organisations. On the contrary, the intra organisational networking stands for networking among the personnel within the organisations. The latter is useful for connecting people, maintaining relationship with each other's, sharing professional knowledge and personal information among the personnel within the organisation. Furthermore, it strengthens the organisation by fostering a strong culture of respect, trust, openness and inclusiveness within the organisation (DiMicco, Geyer, Millen, Dugan and Brownholtz, 2009; Ellison, Gibbs and Weber, 2015; Turkina, 2018).

Authors Austin et al. (2012) have identified two types of inter organisational networking systems. One type of network is set up either by working collaboratively or establishing partnership with other citizen organisations, corporate and government. Another type of network is called professional network, which is, set up with professionals in the same field. One can extend his/her knowledge base and avail talent pool through this type of network. Further, author Manda (2014) discussed about two types of networking. They are local and international networking. Both local networking and international networking is as good as each other. Local networking provides the knowledge about the local community to the entrepreneurs. The international networking helps one to expand the vision and improve the business by applying international approaches.

Pertaining to this paper, the significance of inter-organisational networking for the social enterprises is explained by studying the influence of networking on the different functions of social enterprises including marketing, financial self-sufficiency, human resource management, risk management, gaining people's participation, sustainability of the social enterprise and social value creation. This research paper aims to prove the significance of networking for the social enterprises and to build the theory and practices of social entrepreneurship by developing and testing hypotheses.

### Theory and Hypotheses

#### Importance of Networking for the Enterprises

The inter-organisational networking helps the start-up entrepreneurs to obtain knowledge from experienced entrepreneurs from diversified field of entrepreneurship and this expanded knowledge will enable them to further develop their business and to get exposed to new business opportunities. It helps the entrepreneurs to improve their business by reducing the transaction costs, it generates business opportunities and

paves ways for the generation of knowledge spill overs (Turkina, 2018; Fallon, 2017). It is the lifeblood for the business growth. It is useful to create a business alliance, to market, to manage the supply chain system, etc. (Rittscher, 2012). It is a supportive system of sharing information and services among individuals and groups who share a common interest. It enables entrepreneurs to learn from one another, to identify new opportunities and to remain focused on their mission. It helps them to promote their ideas, to receive feedback and to gain support to further improve their business. In addition, it helps them to find partners and investors, to increase customer base and to gain support from the community members (Saif, 2014).

The entrepreneurs build their social contacts or social networks for a different purpose in early phases of their entrepreneurial venture. In the early phase, the entrepreneurs build and maintain networks in order to get support, information, knowledge and business relationship in order to test their idea, plan for a venture, establish their idea and set up a firm (Greve and Salaff, 2003). Networks have been formed for research purposes too (Defourny, 2001). By networking the entrepreneurs: accomplish challenging tasks which is otherwise impossible to do alone; bring innovative solutions to the most pressing problems; and strengthen or increase their customers through word of mouth strategy (Fallon, 2017). Networking facilitates the entrepreneurs to share knowledge gained from one another that is beneficial for the business and personal growth, to gain referral services from each other and to build their reputation which will enable them to market their products/services, to establish partnership with people who are experts in the field of one's entrepreneurial work which assists in being successful in the business, to gain motivation and confidence from others in times of need, to find new customers continuously and increase the sale, and to learn from the experience and knowledge of like-minded people (Haupt, 2015).

#### ***The Importance of Networking for the Social Enterprise***

Networking skills is important for social entrepreneurs since a large part of resources is lying with the government, donors, board members, volunteers etc. therefore, it is the need of the hour for the social entrepreneurs to build a strong network and to develop their networking skills in order to strengthen their organisational capacity even with the little resources available for them. Mobilizing financial and human resources is an enormously burdensome task for the social entrepreneurs but these resources are important for the business growth. Together with accessing resources, collaborative work with other organisations assists the social entrepreneurs to achieve greater social value/impact too (Austin et al., 2012). Networking among various stakeholders enables the social entrepreneurs to meet their mission and to succeed in their venture. It is one of the factors that will help the social entrepreneurs to meet their social mission successfully. Networking helps the social entrepreneurs to get access to information, resources, support, diverse skill sets and power (Mair and Marti, 2006; Wang, Wang, and Li, 2007; Oprica, 2013). It also helps them to identify potential grant-givers and to share their resources with the networking members (Dacin, Dacin and Matear, 2010).

As the social entrepreneurs are facing difficulties in resource mobilisations unlike commercial entrepreneurs and are looking for opportunities to obtain resources in order to meet their social mission they rely on strong networks of people and organisations. They get access to financial, human and other resources through their networking contacts. In order to acquire these resources, the social entrepreneurs establish and maintain a trust-worthy relationship among their networking members. In addition, with regard to human resources, the social entrepreneurs habitually dependent on volunteers who serve as board members and helps them to raise funds for their social enterprise and also offer professional services. Developing a powerful network with dedicated members will enable the social entrepreneurs to overcome frequently faced difficulties namely the challenge of attracting best talents, lack of support from the financial institutions, lack of resources, inadequate fund, restricted organisational norms that hinders the mobilization and utilisation of resources and to meet their social mission. In addition, networking enables the social entrepreneurs to get funding and other resources for meeting their social mission. (Austin, et al., 2012). While being involved in networking activities, the social entrepreneurs face financial risk at the lower level since they gain local support through their networking (Shaw and Carter, 2005).

Further, networking plays a vital role for marketing the products/services in the social enterprises. It helps them to get access to markets, to get customer information, to identify opportunities and to obtain information about potential funding sources. In addition it enables them to gain knowledge about local environments or conditions, about the unmet local social needs and to identify opportunities at the local community itself. Building a local network enables the social enterprises to establish a good rapport with the local community people and thereby build their credibility or trustworthiness among the local community which in turn will help them get support for their activities from them as this is very essential. Further the local networks are useful to identify unmet social needs and to find new paths for resources in order to meet their social mission (Shaw, 2004; Shaw and Carter, 2005).

When comparing commercial enterprises, and social enterprises, the commercial enterprises are using their networks or networking with profit motives whereas social enterprises use the networks to collaboratively work with them to meet their social mission and to get connected to various types of resources to meet their social mission innovatively (Shaw, 2004). The social entrepreneurs are effective networkers when compared

with the for profit entrepreneurs. The social entrepreneurs build a good relationship with their networking partners which helps them to get assistance from their networking partners for achieving their social mission (Shaw and Carter, 2005).

From the existing literatures, one could derive a conclusion that networking enables the social enterprises to be successful in their venture. It is because, the networking activities carried out by the social enterprises help them to get access to the following factors which are important for their growth. The factors include acquiring information, resources, support, diverse skill sets and power to overcome the challenges of inadequate financial and human resources, financial risk, marketing their products/services, gaining people's trust, meeting their mission, and creating a greater impact.

### **Hypotheses**

Based on the learnings from the existing literatures, the following hypotheses were framed for proving the significance of networking for the social enterprises.

*H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the ability to market the products / services of the social enterprises and their networking activities.*

*H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the ability to obtain financial self-sufficiency in the social enterprises and their networking activities.*

*H<sub>03</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the ability to attract talented / professional human resources for the social enterprises and their networking activities.*

*H<sub>04</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the ability to manage risks for the social enterprises and their networking activities.*

*H<sub>05</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the ability to gain people's participation for the social enterprises and their networking activities.*

*H<sub>06</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the level of social values created by the social enterprises and their networking activities.*

*H<sub>07</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the sustainability of the social enterprises and their networking activities.*

## **II. RESEARCH METHOD**

Exploratory research design is adopted for the study. The data was collected both from secondary and primary sources. Initially it was collected from 195 published case studies of Indian social entrepreneurs. After the learning from the case study and from the existing literatures, a research tool (questionnaire) on a five point scale was prepared and the data was collected from 63 social entrepreneurs who were the founders of the social enterprises. All the respondents have completed five years of their venture creation. They are from fifteen states of India. The states are namely Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Delhi, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra, Odisha, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal. The respondents are from different field of working. The fields are community development, entrepreneurship development, health care services, education, agricultural development, environment protection, sports development and welfare services for the children, women, youth, senior citizens, differently abled persons, unorganised workers, farmers and women suffering from HIV/AIDS.

The networking activities were used as an independent variable to find out its influence on the dependent variables namely marketing, financial self-sufficiency, human resource management, risk management, gaining people's participation, sustainability of the social enterprise and social value creation. These dependent variables are termed as "Functions of Social Enterprises". The statistical test in particular correlation test is used for finding out the relationship between the variables. Further, One-Way MANOVA test was used to find out the causal relationship between the variables.

## **III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### ***Networking Activities***

Out of 63 social entrepreneurs, all of them are practicing networking activities or collaboratively working with other organisations. The collaborators or networking partners vary depending on the nature of the services carried out by the social enterprises. If put together, the collaborators or networking partners of the social enterprises include Government departments and officers, international non-governmental organizations, grass root organizations (non-governmental organizations, voluntary sector, non-profit organizations), corporates, local panchayats, local community people, media experts, educational institutions (schools, colleges and universities), lawyers, retired judges, doctors, scientists, psychiatrists, police departments, hospitals, political leaders, former government officers, other social entrepreneurs, teachers, psychologists, social activists, banks, insurance companies, business people, parents of the victimised children, information technology sectors, non-resident Indians, Corporate Social Responsibility, religious organizations etc.

### ***Networking and Functions of Social Enterprises***

The correlation analysis reveals that there is a positive relationship between networking and the functions of the social enterprises namely marketing the products / services, human resource management, risks management, gaining the people’s participation, social value creation and the sustainability of the social enterprise except for financial self-sufficiency, (see Table 1).

**Table 1: Correlation Analysis between Networking and the Functions of Social Enterprises**

S.No	Functions of Social Enterprises	Networking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Networking	1							
1.	Marketing the products / services	.331**	1						
2.	Financial self sufficiency	.157	.163	1					
3.	Human resource management	.518**	.251*	.275*	1				
4.	Managing risks	.564**	.234	.011	.338**	1			
5.	Gaining people’s participation	.729**	.376**	.330**	.634**	.469**	1		
6.	Sustainability of the social enterprise	.469**	.232	.352**	.435**	.332**	.568**	1	
7.	Social value creation	.566**	.270*	.078	.359**	.147	.419**	.282*	1

\*\* - Rejected at 0.01 level; \* - Rejected at 0.05 level

**Networking and Marketing the Products / Services**

The r value (.331\*\*) shows an uphill positive linear relationship between networking and marketing the products / services of the social enterprises at the significant level of .008 (see Table 1). Therefore the null hypothesis “ $H_{01}$ : There is no significant relationship between the ability to market the products / services of the social enterprises and their networking activities” is rejected at 0.01 significant level. One could conclude that networking increases the ability of the social enterprises to market their products / services. The social enterprises market their products / services through word of mouth marketing and through conducting conferences or seminars among the targeted beneficiaries (the customers are called as beneficiaries in most of the social enterprises) using their networking contacts specifically with government departments, local citizen organisations or educational institutions. In addition, the social enterprises market their products / services through their social media networks too.

**Networking and Financial Self Sufficiency**

The relationship between networking and financial self-sufficiency is proved that there is no significant relationship between the variables (see Table 1). Therefore the null hypothesis “ $H_{02}$ : There is no significant relationship between the ability to obtain financial self-sufficiency in the social enterprises and their networking activities” is accepted.

**Networking and Human Resources Management**

The positive r value (.518) on networking and human resource management proves the positive linear relationship between the two variables at the significant level of .000 (see Table 1). Hence the null hypothesis “ $H_{03}$ : There is no significant relationship between the ability to attract talented / professional human resources for the social enterprises and their networking activities” is rejected at 0.01 significant level. The result proves that networking enables the social enterprises to attract / retain talented / professional human resources to their venture. Since the social enterprises are not able to pay to their employees on par with the commercial enterprises, attracting and retaining the talented / professional human resources is one among the major challenges faced by them. The social enterprises are able to overcome this challenge since they have a strong networking with the local communities and local citizen organisations.

**Networking and Managing Risks**

The correlation analysis on networking and managing risks shows a positive linear relationship between the two variable by exhibiting an r value of .564 at the significant level of .000 (see Table 1). Therefore the null hypothesis “ $H_{04}$ : There is no significant relationship between the ability to manage risks for the social enterprises and their networking activities” is rejected at 0.01 significant level. While discussing on risks, there

are two major risks faced by the social enterprises. One is financial risk and the other life risk. Excluding financial risk, as the relationship between networking and finance is discussed above, the social entrepreneurs are able to overcome life risk due to death threat through networking. The life risk occurs when the social enterprises' innovative and low cost products / services disturb the commercial business or when the services of the social enterprises disturb the illegal business (eg. alcohol sale) of some mafias, the social entrepreneurs who run these social enterprises face the challenge of death threat. The social enterprises are able to overcome this type of life risk by networking with government officials, local citizen organisations, local panchayat and local communities. Thus it is clear that networking helps the social enterprises to manage the risks that comes on the way towards their mission.

#### **Networking and Gaining People's Participation**

While analysing the relationship between networking and people's participation, the r value .729 proves that there is a positive linear relationship between the two at the significant level of .000 (see Table 1). Therefore, the null hypothesis "*H<sub>05</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the ability to gain people's participation for the social enterprises and their networking activities*" is rejected at 0.01 significant level. Since the social enterprises work at the grass root level, it is vital for them to gain the acceptance of the local community at the initial stage and gain people's participation while working towards their mission. The social enterprises makes this possible only by networking with local panchayat (local body governance), local citizen organisations, local government, educational institutions and local communities. So, it is strongly defendable that networking helps the social enterprises to gain people's participation for the mission works carried out by them.

#### **Networking and the Sustainability of the Social Enterprise**

The r value .469 at the significant level .000, determines that there is a positive, significant and linear relationship between networking and the sustainability of the social enterprises (see Table 1). Therefore, the null hypothesis "*H<sub>07</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the sustainability of the social enterprises and their networking activities*" is rejected at 0.01 significant level. From the Table 1, it is evident that there is a positive and significant relationship between sustainability of the social enterprises and other functions of the social enterprises including financial self-sufficiency, human resource management, risk management, gaining people's participation and social value creation. It is obvious to defend that when networking contributes to manage these functions effectively, it will definitely lead to the sustainability of the social enterprises. Therefore, networking is one of the important factors for the sustainability of the social enterprises.

#### **Networking and Social Value Creation**

From the result of the correlation analysis, it is proved with an r value .566 that there is a positive, significant and linear relationship between networking and social value creation at the significant level of .000 (see Table 1). So the null hypothesis "*H<sub>06</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the level of social values created by the social enterprises and their networking activities*" is rejected at 0.01 significant level. The social enterprises are able to create social value effectively by obtaining human resources and other infrastructural resources to meet their social mission through their networking contacts. In view of the above result, it is proved that when the social enterprises engage in networking activities, they can achieve increased and successful social value creation.

#### **One-Way MANOVA**

Further the researchers tested the hypotheses with the statistical tool of One-Way MANOVA in order to prove the causal relationship between the two variables. That is the effect of networking on the various functions of social enterprises are proved in the below section.

**Table 2: Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) between Networking and Functions of Social Enterprises**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Networking	Pillai's Trace	2.343	1.725	98.000	336.000	.000	.335
	Wilks' Lambda	.030	2.063	98.000	274.552	.000	.393
	Hotelling's Trace	6.115	2.514	98.000	282.000	.000	.466
	Roy's Largest Root	3.402	11.664 <sup>c</sup>	14.000	48.000	.000	.773

\*\* - Rejected at 0.01 level; \* - Rejected at 0.05 level

From the Multivariate Tests table, one could arrive at a conclusion that the functions of social enterprises are depending on networking since the sig. values are less than .001 (Table 2).

Further, to determine how the dependent variables differ for the independent variable, the researchers looked at the **Tests of Between-Subjects Effects** table (Table 3). From the result, it is observed that networking do not have statistically significant effect on marketing the products/services and on financial self-sufficiency.

Therefore the null hypotheses  $H_{01}$  and  $H_{02}$  are accepted. The reason could be dual. That is, either the Indian social entrepreneurs have not effectively used their networking sources for marketing or for attaining financial self-sufficiency or the networking partners did not show willingness to provide support adequately for the same.

**Table 3: Tests between Networking wise Subjects Effects for Functions of Social Enterprises**

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Networking	Marketing the products / services	38.017	14	2.716	1.584	.119	.316
	Financial self sufficiency	8.565	14	.612	.739	.726	.177
	Human resource management	27.910	14	1.994	3.414	.001	.499
	Managing risks	20.045	14	1.432	3.494	.001	.505
	Gaining people's participation	23.348	14	1.668	5.161	.000	.601
	Sustainability of the social enterprise	16.534	14	1.181	3.570	.000	.510
	Social value creation	32.188	14	2.299	2.689	.006	.440

\*\* - Rejected at 0.01 level; \* - Rejected at 0.05 level

One can observe from the above table that networking has a statistically significant effect on human resource management ( $F(3,11) = 3.414; p < .01$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .499$ ); managing risks ( $F(3,11) = 3.494; p < .01$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .505$ ); gaining peoples' participation ( $F(3,11) = 5.161; p < .01$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .601$ ); sustainability of the social enterprise ( $F(3,11) = 3.570; p < .01$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .510$ ) and social value creation ( $F(3,11) = 2.689; p < .01$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .440$ ). Therefore the null hypotheses  $H_{03}$ ,  $H_{04}$ ,  $H_{05}$ ,  $H_{06}$ , and  $H_{07}$ , are rejected at 0.01 significant level. Further, while looking at the value of Partial Eta Squared, 60 percentage of the variation in the dependent variable (gaining people's participation) is explained by the independent variable (networking). Followed by, 51 percentage of the variation in the sustainability of the social enterprises and managing risks is explained by networking. 50 percent of the variation in human resource management is explained by networking and 44 percent of the variation in social value creation is explained by networking.

While analysing the percentage of variation, the effect size of networking is more on peoples' participation because of the local networking system. The local networking system includes local citizen organisations, local communities and local Panchayat. The social enterprises are able to gain peoples' participation through networking since the above said the local networking system have already established good rapport with the people whose participation that the social enterprises work for. The social enterprises are able to manage their risks that arise on the way towards their mission and sustain their social enterprises with the help of networking partners since they have established good relationship with their networking partners and have inspired them through their dedication and persistence towards their social mission and charismatic leadership skill. The networking members come to rescue the social entrepreneurs when they are in trouble, especially when they face the risk of life threat. The social enterprises are able to identify the best talented workers from the local communities through their local networking systems. Since they have recruited the employees from local communities and capacitated them through training; the employees remain loyal to the social enterprises and also the employees feel proud and a sense of ownership since they work for their own community people. By providing human resources both at the organisational level (employees) and at the field level (beneficiaries) to work towards their social mission, the networking enables the social enterprises to create social value effectively. Therefore, from the MANOVA result, one could conclude that networking plays a pivotal role in the success and the sustainability of the social enterprises.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In the exploration of the causal relationship between networking and the functions of the social enterprises, this research paper gives a deeper understanding of how networking activities positively influence the functions of the social enterprises. As discussed in the presentation of findings, networking plays an important role for successfully and sustainably managing a social enterprise by being useful for the social entrepreneurs to manage human resources (attracting and retaining talented workers), to manage risks that is on the way towards their mission, to gain people's participation to carry out their mission works, to sustain their social entrepreneurial venture and to create social value effectively. In this way, the networking approaches advances the social entrepreneurial ventures. Since networking plays a significant role for effectively carrying out the various functions of the social enterprises, it is the need of the hour for the novice social enterprises to expand their networking activities.

The 32% effect size of networking accounted for marketing the products / services and 18% effect size of networking accounted for financial self sufficiency, even though there are no significant effects but it paves an opportunity for future research. Future research must focus on why networking activities is not as influential for marketing and for attaining financial self-sufficiency as it is for the other functions of the social enterprises? How can the social entrepreneurs make the networking skills effective for attaining financial self-sufficiency?

Also a longitudinal study may also be proposed in the stream of networking among social enterprises. A group of successful social enterprises can be selected and they can be closely watched or studied on their growth after using networking strategies. There is an urge for a research on the process or stages of establishing networks among social enterprises, since it plays an important role for the success and the sustainability of social enterprises.

## V. REFERENCES

- [1] Austin, J., Stevenson, H. and Wei-Skillern, J. (2012). *Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both?* R.Adm., São Paulo, 47(3), 370-384.
- [2] Birley, S. (1985). *The role of networks in the entrepreneurial process.* Journal of Business Venturing, 1(1), 107-117.
- [3] Brady, A. and Haugh, H. (2007). *Social entrepreneurship & networks.* Journal of Finance and Management in Public Services, 6(3), 29-44.
- [4] Dacin, M.T., Dacin, P.A. and Tracey, P. (2011). *Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions.* Organization Science, 22(5), 1203-1213.
- [5] Dacin, P.A., Dacin, T.M. and Matear, M. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here.* Academy of Management Perspectives, August, 36-56.
- [6] Defourny, J. (2001). *From third sector to social enterprise.* In C. Borzaga and J. Defourny, eds., *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*, London and New York: Routledge, 1-18.
- [7] DiMicco, J.M., Geyer, M., Millen, D.R., Dugan, C. and Brownholtz, B. (2009, January). *People sense making and relationship building on an enterprise social network site.* In *Proceedings of the 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences – 2009*, (1-10). IEEE.
- [8] Ellison, N.B., Gibbs, J.L. and Weber, M.S. (2015). *The use of enterprise social network sites for knowledge sharing in distributed organizations: The role of organizational affordances.* American Behavioral Scientist, 59(1), 103-123.
- [9] Entrepreneur India. (2018). *Networking.* Entrepreneur Media, Inc. [online] Available at: <https://www.entrepreneur.com/encyclopedia/networking> [Accessed 28 Aug. 2018].
- [10] Fallon, N. (2017). *Networking for Entrepreneurs: 7 Ways to Make a Connection.* Business News Daily, [online] Available at: <https://www.businessnewsdaily.com/6420-entrepreneur-networking-tips.html> [Accessed 28 Aug. 2018].
- [11] Greve, A. and Salaff, J.W. (2003). *Social Networks and Entrepreneurship.* Entrepreneurship, Theory & Practice, 28(1), 1-22.
- [12] Wang, H., Wang, L. and Li, J. (2007). *The effect of social network in social entrepreneurship: An empirical Chinese case study.* In *2007 International Conference on Wireless Communications, Networking and Mobile Computing*, (4213-4216). Piscataway, NJ: IEEE.
- [13] Haupt, S. (2015). *Top 7 Benefits of Networking for Entrepreneurs.* [online] Available at: <http://bootstrapbootcamp.com/top-7-benefits-of-networking-for-entrepreneurs/> [Accessed 28 Aug. 2018].
- [14] Mair, J. and Marti, I. (2006). *Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight.* Journal of World Business, 41 (2006), 36-44.
- [15] Malaki, B. (2015). *Social Networks and Social Entrepreneurship.* [online] Available at: <http://buni.or.tz/social-networks-and-social-entrepreneurship/> [Accessed 28 Aug. 2018].
- [16] Manda, S. (2014). *The importance of business networking for entrepreneurs.* [online] Available at: <http://www.startupist.com/2014/11/the-importance-of-business-networking-for-entrepreneurs/> [Accessed 28 Aug. 2018].
- [17] Oprica, R. (2013). *Social networking for social entrepreneurship.* Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 92 (2013), 664 – 667.
- [18] Rittscher, S. (2012). *Six Keys to Successful Networking for Entrepreneurs.* Forbes. [online] Available at: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/susanrittscher/2012/05/31/six-keys-to-successful-networking-for-entrepreneurs/#24ae6391580b> [Accessed 28 Aug. 2018].
- [19] Saif, E. (2014). *Power of Networking for Entrepreneurs.* [online] Available at: <https://www.slideshare.net/esaiife/power-of-networking-for-entrepreneurs> [Accessed 28 Aug. 2018].
- [20] Shaw, E. (2004). *Marketing in the social enterprise context: is it entrepreneurial?* Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal, 7(3), 194-205.
- [21] Shaw, E. and Carter, S. (2005). *Social Entrepreneurship: Theoretical Antecedents and Empirical Analysis of Entrepreneurial Processes and Outcomes.* Babson College. [online] Available at: [http://fusionmx.babson.edu/entrep/fer/fer\\_2004/web-content/SectionXXIII/P1/XXIII-P1\\_Text.html](http://fusionmx.babson.edu/entrep/fer/fer_2004/web-content/SectionXXIII/P1/XXIII-P1_Text.html) [Accessed 28 Aug. 2018].
- [22] Turkina, E. (2018). *The importance of networking to entrepreneurship: Montreal's artificial intelligence cluster and its born-global firm Element AI.* Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, 30(1), 1-8.