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Abstract

The social economy is trying to address the issues of social and economic disparity and to find alternative socio-economic solutions for poverty eradication and to facilitate community outreach public well-being. Currently, the social economy (SE) courses are teaching in many universities, colleges, and develop social enterprise different initiatives. Moreover, social economy researchers present their research findings at different seminars, conferences, symposiums; many books and journals are published on the social economy; however, very few initiatives have taken to educating the end users of community outreach the social entrepreneur. Hence, the paper focuses to discern how social economy (SE) concept, its different initiatives, operational strategies, and policies can be reached to community outreach people in order to orient them about these phenomena. The paper contains the definition of SE, the importance of SE, and issues in SE with examples, how social economy community outreach learning can be facilitated to inform readers. The paper is written based on literature reviews, the author’s personal experience, and secondary data. The paper finds SE ideas are traveling within academicians, researchers, social economy study students, and social economy practitioners. Therefore, the social economy community outreach education is very important to educate community outreach people to develop their understanding of the social economy, their benefit, to know how social enterprises can be initiated and managed by the community outreach people and prospective community social entrepreneurs.
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Introduction

Many kinds of literature identify the social economy concept is not massively known to majority community outreach people rather the social economy idea is circulating within among social economy professionals, practitioner and researchers. The social economy activities and their implementing strategies are limitedly known to community outreach people. Social economy messages are traveling and moving around social economy institutions, research centers, and the existing social entrepreneurs. Therefore, the paper focuses on to find why community outreach people are not known to the social economy. The study attempts to research on how the social economy concept can be massively massaging out to community people for informing them to understand and to know the benefits social enterprises and their implementation strategies. As well as motivate community people to engage in social enterprises. The paper discusses different types of social enterprises, the difference between public institutions, philanthropic organizations, charities, NGOs and private businesses. Moreover, the paper discusses how these organizations can altruistically mentor, support, and engage community people to engage in social enterprise and provide their services to community people for their well-being.

Social economy community outreach education

The social economy community outreach education can be done for the general public using popular educational materials either through public broadcasting media like, newspapers,
magazines, radio, TV shows, or organizing street festivals, community gathering and. Moreover, this can be done by organizing workshops that facilitate two ways of interactive informal learning with hands-on practical examples to engage disadvantaged people to social enterprises and foster their community participation to address their social issues. This social economy educational outreach service can support community-based informal learning to community people at their neighborhoods. The social economy outreach community learning program could be also in the classroom settings, but it should not be highly rigid sophisticated analytical lectures.

The social economy outreach education sessions can facilitate the social economy outreach campaigns for engaging the community people to learn and understand the concept of social economy, benefits of social economy, different types/forms social organizations/enterprises, how to manage the social businesses, problems of businesses. The social economy outreach learning sessions could be in classrooms, libraries, after-school programs, community centers, community-based organizations, museums, lawns, playgrounds, parks, lakeshores open spaces, etc. These workshops sessions can work for people to know how to run social enterprises and managing social businesses; how social marketing can be done to inform people and to promote entrepreneurs’ social business. These topics can be discussed with the social economy learners by the social economy community outreach extension worker. The sessions can assist the social entrepreneurs to understand, learn and get ideas about social business, encourage them to initiate social businesses with their own existing skills. This is not one shot sessions between attendances and social economy community outreach workers rather continuously supporting and motivating the social business initiators, social business seekers, social entrepreneurs for engaging them in social businesses. It is also necessary post-follow-up workshop sessions for reviewing and brainstorming for solving problems if workshop attendees faced in running their social businesses in the community.

Objectives of the study

- To examine different elements and concepts of social economy
- To identify different agencies of social economy
- To explore the benefits of social economy
- To explore operational strategies, policies of different social economy organizations
- To find out how social economy organizations can be generated and
- To discern how social economy education can be disseminated to community outreach people

Problems facing by Social enterprises (SEs)

Helmut K. Anheier (2014) identifies some problems in SEs. He asserts SEs are suffering from resource constraints, lack of social enterprise skills, inadequate systems to support and sustain the SEs, private-sector monopoly business competitions and ideological resistance and changing environments play their part for hindering social enterprises development in the society. Nonetheless, the professionalization of the sector is happening through the combined efforts of organizations themselves, supporting networks, university programs and the sharing of knowledge and experience. All together result from the social business market failure in the capitalistic society. Moreover, Helmut K. Anheier finds human resource management (HRM) related issues in the SES are: perceiving people as a strategic resource for achieving competitive
advantage; making use of planning; adopting a coherent approach to employment policies and practices; integrating employment policies and practices with business strategy; reacting proactively to managerial issues, not reactively; taking action on employment matters at the most senior management levels. However, HRM plays a major role in determining and influencing business strategies. SEs need to manage a commercial and a social mission would suggest the possibility of a hybrid approach, possibly a middle view somewhere between hard and soft that is very complex for achieving the social objectives with economic determination.

Helmut K. Anheier (2014) thinks there are common strands linking the HRM agenda to that of SEs: need to establish clarity about staffing levels and patterns of work; culture-fair recruitment and selection processes; motivational performance and reward options; and an energizing the work relationship; progressive development policies. Moreover, Helmut K. Anheier (2014) finds SEs are facing governance challenges the following problems in mitigating 'failure' of SEs: enabling self-sufficiency through regular, sustainable trade; reconciling different types of accountability, including democratic and financial efficacy; and developing a culture of transparent practice at board level, including board member effectiveness; and managing the delivery and measurement of social benefits.

A brief summary of some of the opportunities and challenges of social economy organizations is given in Table 1 identifies by Helmut K. Anheier.

Table 1. Opportunities and challenges in the governance of SEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish strong strategic leadership</td>
<td>Board management difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide staff empowerment and upskilling</td>
<td>Identifying leadership issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance democratic accountability</td>
<td>Prohibitive cultural barriers to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a level of competitiveness in new and existing markets</td>
<td>Enabling the inclusion of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster and maintain board-level transparency</td>
<td>Managing function-specific expertise (such as marketing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage and deliver benefits to a range of identified stakeholder groups</td>
<td>Problems with identifying and managing diverse stakeholder interests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bob et al. (2009) identify some problems in SEs too. He finds although the social enterprise has been identified as a growth sector, there have been difficulties encountered in fulfilling its potential. One of the major barriers to growth in the social enterprise sector is 'complexity and lack of coherence within the sector, combined with widely varying skills and knowledge bases' (Yunus, 2008). Bob et al. (2009) assert that SE managers need to be dedicated and business-minded. SEs are under pressure to perform in the marketplace and competitive tendering process as well as the subsequent delivery of quality products/services. Dees et al. (2002: 2) observe that 'social entrepreneurs frequently fail to consider all of their scaling options systematically.’ One of the reasons for this is the narrow conception of growth as equating to market presence rather than also including internal capacity-building activities, such as innovation and learning, quality enhancement and social impact.

Helmut K. Anheier (2014) identifies five critical issues in social enterprise development that are: 1. Managing diverse stakeholder interests, 2. To achieve accountability, 3. In order to examine
the effectiveness of governance, many organizations rely on formal systems of measurement. Many broad challenges for SES seeking to evidence their accountability: how to measure governance performance as part of encouraging good governance practice. Performance measurement typically focuses on quantified data which is difficult in SEs, and SEs face a further constraint because the financial and non-financial costs of embedding measurement systems place a strain on already scarce resources.

**Concept and component of social economy**
Social economy defined as the third, voluntary and/or not-for-profit sectors in the society (Amin et al., 2002; Dart, 2004; Hudson, 2005). R. Paton (2003) and J. Pearce (2003) finds democracy; social justice; empowerment of minority or excluded groups; entrepreneurship; sustainable development; and working in partnership are the elements of social economy. These elements generally fit with the aims of SEs - as they work in partnership with staff, service users and support groups to achieve social, environmental and economic outcomes. They do so through entrepreneurship and aim to alleviate or redress issues concerning to target groups (Helmut, 2014). Defourney & Nyssens, 2006 suggest that SEs represent a new dynamic within the third sector. SEs as that part of the social economy primarily engaged in trading (ECOTEC, 2003). SEs are now competing in a diverse number of market sectors, including, health and social care, housing, children's services, transport, food, and farming, plus environmental services and leisure (Westall & Chalkley, 2007). Third-sector organizations in this cluster also derive a high proportion of their income from fees and charges (Bob et al. 2009).

SEs in Asian organizations are mainly involved in service provision of health and education, gaining most of their income from fees and receiving little state support. A more recent development has been the growth in numbers of those organizations involved in ethical or fair trade representing small scale producer groups. Fairtrade alone is claimed to provide benefits in improved livelihoods to over 7 million farmers and their families in developing countries across the world (Fairtrade Labelling Organization, 2008).

The third sector in Latin America is larger than in other developing country clusters and is heavily orientated towards service functions such as education (Bob et al. 2009). In Africa, third-sector organizations are limited by financial support. In the last decade, Britain's third sector grew from 120,000 in 1995 to 160,000 in 2005 (Cabinet Office, 2007). The number of people volunteering once a month rose from 18.4 million in 2001 to 20.4 million in 2005 and charities' turnover has increased from £16 billion in 1997 to over £27 billion in 2004/2005 (Bob et al. 2009). However, currently, SEs are positioned within the market-driven economy. SEs are described as the enterprising wedge of the social economy (Pearce, 2003).

The social economy is formed by a rich diversity of enterprises and organizations, such as cooperatives, mutual, associations, foundations, social enterprises, and paritarian institutions, sharing common values and features like collectivity, public wellbeing, social, citizenship and cultural capital, local living economics among community people and develop socially responsible businesses in the business world. Social economy studies the relationship between the economy and social behavior. It analyzes how consumer behavior is influenced by social morals, ethics and other humanitarian philosophies. A social economy develops because of a
need for new solutions for issues (social, economic or environmental) and to satisfy needs which have been ignored (or inadequately fulfilled) by the private or public sectors (Restakis, 2006).

Successful social-economy organisations play a role in fulfilling governmental policy objectives by: contributing to socially inclusive wealth creation; enabling individuals and communities to renew local neighbourhoods; demonstrating new ways to deliver public services; developing an inclusive society and active citizenship and embracing competitors, as competition may indicate greater overall market productivity in achieving social goals.

The ethical concept or primary objective of social economy is to improve the lives of disadvantaged people, provide support, advance social cohesion among them as well as improve the environment of the community and develop harmony of the local ecology. It is about the creation of moral value and appropriation of earnings, profits, and resources that are reinvested for the benefit of disadvantaged people. In Canada, The Social Economy includes social assets (housing, childcare centers, etc.) of community organizations; social enterprises including co-operatives and revenue-generating programs of non-profit groups; credit unions and social financing organizations like community loan funds; training and skills development enterprises; and sectoral and regional organizations e.g. renewal energy associations. Helmut K. Anheier (2014) mentions SEs' services in the following categories: mental disability; physical disability; homelessness; special educational needs; employability and training; fair trade; community arts; aged; intermediate labor market; and drug dependency and rehabilitation.

**Characteristics of social economy**

Some theorists believe that SEs should function in the same way as traditional businesses are doing. However, Pearce (2003) argues that SEs are in fact altogether different from mainstream businesses as they seek to measure the triple bottom line of social and environmental impact as well as the financial impact. However, one thing that SEs have in common with for-profit organizations is that they need access to financing and improved financial management. However, SEs financial management challenges are more complex because they deliver both a financial and a social or environmental bottom line. Therefore, they need additional support to maximize their business performance and, in turn, their social impact (Helmut, 2014).

Social values are of greater significance in the management of third-sector organizations (Hudson, 2004; Waddock, 2004) than conventional companies. Values are ethical and moral codes of conduct shaped by the social, religious, cultural and historical contexts in which we live. Their central importance is illustrated in the description of SES as being 'value-led, market-driven' (Westall, 2001). SEs strategy development process will involve greater time and effort being devoted to networking, communicating, politicking and negotiating in a bid to fashion consensus among the key stakeholders. Third-sector organizations are often in a position of resource dependence when their revenue streams derived from fees, grants and donations (Stone et al., 1999). This means that the ability of their managers to develop strategies is constrained by the demands of their existing contracts and the pressing need to replace them to ensure survival. In this situation, strategic choices are often, in fact, enforced choices.

SEs usually exhibit democratic governance structures, whereby their members can meaningfully influence strategy making (and other types of decision-making). However, Pearce (2003: 38)
observes the central to understanding the nature of third-sector organizations (SEs) is the notion of a social mission (Bob et al. 2009, Quarter et al. 2009). A social mission is an organizational commitment to address human needs that are either unmet by state and market providers or arise because of their efforts to satisfy other needs. The social orientation of third-sector organizations means that, in practice, they are often seeking to achieve a broader set of strategic objectives that are their public and especially, private-sector counterparts. SES are more inclined to embrace a double or triple bottom line management philosophy and, therefore, seek to balance economic, environmental and social impacts (Elkington, 2004).

**Strengths of social economy**

John Pearce (2003) describes the benefits of the social economy is common good to the public. I also prefer to use the term “common good” instead of the term ‘social purpose’ because it is about a community serving the economy. The Social Economy operates for the common good rather than exclusively for individual gain. In social enterprises, assets are held in SEs and profits are used for the benefit of society. The ‘Social Economy’ seeks to promote and support the concept of community development economy, not promote the private economy. The social economy focused on local geographic communities’ interest. The SEs facilities and develop cooperation among community people and organizations involved in the Social Economy work together for mutual benefit. The social economy is not a centralized idea rather it is about decentralization bottom-up approach for the well-being of the disadvantaged community people. These are small businesses that are appropriate to local conditions and that are managed by local communities. According to Bob Doherty, Helmut K. Anheier, J.G. Dees, and Jack Quarter, and many other scholars think social economy organizations should be democratic structures and each person should be involved in the governance of organisations in the social economy shares equal rights to participate in decision-making, usually on the basis of one person one vote. The ‘Social Economy’ respects and seeks to safeguard human and ecological diversity to ensure the present and future well-being of society and of the planet on which we live. Social economy organizations are socially useful and enhance the quality of life of the community people.

Some scholars define social enterprise are hybrid organizations which maintain a social mission while pursuing profit, but others define them more specifically as for-profit ventures that operate to generate revenues for a partner non-profit. Hybrids have primarily existed in sectors such as job training, health care, and microcredit, but they have recently expanded to include environmentalism, technology, and even consulting (Hall, 2016).

Helmut K. Anheier (2004) believes the Social Economy concept adopts an integrated approach which embraces and respects economic, social, cultural and environmental aspects of life. It embraces and inclusive to all persons in society to have an equal right and equal opportunity to participate in affairs without discrimination as to race, gender, sexual orientation, ability, religion, political belief or social and economic disadvantage. So the Social Economic institutions are people-centered agencies in the society that serve the interests of people. The Social Economy ensures that its work and practices will safeguard the resources of the planet for future generations and drives the local economies by jobs created, services provided, income generated and distributed.
The bottom people of the community get the opportunity and benefit from social economy institutions, the disadvantaged people can involve in social business organizations, can put their voice and choice in their local social economy organizations. SEs play a significant part in the financial and social economies of many countries. For example, Helmut K. Anheier (2014) finds in Austria, the success of Aktion 8000 in the early 1980s and its later evolution into the Public Integration Allowance (GEB) has brought 50,000 jobs there in the area of social welfare services and cultural and environmental activities to long-term unemployed. In Belgium, it is estimated that 350,000 people are employed in the social economy that has flourished post World War II and over 100,000 volunteers are involved. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is heavily influenced by the notion of the triple bottom line (Elkingon, 1998) to assessing and reporting on the three spheres of sustainability: economic, social and environmental.

SEs has many benefits that have proved in the UK too. For example, SEs policies in the UK have benefits like localism a government policy that numerous and appropriate local issues are to be determined by local people. In Bangladesh, micro-finance institutions (MFIs) generates more than 20 million self-employment and eradicate poverty down to 22% (ADB Report, 2018). Although SEs are businesses that deliver goods and services, their primary mission is to deliver social benefit (Lewis et al., 2006). They are diverse organizations, ranging from small, community-owned village shops to large companies with multi-million-pound contracts. It is estimated that there are in the UK at least 55,000 SEs, generating more than £27 billion turnovers and contributing more than £8 billion to its GDP a year (DTI, 2006).

By messaging out the social economy education, the local social-economic institutions can mentor and flourish. The local social cooperatives, farmers cooperatives, professional associations/ cooperatives, micro-finance institutions, community investment organizations, credit unions, community banking, social financing, social enterprises, the social economy education can easily revitalize the local living economies, mobilize community resources, empowered local people, eradicate poverty, increase local employment, improve ecological harmony, restore environment, increase local production and reduce distance travelling goods consumption in the community, etc. The social economy activities ultimately can reduce the social imbalance in the community. Therefore, social economy outreach education program is necessary and important in order to reduce the social abnormalities, reduce unemployment, eradicate poverty, and to protect the environmental destructions in society.

**Importance of social economy**
Social economy institutions are not solely profit-maximizing business rather they are blended social and economic mission together to benefit and to empower the disadvantaged people in the society. John Pearce (2003), a Community Enterprise Researcher identifies the many importance of the social economy; he finds it contributes to efficient competition in the markets in order to offer the potential for job creation and new forms of entrepreneurship and employment; they meet and new needs; favors citizen participation and voluntary work; enhance solidarity and cohesion; and contribute to the integration of the economies of the candidate countries. The Social Economy can be seen as a distinctive part of a mixed economy, a Third Sector which operates alongside and in collaboration with the Private and Public sectors. The Private sector is about private gain, the Public sector is about State planning and delivering services, while the Third sector blends self-help with mutuality to work for the common good. What distinguishes
the Social Economy especially are the Values-driven social business that respect community values and the local economy.

The Institute of Entrepreneurship Development finds the social economy becomes more important in the crisis and post-crisis periods in any country. For example, in 1934, after the First World War, Great Britain adopted a law aimed at the help for the problematic people and the outdated industry, which had suffered a lot from the crisis. At the same time, the USA adopted the Tennessee Program, which was the first complex governmental program aimed at the development of the region. The target was to effectively use the resources of the Tennessee Valley to solve vexing social problems of the region.

History of social economy organizations

Bob et al. (2009) in their book Management for Social Enterprise narrate the history of SE. They mention the SE (Social Enterprise) is a powerful idea, having its historical roots in the cooperative, community and voluntary sectors. The social enterprise sector can trace its origins back to medieval guilds, but it is the Rochdale Pioneers, founded in 1844, who are normally seen as symbolizing the start of the growth in numbers of SES (Pearce, 2003). The cooperative principles of working together for a common social purpose worked to address the spiraling poverty levels for those in traditional trades who were displaced during the industrial revolution (Birchall, 1994).

Nearly 200 years later, cooperatives and new mutual are undergoing a renaissance, offering new solutions and applying them in a modern context. These can range from football supporters' trusts and new models for childcare and care homes for the elderly, to maintaining vital services in rural communities and more traditional activities, such as retail and financial services. In 1948, the UK government took prime responsibility for services such as health, education and social welfare, which led to the eventual decline of friendly societies. The policies of the Labour Government of the early 1970s stimulated the development of the community and voluntary sector. During Margaret Thatcher's Conservative Government (1979-1990), the social sector evolved in the opposite direction-partly as a response to the ideal of individualism behind the free market economic policy at that time (Bull, 2006). Under the Thatcher Government, the welfare state model was replaced by a social policy framework based on neoliberalism, the effects of which were deregulation, privatization, and reliance on the market and private philanthropy, resulting in economic and social inequality (Tickell and Peck, 2003). More recently, social demographic changes and the economic problems surrounding the operation of national health and wider welfare services are stimulating the renewal of SEs as suppliers of such services (Bull and Crompton, 2005). SEs are part of the wider social economy.

A number of authors suggest that the social economy in the UK and Europe has nineteenth-century origins (Amin et al., 2002; Moulaert & Ailenei, 2005). The European Commission's Social Economy Unit defines the social economy as including cooperatives, mutual societies, associations and foundations, and SES. However, 12 years ago, the term 'social enterprise' was rarely discussed. Since then, the term has made significant breakthroughs on both sides of the Atlantic (Defourney & Nyssens, 2006). Italian Parliament introduced Law 8/11/1991, n.381 to regulate a new legal form of cooperatives named 'social cooperatives'. C. Borzaga and L.
Santuari (2003) argue that the growth in numbers of Italian social cooperatives is due to the community's needs not being met by public services.

Similar initiatives have emerged in other EU states and, in 1996, the European Research Network (EMES) was formed to study SEs within the EU. J. Defourney and M. Nyssens (2006) propose that European SEs are positioned at the crossroads of the market, public policies and civil society. SEs are emerging from civil society organizations (CSO)/non-governmental organizations (NGOs). SES are emerging from civil society organizations (CSO)/non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the emerging markets of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Faced with the reduction of international charitable donations, such organizations are developing entrepreneurial strategies to generate income to further their social missions (Etchart & Davis, 2003). According to A. M. Peredo and J. J. Chrisman (2006), community-based enterprises (CBEs) that are managed and governed to pursue economic and social/environmental goals can result in local sustainable development. These organizations, led by social entrepreneurs, are face high levels of uncertainty and risk, stemming from both political and economic instability and lack of access to capital markets.

Social economy enterprises initiatives in different countries

All social economy scholars agreed social enterprises have a social and societal purpose missions combined with an entrepreneurial spirit of the private sector that reinvest their surpluses to achieving a wider social objective and are registered as cooperatives, associations, voluntary organizations, charities, or mutual; however, many social agencies are unincorporated. The Canadian Community Economic Development Network (CCEDNet) is a national member-led organization committed to strengthening Canadian communities by creating economic opportunities that enhance social and environmental conditions. The Canadian Social Economy Hub (CSEHub) acted as a facilitator between 2005 and 2011, promoting collaboration among six regional research centers across Canada (Québec, Atlantic, Southern Ontario, Prairies, and Northern Ontario, BC and Alberta and the North), and creating opportunities and exchanges with international networks. In France, the social economy is a major sector, representing 10.3 percent of employment (Atlas Commenté de l'Economie Sociale et Solidaire, 2014). In Spain by 2013, the social economy in Spain represented 12% of the Gross Domestic Product, with more than 44,500 businesses, more than 2,215,000 employees, impacting more than 16,528,000 associated people (Spain, Law 5/2011 of 29 March on Social Economy).

In the UK, the social enterprise movement is centred with a Social Economy Alliance created to support an ecosystem of social impact-focused businesses and charities. In the United States, rapid social change has led to shifts in both purpose and organizational forms of actors within the social economy. A diverse array of organizations, companies, constitutes the social economy, including for-profit businesses, non-profits, cooperatives, credit unions, limited liability companies, social enterprises, and benefit corporations.

In Bangladesh, the Yunus Center operates a social business lab since 2013. This social business lab provides social business community outreach education to community people through organizing open house social business orientation sessions, organizing workshops in different communities and discussing social business ideas, assist the prospective social entrepreneurs to
design their social business plans and to link them to funding agencies, Grameen sister organizations. In the workshop, Yunus Center brings the existing and prospective social entrepreneurs together and facilitates the discussions among them to share their social business experience with the attended workshop participants. Yunus Center Social Business Lab has organized 35 social business workshops in Bangladesh. 22,000 social entrepreneurs have received social business equity financing for starting and running their businesses in Bangladesh.

Indian many fellowships agencies like Ashden International Awards, AirAsia Foundation Grants, Asoka Foundation, DBS Social Enterprise Grant Programme, Echoing Green, and SEED funds have been providing fellowships for researching social businesses. The fellowship agencies are for innovative ideas for enterprises that have economic, social and environmental benefits. The British Council International UK, through its Global Social Enterprise program, it promotes the development of social enterprise and social investment to help address entrenched social and environmental problems and deliver positive change in South Asian (Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan) communities and societies. It has been working with across 28 countries with local and international partners.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) defines sectors differently, depending on the purpose. A sector can be a grouping of institutions, such as government (taxing authority), business (taxable profit-making), philanthropy (untaxed non-profit), and household (taxable personal income). However, due to increasingly hybridized institutions within the social economy, their categorization may not clearly fit within the social enterprise compass. The designation may depend upon legal and financial structures, as well as the organization's purpose and goals. Policy makers may need to shift legal boundaries to adapt to this dynamic social economy. The cooperative movement in India has made remarkable progress, working more than 600,000 cooperatives and 250 million members, making it the largest cooperative movement of the world. Cooperatives have a huge network and unparalleled reach, with 100% coverage in 500,000 villages. Cooperatives play a pivotal role in the mainstream of Indian economy, particularly in the fields of agriculture & rural credit, distribution of agricultural inputs, storage, fertilizer, marketing, labor, microfinance and housing and cooperatives are working towards inclusive growth, cooperative ideals and cooperative organization are more effective in meeting their people-centered objectives. Cooperative provides third highest employment after the private sector and government jobs. Social economy attempts to suitably blend economic feasibility with social reality. The cooperatives in India emphasize on equitable distribution of value amongst stakeholders. In America, India, Bangladesh the rise of the social economy, sometimes referred to as the fourth sector, began in the 1980s (Helmut, 2014).

Social economy agencies carry the logic of justice. The social economy plays a prominent role in market-oriented activities such as agriculture credit and banking, insurance or commerce, as well as predominantly non-market-oriented activities that have been proved socially useful but not profitable, such as the provision of health, social services, and education (Helmut, 2014). Moreover, social economy is about activities whose ethics convey strong principles (Bidet 2010) such as placing service to the organization's members or to the community ahead of profit; autonomous management; democratic decision-making processes; and the primacy of people and work over capital in the distribution of revenues (Defourny et al., 1999).
Among international humanitarian relief associations, it is seen Doctors without Borders founded in France, the British nongovernmental organization (NGO) Oxfam and the human rights organization Amnesty International, the German Bread for the World humanitarian assistance and development organization, and Greenpeace in the Netherlands have been working for humanitarian services in the world. The Sasakawa Peace Foundation in Japan, Kswagen foundations in Germany, the Welcome Trust and the J. R. Rowntree Foundation in England, the Myer Foundation in Australia and the Molibraham Foundation working on leadership and civil society development in Africa, Grameen Bank, and BRAC are serving to disadvantaged people in Bangladesh. The Tata Institute and PRIA in India, Self-help Group India, the rural development NGOs in Thailand and Indonesia, the countless rotating credit associations in West Africa, the associations among slum dwellers in Mumbai, the network of Catholic welfare associations in Brazil and Argentina, corporate foundations in Turkey, large education non-profits like the G. Vargas foundation in Brazil among the largest organizations in the country are world known humanitarian agencies in World. Even numerous Al Wakf foundations in Egypt and other Arab countries are also working as social agencies in these countries (Helmut, 2014).

Types of social economy organizations
Social economy institutions are social businesses, social enterprises, socially benefited businesses, micro-finance institutions (MFIs), community interest corporations (CIC), social benefit corporation (B-Corporations), social cooperatives, social share market, social financing, social bonds, community bonds, social equity financing, rotary savings cooperative association (ROSCA), gift economy, sharecropping, mutual funds etc. are working for public goods in different societies. However, the classical economy business institutions principle is earning profit from the investment; reinvest the profit and accumulating the profit privately or corporate stakeholders for their private ownership.

The Social Economy is found in almost all economic sectors. For example, cooperatives are particularly prominent in certain fields, such as banking, crafts, agricultural production and retailing. Mutual societies are predominantly active in the insurance and mortgage sectors, whilst associations and foundations figure strongly in the provision of health and welfare services, sports and recreation, culture, environmental regeneration, humanitarian rights, development aid, consumer rights, education, training, and research. Some Social Economy bodies work in competitive markets while others work close to the public sector.

The European Commission, Enterprise identifies the main characteristics of the Social Economy enterprises are: Cooperatives, mutual societies: members' fees based on insurance calculations (where relevant), but no capital contributions; they serve to the medical, life and non-life insurance; guarantee schemes; home mortgages. Other types of social economy agencies are associations/voluntary organizations: they are independent service providers, voluntary work, sports and advocacy/representative organizations served in the fields in health care, care for elderly and children and social services. Foundations are also considered social economy organizations because they are providing grants to relieve the needs of individuals, funding voluntary work, health and elderly care.
The modern foundation is often associated with the rise of the large grant-making foundation in the United States in the early twentieth century and its replication in other parts of the world. Foundations are private assets that serve a public purpose, with five core characteristics (Helmut, 2014): Non-membership-based organization: Legal trust, possessing significant assets from one or more donors whose intend given away for purposes deemed "charitable"; 2. Private entity: institutionally separate from government, and "nongovernmental" in the sense of being structurally separate from public agencies; 3. Self-governing autonomy bodies; 4. Non-profit-distributing commercial activities to their owners, members, trustees, or directors; and 5. Serving a public purpose social group or a closed circle of beneficiaries group.

Foundations hold private assets in order to serve a public purpose or to provide a benefit as specified in tax law and other relevant regulations. The nature of the assets of foundation can be stock and other shares in business firms, financial, real estate, patents, etc. The most common types of foundations are 1. Grant-making foundations i.e. endowed organizations that primarily engage in making grants for specified purposes; 2. Operating foundations, i.e. foundations that primarily operate their own programs and projects; 3. Corporate foundations such as the company-related or company-sponsored foundation based on corporate assets, which vary by the closeness to the parent corporations in terms of governance and management; 4. Community foundations, i.e. grant-making and operating foundations that pool revenue and assets from a variety of sources (individual, corporate, public) for specified communal purposes, and 5. Government-sponsored or government-created foundations support for public endowment.

The public liability companies (PLC) are community Interest Company; limited-liability partnership; and charitable incorporated organization that are considered social economy organizations because they are serving the social interest of community people in the society. E. Shaw and S. Carter, 2007 classify SE organization based on the legal structures commonly associated with SES include the charity that trades; trusts; community interest company (CIC); a company limited by guarantee; a company limited by shares; the community benefits society; industrial and provident society; and unincorporated association.

The CIC in the UK has used many organizational forms, including social firms, intermediate labour market companies, development trusts, cooperatives, employee-owned companies, community enterprises, housing associations, football supporters' trusts, leisure trusts' charities with trading arms, and credit unions, among others. Since July 2005, they were able to register as a new legal form-the community interest company (Social Enterprise Coalition, 2008). A limited-liability company carries on social activity, and it is able to generate surpluses to support its activities, maintain its assets, makes its contributions to the community and in some cases make limited returns to its investors.' The Community interest company (CIC) is a new limited company structure for that secures an 'asset lock' for the community and focuses on community benefit (Dunn and Riley, 2004). It has been designed to make incorporation simple for SES wishing to use the familiar corporate form with a separate legal identity from its members.

Charity, Philanthropy, and civil society organizations are also considered social economy organizations. The notion of charity includes relief of poverty, helping the sick, disabled, and elderly, supporting education, religion, and cultural heritage. It is one of the “five pillars” of Islam, and central to Christian and Jewish religious teaching and practice as well. Philanthropy,
i.e. the practices of individuals reflecting a “love of humanity” and the voluntary dedication of personal wealth and skills for the benefit of specific public causes (Helmut, 2014). It also refers to private efforts to solve common social problems such as poverty or ignorance. Examples are Red Cross, World Vision, Islamic Relief Organization, CARE International, etc. who are involved in humanitarian relief activities in communities.

Civil society is the sum of institutions, organizations, and individuals located between the family, the state, and the market, in which people associate voluntarily to advance common interests. The civil society organizations are contributing to social capital development among the members of the organizations through personal networks. This social capital captures the norms of reciprocity and trust that are embodied in networks of civic associations, many of them in the non-profit field, and other forms of socializing (Quarter et al., 2009). For Habermas (1991), civil society is made up of more or less spontaneously created associations, organizations, and movements, which find, take up, condense, and amplify the resonance of social problems in private life, and pass it on to the political realm or public sphere. R. Dahrendorf (1991) sees the concept of civil society as part of a classical liberal tradition and is characterized by the existence of autonomous organizations that are neither state-run nor otherwise directed from the center political power (Coleman, 1990).

The civil society organizations, charity organizations, and Philanthropic agencies are known as public wellbeing organizations because they are working for the prevention and relief of poverty; advancement of education; advancement of religion; advancement of health or the savings of lives; advancement of citizenship or community development; the advancement of the arts, culture, heritage, or science. These social economy agencies are also working for the advancement of amateur sport, human rights, conflict resolution, or reconciliation, or the promotion of religious or racial harmony or equality and diversity; environmental protection and improvement; provide relief of those in need; work for animal welfare; engage in rescue services or ambulance services, etc.

Not-for-profits (NPOs) are also social economy organizations. According to economic definitions, non-profit institutions or NPIs receive the bulk of their income neither from the sale of goods and services in the market, nor through taxation, but from the voluntary dues and contributions of their members and supporters. Importantly, this basis for defining NPIs, which focuses on the common characteristic that they do not distribute their profits, is a central feature of most definitions of "the non-profit sector" in legal. Non-profit institutions have social entities, created for the purpose of producing goods and services, but whose status does not permit them to be a source of income, profit, or another financial gain for the units that establish, control or finance them (Helmut, 2014). In practice, their productive activities are bound to generate either surpluses or deficits but any surpluses they happen to make cannot be appropriated by other institutional units. (European Communities et al. 2009). Thus, from an economic perspective, non-profits are primarily defined by their revenue structure. According to L. M. Salamon and H. K. Anheier, the Non-profit entity has five characteristics: 1. An organization is formally incorporated 2. Institutionally separate from government, 3. Self-governing, i.e. equipped to control their own activities, 4. Non-profit-distributing, i.e. not returning profits generated to their owners or directors and 5. Run voluntary, i.e. involving some meaningful degree of voluntary participation.
Non-profit organizations also can be classified by their basic form or governance structure (Helmut, 2014). Such a classification yields essentially three types; namely, associations, corporations, and foundations: Non-profits as membership associations, where members and their shared interests provide the raison d'être for the very existence of the organizations and where members typically have a decisive role in leadership formation and representation in governing bodies. Non-profits as corporations based on set capital and limited liability, where a board substitute for owners and represent the organization to the outside. Non-profits are asset-based entities, where the board holds and operates an endowment trust, and with a dedicated charitable purpose (Ibid, 2014).

Nongovernmental institutions are strong enough to counterbalance the state, but they are not preventing the state from fulfilling its role keeping peace in society (Gellner, 1994). Similarly J. Keane (2009 defines civil society as a "complex and dynamic ensemble of legally protected nongovernmental institutions that tend to be non-violent, self-organizing, self-reflexive, and permanently in tension, both with each other and with the governmental institutions that 'frame, constrict and enable their activities." By contrast, Anheier et al. (2001b) propose an abstract definition similar to the structural-operational definition of non-profit organizations to facilitate cross-national comparisons: "a sphere of ideas, values, institutions, organizations, networks, and individuals located between the family, the state and the market."

Voluntary associations are private, membership-based organizations in which membership is non-compulsory. They are distinct from many non-profit organizations like hospitals, social service agencies, or art museums, which may have a governing board but no broad membership base. They are like partnerships’ cooperatives, mutual organizations, business and professional associations, compulsory organizations (craft guilds, bar associations, and, in some countries, chambers of commerce) political organizations (parties, political action committees, interest groups), and quasi-governmental institutions (mass membership organizations in autocratic societies, state churches).

Faith-based organizations (FBOs) are specialized organizations formed by church clergy to help meet the human service needs of its congregation. They tend to be multipurpose organizations that perform a wide range of functions, from operating homeless shelters, food banks, and neighborhood centers, to running job training and transportation programs (Helmut, 2014). There are several types of faith-based organizations: Church service agencies, Ecumenical or interfaith coalitions, Direct-service ministries are local organizations operating in specific neighborhoods and offering a particular service such as a soup kitchen or homeless shelter, Church-sponsored ministries have informal and formal connections with its parent organization through funding, board memberships, or staff.

Cooperatives, mutual and self-help group’s organizations are cooperatives, organized by individuals seeking to improve their economic situation through collective activity. Mutual societies differ from cooperatives in that they are mechanisms for sharing the risk, either personal or property, through periodic contributions to a common fund (Helmut, 2014). Examples are retirement, sickness, and burial funds, or savings and loan associations. Self-help groups are similar to both cooperatives and mutual societies in that individuals join to accomplish goals of mutual support that would be unattainable on an individual level. They
differ from both, however, in that they are not principally engaged in commercial activities. Many self-help groups are informal, but some self-help groups develop into formal organizations over time.

Although many social organizations are exits in different communities, the majority of people are suffering information about them even prospective social entrepreneurs are not aware of these facilities are available in the society. There is a gap between social economy organizations sharing/serving information and the community outreach prospective social entrepreneurs. By minimizing these gaps of social economy professionals the knowledge and community outreach social entrepreneurs could vitalize the social economy of the society; disadvantaged people can receive more services from various types’ social economy organizations. Hence social economy community outreach education is crucial and urgently necessary to promote social enterprise businesses in the community.

Social enterprises
Social enterprises are firms that blend social and commercial objectives as well as methods. They are part of a wider social economy (Helmut, 2014). The term is used somewhat differently in the United States and in Europe. In the US, social enterprises are non-profit and for-profit firms where the primary objective is to maintain and improve social conditions in a way that goes beyond the financial benefits created for the organization's funders, managers, employees, or customers. In Europe, social enterprises, unlike traditional non-profit organizations, are frequently constituted as cooperatives and mutual societies with the principal aim of serving the community or a specific group of people (Helmut, 2014). To some extent, a feature of social enterprises is their desire to promote a sense of social justice and solidarity. According to K. Peattie and A. Morley (2008), the problems with defining SES is linked to a tendency by certain authors to focus on particular characteristics and these cannot be applied across the sector. For example, SEs are often described as not generating profits for distribution to shareholders when it is clear that a number of SES, such as Traidcraft, and other SES set up as community interest companies (CICs), are intended to share an element of profit with their shareholders. Also, SEs are often described as being small and democratic. Austin et al. (2005) argue there is nothing that prevents SES from being large and there is an emerging concept of 'corporate social entrepreneurship'. Some authors also approach definitions from a normative position, arguing that SEs should be non-profit-making or democratic.

K. Peattie and A. Morley (2008) argue that SEs are distinguished from other organizations by the simultaneous possession of two attributes. SEs trade goods and/or services in a market, so they are an 'enterprise'; and they are not simply a voluntary or community organization.). SEs are the primacy of social aims because the primary purpose of SEs lies outside the commercial outcomes related to their trading of goods and/or services in a market (beyond the generation of profit or the growth of the enterprise itself). That is what makes them 'social'. The most widely used definition in the UK is the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI, 2002): A social enterprise is a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community rather than being driven by the need to maximize profit for shareholders and owners (Bob et al., 2009). The DTI (2002) proposes that 50 percent of the income from the trading of goods and services must be targeted to operationalise the SEs' social and environmental missions through a business model of competitively trading for a social
(or environmental) purpose. Ed Miliband (2007) also proposes that SEs put ethics at the centre of their businesses, not just as a bolt-on. He argues for SEs competing on the basis of ethical values, particularly in consumer markets. He also argues that, by competing on these values, standards in the private sector can be raised and this can also transform public services. Fairtrade supply chain relationships establish the need to treat others fairly, as one would wish to be treated. Deontological ethics (ethics of duty) prioritize personal moral duty to others and are the foundation for the ethics of rights and justice (Crane & Matten, 2004).

Bob et al. assert that SEs shares three common characteristics: 1. Enterprise orientation. They are directly engaged in providing goods or services to a market; 2. Social Aims. They have explicit social aims, such as job creation, training or the provision of local services. Their ethical values may include a commitment to building skills in local communities. Their profits are principally reinvested to achieve their social objectives. Increasingly, SEs measure their social impact and 3. They have social ownership. They are accountable to their stakeholders and the wider community for their social, environmental and economic impact. Profits can be distributed as profit sharing to stakeholders or used for the benefit of the community (Westall, 2001).

SE is loose umbrella terms which raise the awareness of a variety of organizations that highlight alternative ways to do business that directly incorporate social and environmental concerns (Bob et al., 2009). So this gives the possibility of creating revenue streams that enable an organization to create sustainable social change without being reliant on time-limited funding or charitable donation. According to A. Westall (2001), such a definition can, therefore, raise the awareness of diversity; create new initiatives and new innovative models. K. Birch and G. Whittam (2006) appear to support this position by proposing that a market emphasis could encourage the development of new forms of organization. The SE Alliance in the USA defines SE as an organization or venture that advances its social mission through entrepreneurial earned income strategies. The US approach appears to see SES as forming a subset of social entrepreneurship, focusing in the main on earned income as a method to achieve social aims.

J. Kerlin (2006) summarizes some of the key differences between the American and EU approach to SES and argues that the key emphasis in the US is on generating revenue while the main emphasis in Europe is on bringing about social benefits. The European Research Network's (EMES) definition of SES proposes four criteria that distinguish between both economic and social indicators: directly involved in the production of goods or services to people on a continuous basis, the productive activity representing one of the key reasons for the existence of SES; created by a group of people on the basis of an autonomous project and governed by these people they are not managed by public authorities or other organizations (federations, for-profit private firms and so on); a significant level of economic risk; a minimum amount of paid work.

EMES also propose five criteria to capture the social dimensions of SEs: an explicit aim to benefit the community or a specific group of people; an initiative launched by a group of citizens who share a well-defined need or aim-this collective dimension must be maintained over time and the importance of leadership, often embodied in an individual or small group of leaders, must not be neglected; decision-making power is not based on capital ownership, but, rather, generally on the principle of 'one member, one vote' is followed. SE directly engaged in the provision of goods or services; voluntarily created by citizens and managed by groups of
citizens; stakeholders have the right to participate in them; involve a significant level of economic risk; have a minimum number of paid employees; the decision-making power is shared by stakeholders and is not based on capital ownership; participatory in nature; avoid profit maximization behaviour and involve the limited distribution of profits; have as an explicit aim to benefit a specific group of people. An enterprise culture is to achieve social aims. This focus on generating an income from trading activities differentiates SES from companies the broader social economy.

J. Defourney and M. Nyssens (2006) agree and argue that SES apply the methods of the private sector to achieving the types of primary social aims more normally associated with the public and voluntary sectors. This makes SES a form of organizational hybrid. K. Birch and G. Whittam (2006) discuss sustainable development in the social enterprise sector in relation to the production and promotion of social capital. They argue that SEs can play a crucial role in developing social capital by building new relationships and networks. Despite SEs focusing on economic sustainability, recent work has emphasized the double or triple bottom line, arguing for the debate regarding the sustainability of SEs to be widened to include social and environmental sustainability. B. Doherty and S. Thompson (2006) discuss the double and triple bottom line in relation to SES. Key stakeholders for SEs include a range of disadvantaged groups. Building successful stakeholder relationships with the targeted disadvantaged groups is key to the success of SEs (Bob et al., 2009) is the effective ones establishing high degrees of trust. Many SEs have been created to deliver products and services into sectors including healthcare, the arts and culture, employment, housing, social care, education and training, environmental and recycling services, financial services, food and beverage manufacturing (for example, fair trade models), regeneration, provision of leisure services, retail, transport and agriculture.

**Gaps in knowledge sharing social economy education with the community outreach**

Media, social scientists, opposition politicians’ talk about the widening of the social and economic gap between rich and poor. They are also talking about increasing poverty, destroying the environment and harming ecology by corporations. However, the question is there any action programs/services developed against these social problems? Therefore, a massive campaign against environmental problems, social problems are necessary. However, how community people can inform about social enterprises, and different social entrepreneurship development initiatives if any around. From 1990s, the socio-economic disparities, nutritional health hazards, cultural hegemonies, IT for resource extractions, IT for high skills costs, environmental hazards, ecological destructions, consumption competitions, using latest model goods, or adapting with updating IT, knowledge etc. are the sign of prestige, smartness, winner of competition etc., prestige of high fashion, prestige of high IT use, repairing is expensive instead buying is cheap, throughout culture creates unhealthy competition in society. Few unethical Hippocratic and mussel people forcibly, secretly and unethically grasp public resources, misuse public resources and power; they are unethically manipulating the market, selling low-quality products at high prices in their stores by false messaging out bombarding marketing.

Currently, society gives more importance to and value to the material economy, paper money, branded consumption, shining latest products. Many businesses are ties with high tech IT, but the majority of people are not equipped with modern market economies, market hypocrisy, pauperization process, etc. Therefore, the majority of people are unable to adopt them with this
unethical competitive market. However, government bodies are mentoring the modern market economy and subsidizing the ethical business governance rather government bodies are involved in nepotism and corruptions. Politicians have unethical links with business people, the market is in the hands of merchants’ own wish profit maximization by using public infrastructures. Politicians are even receiving bribes and receive opportunities from corporations; therefore, the government has no control over corporations. However, mass people are suffering economically. Market products prices are out of control of mass people. So mass people are suffering from fulfilling their need even they are consuming low-quality products. They are below standards livelihoods. The working people are work with poor wages that are not enough for their living. Therefore, many of them are selling their heritage properties for fulfilling their basic need like health, housing, clothing, and food, etc. Therefore, mass people are suffering from economically, socially, environmentally, culturally, mentally and other human and citizenship rights. Therefore, it is necessary for mass people to know how private businesses are exploiting them, and how they can find alternative ways to get rid of monopoly private business exploitation.

The social economy concept, its different forms, research finding and research analyses are shared in the seminars, conferences, symposiums and classrooms by social economy practitioners, scholars, researchers and academicians. However, the social economy community outreach messaging out education is limited to community people. Therefore, it is urgently needed built-in social economy education in NGOs programs, Charity services, social economy research centers, continuing education centers, adult learning centers, and business schools. Government can directly sponsor to community outreach social economy mass education either through government social economy extension workers and or by supporting registered NGOs for hiring social economy outreach education. Moreover, a social economy manual can develop and supply to the social economy community outreach organizations and community workers for sharing social economy ideas and social enterprise running tips to community people.

The paper already discusses the social economy concept is discussing within the academic spheres like the university class rooms, seminars, symposiums, conferences and summits for more than three decades. Many students, researchers, and professors are researching on it and write many books and journals. Even many charity organizations, philanthropic organizations, private foundations, NGOs, community based agencies are working as social economy agencies in different names. However, many social entrepreneurs do not know how to develop and scaling up their social enterprises. Although the IT world provides many successful social economy agencies’ examples and their experiences on Webs, books, journals; however, many social entrepreneurs do not have clear cut ideas on how to balance social and economic missions of their organizations in a sustainable way. I have interacted with many community outreach people, social economy academicians, researchers, practitioners, evaluators across the world, and I find general public does not know the social economy concept. Even I am surprising many academicians say it is a complex notion. That means the social economy concept is not even clear to many social economists because they are in not practically involved in implementing social enterprises. Therefore, the social economy public lectures with successful examples of SEs can include in townhouse meetings, community outreach campaign programs, TV debates,
community radio discussions and newspapers’ columns that narrate the social economy concept, its benefits and the challenges SEs are facing.

However, in Bangladesh social business agencies like Grameen Bank, BRAC, Yunus Center, Small Business Foundation, NGO Bureau, Department of Social Welfare, and many micro financing institutions (MFIs), etc. are organizing social business workshops in the community as a part of their service to the community outreach people for orienting and counselling them about social business at a free of cost. Their workshops’ topics are: how to start and run social businesses, how to earn income through social businesses; how to do social marketing and how to face the problems of the social businesses. I attended Yunus Center Social Business many workshops in Bangladesh where I find the social business community outreach extension workers directly talk with the community people and the prospective social entrepreneurs’ in-person, and share social business ideas, funding source, business strategies, etc. with community people. The existing successful social businesses entrepreneurs also present in the workshop sessions and share their social business experience with the workshop participants. The Grameen America has community outreach workers who are facilitating similar type of social enterprise community outreach orientation sessions in the community. However, in Canada such type of social business community outreach workshops are rare although huge formal discussions are going on in different academic places.

Therefore, the social economy education at the outreach level is necessary for messaging out what is social economy, how social economy organizations are working in different places, what are their successes, what challenges they are facing to serve the community people, etc. It is also necessary to disseminate information on how innovative entrepreneurs can start their social enterprises individually, collectively as well as how existing NGOs could transform their NGOs into income generating enterprises. How they can develop their organizational management and planning to generate income, what would be their financial management strategies; how to develop bookkeeping tools; social marketing and client management strategies. Social entrepreneurs also need to know the reporting mechanisms to funders and how to evaluate their social performances, etc. Successful neighbouring social entrepreneurs could share their social enterprise organizational development experience with the community people if the social economy community outreach education sessions can include in the workshops, town house meetings, open house discussions, TV talk shows and community radio programs.

In Canada, the Department of Public Health has collaboration with different NGOs, community organizations who jointly organize public health education lecturers in different neighbourhoods through different community agencies. Similarly, the Department of Sports, Parks, Culture and Heritage organize many events, festivals, seminars in different neighbourhoods and display their products, even organize one-on-one counselling to share their activities with the community people.

The Real Estate agencies advertise their apartments selling marketing in the magazines, electronic media; at the same time they also organize open house community meetings in
different neighbourhoods to provide information on their selling products to attract the customers. They also display their building designs, price lists and other information at a different street corner, malls, public places and community centers. The real-estate agencies have multi-dimensional marketing strategies; link their customers to multiple funding links. The Real Estate agencies have multiple payment options for attracting the habitat buyers. Although the Real Estate agencies are purely profit maximization business entity, but their marketing strategies are not limited to focus on print media or electronic media rather they physically present in the community and messaging out their business information that are absent in social enterprise marketing.

Many NGOs have community outreach programs where they have two ways of information sharing sessions with the community people and disseminate their ideas, services, and working strategies to community people. As now paid employments are limited, many youths are unemployed. However, community people need social business services for them. So there is a demand for social businesses like child care, senior equipment services, personal health care services, child tutoring services, mental counselling services, IT skill development training services, develop community gardening skills, senior healthy food distribution services, electronics repairing, reusing and recycling services, community health clinics, community sports services, etc.

Many social entrepreneurs can fulfill these services in the community if they know how to start social business, how to manage social business, how to get and manage social business capital for the social service businesses, and how to handle the problems of the social businesses if they face. Although there are huge labour force in Bangladesh and there are less opportunity for paid employment, 48% working age populations are involved in small and medium social and green businesses like agricultural farming, crop processing, social counselling, fish cultivation, cattle, goat and poultry farming, IT training, electronics repairing, reusing, recycling businesses both at the rural and urban areas. Bangladeshi micro-finance institutions are very active to financing to small business entrepreneurs. Many NGOs are transforming their organization to MFIs and include income earning products to cover their operational costs and to survive financially in the community. The social enterprise agencies the Grameen Bank, BRAC, ASA, Prashika, Nejera Kori, BRDB, etc. has created millions of self-employments and social services in Bangladesh. Even the Grameen America generates more than one hundred thousand small social business in America. It is rapidly expanding across USA.

This social economy MFIs is able to reduce the dependence to public employment, and public support services, eradicate poverty and unemployment in Bangladesh along with their financial sustainability. The disadvantaged children are able to educate themselves, start business and develop their business within their community. These self-managed social organizations are not only providing their services to disadvantaged people, but also conduct open house public meetings at the community levels. People get social business ideas, and managing social purpose business knowing ideas from MFIs open house meetings. The community outreach field workers are always moving in the community talk with community people and share their social business ideas.
working experience with the entrepreneurs. Even they assist the new entrepreneurs, students, rural elites, unemployed youths and adults to develop and design social businesses in the community.

In Canada, many Charities, philanthropic agencies are also transforming into social business and add income earning products for their organizations’ earning. For example, The Canadian Institute for the Blinds (CNIB), Canadian Hearing Society (CHS) are selling many electronic devices to blinks, deaf people that are needed to binds and deaf people. These organizations are not only to earn income by sell products to their clients, but also advise their clients how they could develop net work in the community and to how they could start business and earn money. The Common Ground Coffee Shop provides vocational training, advice and link the mental intellectual challenged people with business entrepreneurs for starting their own businesses. Although many small businesses are engaged in social enterprises in Canada and America, mass people do not know how and what kind of social business they can start in their community. It is evidenced the community outreach social economy development and management education for the community outreach people is very helpful to the new social entrepreneurs to start their businesses in their community.

Social economists generate many ideas that can function as an alternative to compete against the corporations’ hegemonic businesses. However, these ideas need to be communicated to community outreach people to aware them and to inform them what is the social economy, what are tools needed for to start the social economy businesses and operate them successfully. Recently, many countries like UK, USA, Canada, OECD, and many underdeveloped countries innovate many social economy institutions that are run by community people and benefits the community people. These social economy institutions are balancing the social and economic mission of the business; their aims not maximizing the profit in their businesses rather serve the community public social goods. The Canadian Centre for Philanthropy (1998) has identified three areas of demand fuelling the need to supply staff to SEs: changing needs resulting from changing populations, exposing gaps in services provided by the public sector; changes in public perception in relation to the not-for-profit sector; and political encouragement given to SEs as an alternative and cost-effective delivery model.

**Difference between for profit business and social economy business**

Private corporations earn income from society, but the money goes to distance placed shareholders. Money does not retain in the community; however, social enterprises generate incomes that retain in the community, circulating the money within the community, and revitalize the local living economy. Local small business agencies, local manufacturing agencies; traditional rural productions are able to continue producing their products by local people. These social economy business agencies accommodate local unemployed people and local skilled people in their businesses. Social cooperatives accommodate the local people in their local businesses. Local people maintain their social ties their community, develop their social capitals and empower themselves. The local people exchange their ideas, skills, and knowledge for solving the social, economic and ecological problems and to revitalize their social-cultural, political, economic and ecological harmony through involving in social business in the
community. However, the classical profit-making business use public physical, social and political infrastructures, but their earning profits are not shared or invest for the community benefits rather their business profits, dividends are privately owned by the investors and shareholders.

The private profit earning business principle drives private business owners to earn money and accumulate resources privately. This process creates a division of rich and poor in society, and this creates lots of social problems like poverty, overconsumption by rich people, unjustly accumulate resource to a few people; mass people are suffering from unemployment. However, social economic institutions are not solely hungry for profit maximization rather they earn income as well as attentive to public goods. They do business in the community, serve the community, look at the community problem, or share their income for community benefits.

Social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship has emerged as a global phenomenon, led by social activists and their networks, providing new market models for solving community problems (Nicholls, 2006). For example, SEs are proposed as catalysts for revitalizing disadvantaged UK communities through employment and countering welfare dependency (OECD, 2003). Social entrepreneurship is a relatively young concept that first appeared in the 1980s in both academia and praxis. Since the mid-1990s it has been increasingly taken up within the non-profit sector and by philanthropists to refer to innovation and initiation of social change in all areas of need (Helmut, 2014). Such entrepreneurs often set up new non-profit or community organizations, but can also be found within existing organizations and in the public and private sectors. They can operate at the local community level, across a country, or internationally. Social entrepreneurship is a relatively young concept that first appeared in the 1980s in both academia and praxis. Since the mid-1990s, it has been increasingly taken up within the non-profit sector and by philanthropists, often in the context of the search for solutions to social problems and a need for innovation (Bornstein, 2004; and Nicholls, 2006).

Entrepreneurship is an established concept in economics and management studies and is most strongly associated with the economist Joseph Schumpeter, writing in the early twentieth century. For Schumpeter, the essence of entrepreneurship is innovation, and this acts as a "gale of creative destruction" driving capitalism and economic progress and resulting in the transformation or establishment of new industries and ways of life. It is often embodied in the motives, actions, and force of personality of individual entrepreneurs. Such entrepreneurial individuals found new organizations and are rewarded for their efforts and the risks they take with financial profit, status, and personal satisfaction. For Schumpeter, the essence of entrepreneurship is innovation. Social entrepreneurship is the process of creating value by combining resources in new ways to meet social needs. Social entrepreneurship involves the offering of services and products as well as the creation of new organizations (Mair & Martí, 2006). It is the process of creating value by combining resources in new ways to meet social needs (Helmut, 2014). However, social entrepreneurship necessarily requires (at least) one social entrepreneur. Definitions of social entrepreneurs vary from "individuals who develop economically sustainable solution to social problems" (Tracey & Phillips, 2007) to more critical analyses of the social entrepreneur as a person whose aim "is to make the society believe that his endeavor is to bring about a social change" (Vasakaria, 2008). According to Schumpeter,
entrepreneurs are the innovative force in capitalist economies. They are part of the "creative destruction' that drives the capitalist system: they innovate by introducing new ways of seeing and doing things, and thereby displace old ones.

Social entrepreneurs are different from business entrepreneurs in that the focus of social entrepreneurs is the creation of social value, rather than the creation of monetary or economic value for the firm, although the latter may also be part of the resulting organizational model (Helmut, 2014). They are innovative change agents, who see problems as opportunities and are skilled at doing more with less and attracting additional resources from others. Whether the entities through which social entrepreneurs work are non-profit or for-profit, the success of their activities is measured first and foremost by their social impact. Social entrepreneurs work is measured by their social impact.

Social entrepreneurship development
A number of authors have described social entrepreneurs as heroic, bold individuals or groups of people who provide innovative solutions that create and sustain social value (Dees, 2001; Vega & Kidwell, 2007). Spear (2006) also argues that success in SES often comes from teams and groups who use distributed entrepreneurship and circles of entrepreneurial activity. Social entrepreneurship and its strong emphasis focus on the cooperative movement that emphasizes collectivism (Peattie & Morley, 2008). According to G. Vega and R. E. Kidwell (2007), social entrepreneurs develop solutions to social problems that have not previously been applied by the private, public or voluntary sectors. In this way, they can act as catalysts for change. Conceptualizations of social entrepreneurship stress the social innovation processes undertaken by social entrepreneurs. The concept is also now being used to describe a wide spectrum of initiatives, not only within the SE sector but also within the voluntary and corporate sectors (Nicholls, 2006). Bob et al. (2009) find two different types of social entrepreneur are described: those whose belief in a social cause inspires them to become entrepreneurial; and entrepreneurs who decide to apply their business skills to solve a social problem.

These individuals may set up SEs, but they could also set up other types of organizations or networks or alter public policy frameworks. M. Bull (2006) argues the success of a social entrepreneur should be viewed not only in terms of economic success but also in terms of organizational entrepreneurialism and social success. Thompson (2008) agrees and proposes that while SEs may create both social and economic wealth, they need to run their business with entrepreneurial characters. C. Parkinson and C. Howorth (2007) found significant differences between the language used by social entrepreneurs and that of mainstream private-sector entrepreneurs. Concepts of community, collectivism, localness and the desire to focus the business on community needs.

Social investment has been defined in a number of ways. In its most narrow sense, it is the equivalent of program-related investment, i.e. providing financing through loans and loan guarantees. A broader concept among grant-making foundations describes social investment as the practice of aligning investment policies with the organization’s mission (Helmut, 2014). The most encompassing definition equates social investment with "socially responsible investment," which refers to the financial practices of individuals as well as a broader set of institutions, including universities, religious organizations, investment pools, and pension plans, in addition
to foundations. These practices attempt to integrate social responsibility and environmental sustainability with investment.

Although closely related to the term non-profit sector, the terms above address different aspects of the same social reality (Helmut, 2014). For example, social capital is a measure of the individual's connection to society and the bonds of mutual trust it creates; the non-profit sector refers to private action for public benefit; civil society is the self-organizing capacity of society outside the realms of family, market, and state; and social investments are private contributions to achieve public goods. NGOs are now seen as a part of the wider civil society and welfare systems of societies generally and irrespective of their level of development.

**Different models of social enterprise development**

Smallbone et al. (2001) identify 16 different forms of SE, dependent on which definition is used. According to Bull and Crompton (2005), SEs are referred to as comprising 'the third sector'—the not-for-profit sector, the social enterprise, non-profitmaking businesses, civil-society organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs). These terms are used interchangeably, which makes it challenging to bring together the literature for a book of this type. In the North American model, a SE may be incorporated as either a for-profit or non-profit organization. In the USA, the term SE remains a very broad concept, referring mainly to market-focused economic activities serving a social goal (Defourney & Nyssens, 2006). In some cases, SEs are seen as an innovative response to the funding problems of non-profitmaking organizations (Dees, 1998). According to Moulaert and Ailenei (2005), non-profit making organizations can be defined as ones that are required to reinvest any profits in these organization, and their activities (charities), whereas not-for-profit organizations may distribute profits between members or stakeholders (cooperatives). In addition, there is a legal distinction in the USA between 'non-profit-making' and 'not for profit': the former being an organization and the latter activity, meaning that non-profit-making organizations can engage in for-profits activities, although those profits will be taxed (Jones & Keogh, 2006).

Social ownership is defined by ECOTEC (2003) as 'autonomous organizations with a governance and ownership structure based on participation by stakeholder groups and trustees'. The key categories include community interest companies, companies limited by guarantee, industrial and provident societies, housing associations and registered charities with trading income. In each of these, there are elements of democratic governance. They should be autonomous and institutionally separate from the government. Bob et al. (2009) identify four social aims of SEs:

1. It is primarily social (including environmentally) objectives and it principally reinvests its surplus in the business or in the community, in pursuit of these objectives.
2. Social benefits should extend beyond a membership group unless these are socially disadvantaged/excluded. In this, it is guided by the community interest and charitable interest tests from the CIC guidance.
3. CIC guidance states that a 'reasonable person's test should be applied regarding what constitutes community/wider public interest. Access to benefits provided by the organization should be 'widely available and not confined to an unduly restricted group',
4. The CIC test guidance also indicates that political parties and organizations, the purposes of which are support for a political party or political campaigning, should be excluded and
5. The charitable status test is that 'charities must benefit the community at large or a substantial section within it. They must not entirely exclude those of limited means'.

**Social Firms** are businesses created to provide integrated employment and training for people with a disability or other disadvantage in the labour market (Social Enterprise Coalition, 2003). Community Opportunities for Participation in Enterprise, established on the Shetland Islands in 1997, is an example of a social firm. COPE creates employment and training opportunities for people with learning disabilities by running businesses involved in soap making and catering to supply the tourist industry (Bob et al., 2009). COPE is a limited company with charitable status and employs more than 40 staff, trainees and volunteers. Many start small and will remain locally based businesses operating in niche markets, meeting local needs. Others operate nationally or even internationally (Bob et al., 2009). The largest in the UK is probably the Co-operative Group, which has a turnover in excess of £8 billion, more than 70,000 employees and 5.5 million members (Bob et al., 2009). Others such as Greenwich Leisure are also very significant businesses. Greenwich Leisure has a turnover of £28.5 million and over 3000 staff (www.socialenterprise.org.uk). Companies limited by guarantee (CLG). Layton (2008a) proposes SEs have three elements: social ownership organizations are autonomous organizations with an element of participatory governance involving stakeholders and trustees, with profits used for the community or shared with stakeholders; enterprise orientation-income comes from trading; and social aims-social (and environmental) benefits that are not limited to a restricted group.

**Social investment**: Social investments are private contributions to public benefit. Helmut K. Anheier (2014) identifies two aspects are central here: first, the definition makes the implicit distinction that these contributions are investments rather than current expenditures intended for consumptive purposes. In this respect, the notion of social investment is identical to what investments are in the conventional economic sense: they are expenditures for the purchase by an investor or the provision by a donor of a financial product or another item of value with an expectation of favorable future returns. Or they are expenditures for the purchase by a producer or the provision by a donor of a physical good, service, or resource and with a use value beyond that current fiscal year. Social investments are private contributions to social benefit. Social investment can be understood in both a narrow and a more comprehensive sense. The narrow understanding corresponds to the provision and management of capital assets to social enterprises (Helmut, 2014) (i.e. non-profit organizations with business activity), businesses such as cooperatives, mutual, and some employee-owned firms that seek to combine social and economic returns. While they might be profit-oriented, they either produce significant positive communal externalities or have a communal distribution requirement written into their articles of incorporation. In some European countries, this notion of social investment is close to cooperative economics and the notions of social economy (discussed in greater depth later in the chapter), economie sociale (France, Belgium, Spain), or Gemeinwirtschaft (Germany, Austria, and Switzerland). A philanthropic investment is, therefore, a grant invested in a non-profit organization with no expectation of the return of the principal, but the expectation of social return on investment. Foundations and non-profit organizations may consider a wide range of financial investment options for creating such social value (Helmut, 2014).
**Social assets:** It is vital to ensure that the implementation of change does not come at the price of unwarranted damage to key social assets. The role of values as a basis for differentiation has already been noted and so it is important not to change them too radically where such a strategy is involved. However, there are other social assets, such as brand, reputation, legitimacy, relationships and staff relations are desirable to protect in the face of change.

Transparency is a central feature of good governance across non-profitmaking organizations and SEs (Aguilera, 2005; Gray, 1992; Paton, 2003; Strenger, 2004). The formal and informal safeguards and pressures that ensure the proper running of an organization represent transparency. For example, the new legal form of SE in the UK, the CIC, 'locks' assets to protect them from misuse. Both formal and informal elements are integral to ensuring that governance is transparent and thereby contributes to its legitimacy.

Helmut K. Anheier (2014) believes democracy is a central component of SEs. Democratic governance refers to how inclusive governance processes are for a specified stakeholder group in relation to liberty and equality social business for the community. Funding bodies play a crucial role in facilitating start-up SEs and offer a fixed-term level of financial support in the short term. They also have a non-financial interest in the organization. The role of government agencies is important to promote and support social businesses because government policies can enhance the social economy sector of a country. The UK CIC policy is favorable for enhancing social enterprises in the UK. Government policy intends to shape the sector by encouraging greater levels of involvement in social benefit businesses. However, social entrepreneurs need to be active for appropriating social enterprise policies and to communicate this agenda to the related stakeholders. The Social Enterprise Coalition is recognized as the most influential in this regard in the UK context. The CIC legal form will provide some interesting challenges for governance, as specific mechanisms (such as asset locking) apply to them. The particular issues that arise from the board’s management of such provisions will be instructive to the CIC’s usefulness to SEs. An asset lock is a way of ensuring that the assets of a company or society can never be cashed in by private individuals or companies for their own gain.

**Social marketing**
Social marketing is a framework that encompasses economics, psychology, sociology, and communications to understand how to influence behaviour (Kotler and Zaltman, 1971). A key social marketing objective is to understand the target audience, developing a deeper insight into the individual/group and issue. MacFyden et al. (2007) suggest that social marketing puts an emphasis on voluntary behaviour and, to achieve an exchange, the individual must be offered something to be received value in return for adopting a change in behaviour. Eid Miliband (2007), argues for SEs ethical values because social marketing is not solely about the benefits to an organization, but the equal right benefits to an individual or community. According to Helmut K. Anheier (2014) the social economy organizations addressing issues such as fair trade, healthcare provision, employment enhancement, childcare, environmental protection, arts promotion, and social housing. In order to address the issues related to SEs, it needs to clearly define SEs target audiences and programs for service/product delivery internally. Social entrepreneurs need to co-create sustainable product/service offers via stakeholder engagement and build social resources in the form of intangibles forms, such as reputation, trust, brand identity, relationships, and social capital.
These intangible values are important for social enterprises because people look at the products and services of the businesses before they are consuming. This 'value-based marketing' strategy is attracting community people (Helmut, 2014; Deshpande & Farley, 1998; Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Slater & Narver, 1994). Because the principal function of social business is not to generate a profit but to create a satisfied customer, with profit being the final reward. Therefore, social businesses marketing strategy should incline with the fulfillment of the customers demand that social entrepreneurs should passion for social marketing instead of money making conventional business marketing. Such kind of social marketing value is replicated in other governments such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the USA, and Scotland.

A. R. Andreasen (2002), in the USA, identified six criteria should be judged to determine whether or not it is a social marketing campaign namely, behavior change, consumer research, segmenting and targeting, marketing mix, exchange/benefit, and competition. French and Blair-Stevens (2006) outlined eight key attributes for social marketing: Customer orientation; behaviour; theory; insight; exchange; competition; segmentation; and methods mix. The role of the social marketer is to build and foster relationships with the customer over time and continue to consult and seek customer input to gain a greater understanding. Behaviour is the focus on understanding and changing behaviour that is at the core of social marketing. It aims to achieve a measurable impact on what people actually do. A. Bandura (1985) suggests that social marketers should consider the influence of the environment on individuals. The environment can be subdivided into the immediate environment, is that of family, friends and the local community, and the 'wider social context' of economic conditions, cultural norms, and social mores. (Hastings, 2007). Considering and addressing both types of environments can limit the risks of failure.

Segmentation of the customer in the social market analysis is very essential. Helmut K. Anheier (2014) finds social marketers recognize that different audiences have specific needs and, to achieve effective message delivery, it is necessary to analyse both audiences’ demographic and psychographic data. These can include factors such as age, gender, marital status and personality dispositions. Segmentation is recognized as an essential tool for social marketers and assists in the determining of want, needs, desires, and tendencies of specific groups within a larger population.

Methods mix is another marketing strategy where the techniques of the 4Ps marketing mix (McCarthy, 1960) or the extended version, the 7Ps (Booms & Bitner, 1981), can be exploited: product; people; price; policy; promotion; physical evidence; and place. Thackeray et al. (2007) suggest that, when considering a social marketing programme, several key questions should be considered: What is the product? What is the purpose of the promotion? What message will be conveyed? What tools will be used? And what promotional communication materials will be utilized? They suggest that a promotional strategy is required and becomes part of the marketing plan, which is then effectively integrated into the strategic plan.

Fair Trade Marketing: Golding and Peattie (2005) discuss the potential for promoting fair trade coffee using a social marketing-based approach. They propose an alternative to the view that fair trade organizations need to learn more from conventional commercial marketing. Social marketing could also be helpful to both fair trade and other SEs. However, the successful
marketing of fair trade and other SE brands require the careful crafting of both conventional and social marketing. Networks in marketing are central to relationship marketing. Gumesson (1997) believed all stakeholders of social enterprises should take responsibility for ensuring a functional relationship prevails among all the stakeholders (business owners and customers) of social enterprises. Commodity service supply chain should be proactive to partnership cooperation and coordination development in social businesses. For example, The Cafedirect and Divine UK social businesses have a new form of supplier partnership based on strong ethical commitments. The below diagram shows Cafedirect and Divine business has links with business economics and its business ethics.

**Socially responsible investments (SRIs)**

Helmut K. Anheier (2014) thinks SRIs are capital investments made with the primary aim of producing revenue, but with screens to select appropriate investment opportunities and vehicles. Kramer and Cooch (2006) introduce the term proactive social investments (PSIs). Such investment activities provide direct financing to create or expand enterprises that deliver social or environmental benefits in furtherance of the investor's programmatic goals. In economically distressed regions, any enterprise that creates jobs increases income and wealth or improves the standard of living can be considered socially beneficial. In mature markets, this category is typically limited to new products or services with specific social or environmental benefits, such as workforce development or solar energy installations. Helmut K. Anheier (2014) identifies five characteristics social investments: autonomy in decision-making about risks and benefits; voluntary, discretionary nature of activities; non-distribution constraint in terms of returns on investment; positive externalities associated with decisions and activities; and normative value base that links investment decisions and activities to intended outcomes.

There is a widespread growth of voluntary corporate social responsibility (CSR) programmes and reporting. TNCs are the sharp conflict of interest inherent in the process involving TNCs, states, labour groups and CSOs. However, there has been much criticism of the voluntary CSR concept. There is no clear definition of CSR. Corporations have an insufficient grounding in ethics. The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is a formative movement comprised of cooperating global interests with the aim of promoting a progressive approach in relation to CSR. It has produced the 'Sustainability reporting guidelines' (GRI, 2006) which are defined on an ongoing basis. In the light of the understanding developed, the later refinements made to the published GRI documentation have increased the emphasis on the need for companies to achieve stakeholder engagement. The social accounting movements also echo this point, emphasizing the need for engagement with stakeholders in the accounting process and linked documentation that has been developed to complement the GRI. The Social Audit Network (SAN) (Pearce and Kay, 2005). SAN looks to promote best practice in SES in what is an emerging activity in the sector. However, in the general business context-free from the ethical standpoint of what is actually happening on the ground in many businesses - there are criticisms of and a degree of cynicism arising in relation to the nature of many companies' CSR approaches.

**Developing a vision and mission in a social enterprise business**

According to R.D. Young (2001), the terms 'vision' and 'mission' refer to 'operational statements derive from a deeper notion of identity. Organizations struggle with these statements in their strategic planning, especially if they are unclear about identity.' However, it is not just in the
development of strategies that fail to understand identity will cause problems. Margolis and Hansen (2002) suggest that without understanding the underlying assumptions, but that is the essence of the organization and the core of the culture and organizational change will be met with resistance and difficulty. It is, therefore, appropriate to consider this foundational concept prior to exploring the more 'operational' concepts of mission and vision. Visions are usually based on notions of 'fairness' and 'justice, and working towards their achievement is seen as a moral imperative (Helmut, 2014). According to this approach, the vision serves as a commitment to transformational social change (Alvord et al., 2004). For example, the Skoll Foundation (www.skoll.com) is dedicated to the promotion of social entrepreneurship and has as its vision: Our vision is to live in a world of peace and prosperity where all people, regardless of geography, background or economic status, enjoy and employ the full range of their talents and abilities.

Figure 1: The mission pyramid, Source: Helmut K. Anheier (2014)

The basic approach of stating a purpose with clarity, articulating core values and translating these into an organization-wide strategy is illustrated in the mission pyramid shown in Figure 2. The advantages of a well-conceived sense of mission are well known. These include: providing a context for strategic decision making by senior management; providing guidance about resource allocation priorities; generating commitment and motivation of the organization's members; communicating the organization's purpose and values to external stakeholders; acting as a moral compass to guide decision making and behavior (Helmut, 2014).

**Strategic management for social enterprises**

Bob et al. 2009 think the appropriateness of the social economy organization’s strategy is dependent on an objective appraisal of the organization's current capability to take advantage of the emerging opportunities presented by its evolving external context. By an objective, we again mean grounded in well-researched evidence rather than simply based on the subjective opinions of internal stakeholders. Bob et al. 2009 find six stages of the SEs strategy process model that is discussing below: 1. Designing a bespoke strategy development process; 2. The organization's vision and mission; 3. Determining the current strategic position; 4. Producing effective objectives, strategies, and plans; 5. Implementation of strategy; and 6. Performance Measurement. A proactive approach to ensuring long-term survival and growth, strategic management can enable SEs to better achieve the desired social and economic outcomes. The
aim of strategic management is to articulate a desired future state for the organization and be proactive in implementing actions to bring it about. In other words, strategic management is an attempt to take control of the organization's destiny by developing a rigorous and legitimate strategy for the survival and growth of the organization.

SEs has two key strategy issues, the strategy process, and strategy content. The former refers to the way in which the strategy is developed by the organization, while the latter refers to the validity of the chosen strategy or strategies (Helmut, 2014; Johnson & Scholes, 2005). Helmut K. Anheier (2014) identifies six stages of a strategy process model: 1. Designing a bespoke strategy development process; 2. The organization's vision and mission; 3. Determining the current strategic position; 4. Producing effective objectives, strategies, and plans; 5. Implementation of strategy; and 6. Performance Measurement.

An organization's strategy is the result of a process embedded in a context (Pettigrew, 2003). Formal strategic planning is one of the main issues in SEs. The appropriate process for developing strategies is the one that is matched to the realities of the organization's context (Courtney, 2002; Rhodes & Keogan, 2005). Sharp et al. (2007) argue that strategy development in SES 'works best when it is appreciative, reflective, participatory and outcomes-focused.' Therefore, it is necessary, in designing the process, to bring forth an agreement on strategic direction and action (Levy, Alvesson & Willmott, 2003; Paton, 2003).

Hudson (2004) stresses to the dimensions of the strategy development process. He finds the evolutionary process that involves small incremental steps. Values are of greater significance in the management of third-sector organizations (Hudson, 2004; and Waddock, 2004) than conventional companies. Values are ethical and moral codes of conduct shaped by the social, religious, cultural and historical contexts in which we live. Their central importance is illustrated in the description of SES as being 'value-led, market-driven' (Westall, 2001). Most third-sector organizations are coalitions of interest groups, each with their own often divergent-priorities, constraints, and power to influence negotiated strategies. In practice, this means that the strategy development process will involve greater time and effort being devoted to networking, communicating, politicking and negotiating in a bid to fashion consensus among the key stakeholders. The social orientation of third-sector organizations means that, in practice, they are often seeking to achieve a broader set of strategic objectives that are their public and especially, private-sector counterparts. SEs are more inclined to embrace a double or triple bottom line management philosophy and, therefore, seek to balance economic, environmental and social impacts (Elkington, 2004).

The SEs planning process the process will guide the organization to address the following: determining the organization's mission and/or vision; evaluating the organization's current strategic position; specifying realistic but challenging strategic objectives; identifying and screening possible strategies for attaining the agreed objectives; strategic plans for translating strategy into actions; devising an implementation strategy to manage the organizational change process; and performance evaluation processes and mechanisms (Helmut, 2014).

Depending on the structure of the organization and its degree of diversification, the SEs strategy development process may have to produce strategies for different levels within the organization.
For example, in larger organizations, strategies will be needed at the corporate, divisional and service delivery levels. Each of these strategies will be concerned with a different set of issues, but be interconnected in a mutually reinforcing hierarchy. Helmut K. Anheier (2014) finds three steps in SES planning process are stating below: First, corporate strategy is concerned with developing the mission, diversification strategy and portfolio management for the organization. Second, SEs planning strategy should focus on developing the resource capabilities needed to deliver a group of services and devising and implementing projects to improve service quality and efficiency. Finally, the service-level strategy is concerned with managing individual services to achieve set objectives for target numbers within budget constraints and other performance indicators.

M. Hudson (2004) draws attention to three dimensions of the strategy development process, each of which is highly context-specific. 1. The process is evolutionary and involves small incremental steps. It follows that experimentation and learning over time are as important as periodic formal planning, 2. It is a political process whereby powerful individuals and/or groups negotiate and bargain their way to a consensus about the most suitable strategy and 3. It involves an analytical process to produce strategic plans based on rigorous reviews of the organization's strategic position in relation to its current environmental situation.

**Sustainable development for business ethics in social economic organizations**

Sustainable development is the adoption of innovation and new ways of working for the community wellbeing. Therefore, innovation and new ways of working are very relevant to three elements of sustainable development-social, environmental and economic aspects (Hart and Milstein, 2003; Rotheroe et al., 2003). Moreover, many SEs are focusing their businesses on the locality and community services, develop social networks and capacity building of the community people. Helmut K. Anheier (2014) finds SEs have the following features in their operations: The creation of community interaction, social infrastructure and social inclusion; building on the local sense of place and space; linking recycling and other environmental initiatives to the achievement of wider social objectives’ Moreover, social enterprises are initiatives in community-based arts; stimulate employment for disabled groups; advocate for social housing; and motivate for engaging the unemployed to social business; and encouraging people to participation in the health care related activities. Social capital consists of resources within communities which are created through the presence of trust, reciprocity and mutuality, shared norms of behaviour, shared commitment and belonging, both formal and informal social networks, and effective information channels (Field, 2003; Hooghe & Stolle, 2003; MacGillivray, 2004; Putnam, 1993; and Kay, 2003). These sustainable development principles used productively by individuals and groups, to facilitate actions to benefit individuals, groups and the community at large.

**Implementing strategies of social enterprises**

Social business implementing strategy involves making efforts to bring about changes in organizational behaviour that will result in the achievement of the long-term social performance objectives of SEs (Helmut, 2014). Social enterprise implementing strategy involves making efforts to bring about changes in organizational behaviour in order to achieve the long-term performance objectives of SEs. Managing implementation is highly context-specific. The design and implementation of any change social enterprise are dependent on the specific conditions
inside and outside of the organization (Balogun & Hope-Hailey, 1998). Many factors influence the chances of the successful implementation of a chosen social business strategy. Among these is the readiness of the organization to accept change (Bob et al. 2009). This is influenced by a number of factors. The change of readiness depends on current capacity and ability to change the organization. However, the question is has the organization got the resources and skills in place to support the process? The support includes management overheads, funds, systems, structures and processes that will enable the change to happen (Bob et al. 2009).

Bob et al. 2009 ask the following questions to dig more to know more about the implementation strategies of SEs: Where do we need to focus efforts to achieve it? The variables are the factors which are seen to affect performance such as team composition, skill sets, structures, systems, processes, policies, resources, and relationships, etc., who are to be the agents of change? What outcomes are required (nature and scale of change), where the effort is to be applied (site) and what changes are needed to affect the outcomes (variables)? These questions are very important to develop skills and experience that are required to manage the changes and who (internally or externally) may possess them.

Many factors influence the chances of the successful implementation of a chosen strategy for SEs (Balogun & Hope-Hailey, 1998). Among these is the readiness of the organization to accept change. Helmut K. Anheier (2014) thinks this is influenced by a number of factors: First, the extent to which members have been persuaded of the need for change and reassured about the personal risks associated with the process is critical. Second, as SEs are widely viewed as stakeholder organizations' (Low, 2006; Bryson, 1995). Third, readiness depends on current capacity and ability to change. Organization’s change readiness includes management overheads, funds, systems, structures and processes that will enable the change to happen. Moreover, the SEs strategic planning literature tends to emphasize the structural elements of change interventions like stages, roles, budgets, timing, and other planned designed elements.

Values are important in terms of both outcomes and processes. Implementation involves a series of trade-offs as resources that are reallocated to new priorities depend on prevailing values and judgment of the desirability (benefits) of such trade-offs against their acceptability (costs) will depend on prevailing values. Individual and organizational capability building is very important in social businesses because capability refers to use the available resources of the organization and is able to mobilize to effect the change. This covers the staff (numbers and expertise), finances and physical assets available in social businesses. The capacity building could through social net support. Helmut K. Anheier (2014) also emphasizes on the accountability of the business to community people. Social entrepreneurs’ actions have to be responsible' to community wellbeing (Gray et al., 1996). Accountability also represents the level of performance’s board member's, and managers are judged to uphold in their duties to stakeholders.

Good governance of social businesses is essential for public wellbeing. Governance can be defined broadly as a 'set of relationships between an organization's management, its board ... and other stakeholders (OECD, 2004). The mechanisms available to achieve accountability in governance are numerous (Rotheroe & Richards, 2007; Van Kersbergen & Van Waarden, 2004). It does provide an overview of the key elements of governance in general, such as the
management of relationships between key groups and working towards an overarching objective. The value of accountability for SEs is related to the governance of the social business. Accountability symbolizes an ethos of proving the effectiveness of its governance, focusing on the performance of an individual's as well as management teams and the board. Transparency is another important facet of governance.

Table 2. Stakeholders’ expectations of governance of SEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder groups relevant to governance</th>
<th>Expected features of governance of SEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service users</td>
<td>Ethical governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal staff (managers, directors, trustees)</td>
<td>Board-level strategic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local communities</td>
<td>A requirement to manage stakeholders’ interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>Enabling and supporting an internal culture of maximizing social benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding bodies</td>
<td>Promoting inclusion of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support groups</td>
<td>Managing the establishment of a culture of accountability and transparency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Dicken, 2007 in Helmut K. Anheier (2014)

Transparency is a central feature of good governance across non-profitmaking organizations and SEs (Aguilera, 2005; Gray, 1992; Paton, 2003; Strenger, 2004). The formal and informal safeguards and pressures that ensure the proper running of an organization represent transparency. For example, the new legal form of SE in the UK, the CIC, 'locks' assets to protect them from misuse. Both formal and informal elements are integral to ensuring that governance is transparent and thereby contributes to its legitimacy.

Helmut K. Anheier (2014) believes democracy is a central component of SEs. Democratic governance refers to how inclusive governance processes are for a specified stakeholder group in relation to liberty and equality social business for the community. Funding bodies play a crucial role in facilitating start-up SEs and offer a fixed-term level of financial support in the short term. They also have a non-financial interest in the organization. The role of government agencies is important to promote and support social businesses because government policies can enhance the social economy sector of a country. The UK CIC policy is favorable for enhancing social enterprises in the UK. Government policy intends to shape the sector by encouraging greater levels of involvement in social benefit businesses. However, social entrepreneurs need to be active for appropriating social enterprise policies and to communicate this agenda to the related stakeholders. The Social Enterprise Coalition is recognized as the most influential in this regard in the UK context. The CIC legal form will provide some interesting challenges for governance, as specific mechanisms (such as asset locking) apply to them. The particular issues that arise from the board’s management of such provisions will be instructive to the CIC’s usefulness to SEs. An asset lock is a way of ensuring that the assets of a company or society can never be cashed in by private individuals or companies for their own gain.

Social marketing
Social marketing is a framework that encompasses economics, psychology, sociology, and communications to understand how to influence behaviour (Kotler and Zaltman, 1971). A key social marketing objective is to understand the target audience, developing a deeper insight into the individual/group and issue. MacFyden et al. (2007) suggest that social marketing puts an
emphasis on voluntary behaviour and, to achieve an exchange, the individual must be offered something to be received value in return for adopting a change in behaviour. Eid Miliband (2007), argues for SEs ethical values because social marketing is not solely about the benefits to an organization, but the equal right benefits to an individual or community. According to Helmut K. Anheier (2014) the social economy organizations addressing issues such as fair trade, healthcare provision, employment enhancement, childcare, environmental protection, arts promotion, and social housing. In order to address the issues related to SEs, it needs to clearly define SEs target audiences and programs for service/product delivery internally. Social entrepreneurs need to co-create sustainable product/service offers via stakeholder engagement and build social resources in the form of intangibles forms, such as reputation, trust, brand identity, relationships, and social capital.

These intangible values are important for social enterprises because people look at the products and services of the businesses before they are consuming. This ‘value-based marketing’ strategy is attracting community people (Helmut, 2014; Deshpande & Farley, 1998; Kohli & Jaworski, 1990; Slater & Narver, 1994). Because the principal function of social business is not to generate a profit but to create a satisfied customer, with profit being the final reward. Therefore, social businesses marketing strategy should incline with the fulfillment of the customers demand that social entrepreneurs should passion for social marketing instead of money making conventional business marketing. Such kind of social marketing value is replicated in other governments such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the USA, and Scotland.

A. R. Andreasen (2002), in the USA, identified six criteria should be judged to determine whether or not it is a social marketing campaign namely, behavior change, consumer research, segmenting and targeting, marketing mix, exchange/benefit, and competition. French and Blair-Stevens (2006) outlined eight key attributes for social marketing: Customer orientation; behaviour; theory; insight; exchange; competition; segmentation; and methods mix. The role of the social marketer is to build and foster relationships with the customer over time and continue to consult and seek customer input to gain a greater understanding. Behaviour is the focus on understanding and changing behaviour that is at the core of social marketing. It aims to achieve a measurable impact on what people actually do. A. Bandura (1985) suggests that social marketers should consider the influence of the environment on individuals. The environment can be subdivided into the immediate environment, is that of family, friends and the local community, and the 'wider social context' of economic conditions, cultural norms, and social mores (Hastings, 2007). Considering and addressing both types of environments can limit the risks of failure.

Segmentation of the customer in the social market analysis is very essential. Helmut K. Anheier (2014) finds social marketers recognize that different audiences have specific needs and, to achieve effective message delivery, it is necessary to analyse both audiences’ demographic and psychographic data. These can include factors such as age, gender, marital status and personality dispositions. Segmentation is recognized as an essential tool for social marketers and assists in the determining of want, needs, desires, and tendencies of specific groups within a larger population.
Methods mix is another marketing strategy where the techniques of the 4Ps marketing mix (McCarthy, 1960) or the extended version, the 7Ps (Booms & Bitner, 1981), can be exploited: product; people; price; policy; promotion; physical evidence; and place. Thackeray et al. (2007) suggest that, when considering a social marketing programme, several key questions should be considered: What is the product? What is the purpose of the promotion? What message will be conveyed? What tools will be used? And what promotional communication materials will be utilized? They suggest that a promotional strategy is required and becomes part of the marketing plan, which is then effectively integrated into the strategic plan.

Fair Trade Marketing: Golding and Peattie (2005) discuss the potential for promoting fair trade coffee using a social marketing-based approach. They propose an alternative to the view that fair trade organizations need to learn more from conventional commercial marketing. Social marketing could also be helpful to both fair trade and other SEs. However, the successful marketing of fair trade and other SE brands require the careful crafting of both conventional and social marketing. Networks in marketing are central to relationship marketing. Gumesson (1997) believed all stakeholders of social enterprises should take responsibility for ensuring a functional relationship prevails among all the stakeholders (business owners and customers) of social enterprises. Commodity service supply chain should be proactive to partnership cooperation and coordination development in social businesses. For example, The Cafédirect and Divine UK social businesses have a new form of supplier partnership based on strong ethical commitments. The below diagram shows Cafédirect and Divine business has links with business economics and its business ethics.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 2. Social enterprise link to economics of the business
Source: Helmut K. Anheier (2014)

**Strategies for managing SEs people**

J. Storey (2007) outlines complementary pathways to developing human resource management (HRM) strategy: good practices; best fit; response to analysis of trends; and building on and exploiting the resource base. Social missions within SEs often involve working with marginalized communities, but within these marginalized communities, there is a very real danger that they may not be able to provide a marketplace for the new commercial activity. Price (2004) defines human resource planning as a process that anticipates and maps out the consequences of business strategy on an organization's human resource requirements. J. Storey (2007) defines two strategic approaches to managing people in organizations. The first is a cost-
based approach that views employees as being a cost to the organization and is primarily concerned with minimizing the cost and controlling the performance of those employed. This is known as a 'hard' strategic approach. The alternative, a 'soft' approach, views employees as assets who contribute to the competitive advantage of the organization.

In reality, organizations may employ a mixture of hard and soft behaviours across skill levels and in differing market conditions. The requirement of SEs to manage a commercial and a social mission would suggest the possibility of a hybrid approach, possibly a middle view somewhere between hard and soft. However, there needs to establish clarity about staffing levels and patterns of work; recruitment and selection processes; motivational performance and reward options; and progressive development policies. The Canadian Centre for Philanthropy (1998) has identified three areas of need to supply staff to SEs: 1. Changing needs resulting from changing populations, 2. Exposing gaps in services provided by the public sector; and 3. Changes in public perception in relation to the not-for-profit sector; and political encouragement is given to SEs.

Measure performance
Performance measurement is a difficult challenge for social business organizations (Bull, 2007; Bull & Crompton, 2006; Rhodes and Keogan, 2005; Rotheroe and Richards, 2007; Somers, 2005; Stone, et al., 1999). They find the difficulty stems, principally, from three areas. First, there is the problem of plurality. Second, the problem of causality: Causal links between the adoption of strategic management and performance is often ambiguous because of indirect links at work (Siciliano, 1997). Finally, there is the problem of measurement. Tools available from the corporate world are often inappropriate for measuring the performance outcomes targeted by SEs-social impact and sustainability reporting being two key areas in this regard (Rotheroe & Richards, 2007). One method is useful to strategic management in third-sector organizations is the Balanced Scorecard (BSC).

The Balanced Scorecard
Pioneered by Kaplan and Norton (1992, 1996), the BSC is a holistic performance management tool is seen to offer a number of benefits to SEs. Such as the BSC has the advantage of 'simultaneously taking into account both financial and intangible resources that can determine success or failure' (Somers, 2005). Secondly, by connecting financially to non-financial objectives, external to internal processes, and current to future performance, the corporate strategy will be mapped more cohesively, and employees at all levels of the organization work towards the same goal' (Somers, 2005: 45). However, many social enterprise scholars note that 'many SEs see impact measurement as a burden (Bull, 2007; Ronchetti, 2006); Bull (2007). However, the BSC seems to offer potential as a viable integrative approach for performance measurement.

Grameen Bank socio-economic performance indicators
Every year GB staff evaluates their work and check whether the socio-economic situation of GB members is improving. GB evaluates poverty level of the borrowers using ten indicators. A member is considered to have moved out of poverty if her family fulfills the following criteria:

1. The family lives in a house worth at least Tk. 25,000 (twenty five thousand) or a house with a tin roof, and each member of the family is able to sleep on bed instead of on the floor.
2. Family members drink pure water of tube-wells, boiled water or water purified by using alum, arsenic-free, purifying tablets or pitcher filters.
3. All children in the family over six years of age are all going to school or finished primary school.
4. Minimum weekly loan installment of the borrower is Tk. 200 or more
5. Family uses sanitary latrine.
6. Family members have adequate clothing for every day use, warm clothing for winter, such as shawls, sweaters, blankets, etc., and mosquito-nets to protect themselves from mosquitoes.
7. Family has sources of additional income, such as vegetable garden, fruit-bearing trees, etc, so that they are able to fall back on these sources of income when they need additional money.
8. The borrower maintains an average annual balance of Tk. 5,000 in her savings accounts.
9. Family experiences no difficulty in having three square meals a day throughout the year, i. e. no member of the family goes hungry any time of the year.
10. Family can take care of the health.


**Personal experience of developing a community social business in Bangladesh**

I have a personal experience of community Khas (public) pond fish culture and community vegetable production social business experience in Bangladesh. During the Bangladesh liberation movement in 1971, many Hindu families migrated to India. The migrated Hindu people do not return to Bangladesh after the liberation war. Their lands are declared enemy properties and treated as public properties. However, many village leaders grasp these properties illegally in our village Barera.

One big pond (six acres water area) and its surrounded ten acres land are captured by three elites illegally in 1972. These three elites are very powerful in the village. We used to play the traditional games in one of the corners of the pond embankment. One day a mussel elite Jabber Munshee forcibly outstate us from this playing land. Even he and his two other associates beat my two young classmates who are studying in grade 11 and also abused our other friends, neighbors including me. We send our wounded classmates to a local hospital. On the way, we meet a cooperative extension worker near the hospital and narrate him the situation. The cooperative extension worker advises me to form a club register with the Social Welfare Department and enlist the club with the Thana Cooperative office.

We, ten young boys, make the Barera Sports Club registered with the Social Welfare Department and Dabidower Thana Cooperative Office. The cooperative officer advice us lease the pond from the Thana Administrative Land Office for three years; cultivate fish and vegetables in the pond and the surrounding Khas embankment lands. These cultivable fish and vegetables generate income for the Club. The cooperative office gives us $100 seed loan money for buying fingerlings, vegetable seeds, and other cultivation tools. We voluntarily cultivate fish and vegetables in the pond and its sounding Khas land for three years. We build a clubhouse on the embankment. The income of the cultivable lands uses for covering the costs of the club. However, as we are students, we are unable to cultivate the whole lands. We make an agreement with six senior homeless widow women (Husbands died in the liberation war.) and four poor families’ to live on the embankment of the pond and cultivate the lands and donate 20% of the produce to the club.
The club uses the donation for repaying the cooperative loan and cover the expenditure of the club. This agreement is supported by all the villagers. The club offers a bursary to ten high school students from the club income money every year. All villagers support the club services and appreciate the club activities. The villagers do not support the mussel corrupted elites who grasp the land illegally for two years. This an example the Barera Sports Club is involved with social enterprise activities in the village, rehabilitate ten poor vulnerable people of the village. Use this public pond for the benefit of the disadvantaged people of the village; rescue the pond and the surrounding lands from the hands of the illegally occupied three muscle men. Use this public property for Barera Sports Club and for homeless poor disadvantaged wellbeing. The Barera Sports Club is a democratic organization in the village that manages the pond and the surrounding Khas lands and use them for social purpose activities as a social enterprise in the village.

Scope of Social enterprises
In Europe, the social economy is a fast-growing sector, significantly outstripping the private sector in terms of job creation (Hudson, 2005). The social economy within the EU has been estimated to cover nearly a tenth of all enterprises and employment, representing nine million full-time jobs. Of these, about half (4.8 million) are employed in Europe's 300,000 cooperatives (Hudson, 2005). According to Hudson (2005), the EU views SES as an essential part of the European economic model and the European Commission has established a Social Economy Unit in the Directorate General for Industry. Moreover, in the UK, the turnover of cooperatives is around £20 billion-consumer cooperatives alone have a turnover of £12.5 billion and 9.8 million members (www.co-operatives-UK.coop). There are 60 building societies with assets of £305 billion, more than 15 million savers and 2.5 million borrowers (www.bsa.org.uk). In the charitable and not-for-profit sector, there are organizations ranging between 500,000 and 700,000 organizations in the UK. Within this, there are 169,000 'general charities' with an income of £26.3 billion in 2003/04 and a paid workforce of at least 608,000 (www.ncvo-vol.org.uk). Since 2000, the sector has seen a net increase in 28,000 organizations (NCVO, 2006).

Branco (2007) explains that the Italian social economy accounts for more than 12 percent of Italy's total GDP. The social economy in Italy is supported by a detailed and advanced legislative and normative framework that is both fully integrated and integral to the Italian economy and a specific credit system (Branco, 2007). They now have a combined turnover of more than £500 million, employ over 13,000 people and have in excess of 118 million customer visits per year (Www.sporta.org). Development trusts (a form of community enterprise based on the use of community-owned assets that generate income to meet local needs, often in areas of greatest economic decline) have also seen rapid growth. Moreover, in the UK, Social Enterprises account for 5 percent of all businesses with employees and contribute £8.4 billion per year to the UK economy' (SEC, 2008). The EU stresses its support for SEs as a valuable part of the social economy sector across its economic region. Furthermore, there is a long-established and thriving non-profit sector in the USA and Canada that encompasses social economy.
According to Salamon et al. (2003), this growth is due to a number of factors, including a reawakening of active citizenship due to advances in information technology and rising literacy levels. The increasing numbers of educated people see third-sector organizations as vehicles for making a difference to societies affected by perceived state or market failures. In addition, the work of Western charitable foundations committed to empowering the poor is also important. More recently, there has been recognition by multilateral organizations such as the World Bank (WB) of the importance of engaging citizens when implementing development agendas.

**Contents of Social economy education could be**

- Concepts, definitions and theories of social economy
- Importance of Social economy
- Histories of social economy
- Types of social economy programs and institutions with examples
- Benefits of social economy services
- Problems facing by social enterprise institutions
- How to manage social enterprise businesses/ institutions
- Earning incomes strategies, pricing products and social marketing
- Social enterprise organizational management and financial management strategies

**Conclusion**

The paper discusses the meanings of social economy, different types of social economy organizations, issues in social economy agencies, history of social economy evolution, issues in social economy community outreach education, strengths and weakness of social economy with examples in different countries, implementation strategies, human resource management and social marketing strategies of social enterprises. The social economy community outreach education can represent a new or renewed expression of civil society against a background of economic crisis, aware mass people against monopoly corporations’ profit maximization policy, energies the weakening of social bonds and the difficulties of the welfare state' (Borzaga & Defourrey, 2001). In order to disseminate the altruistic social economy idea, and promote and encourage people to be involved in SEs, the social economy community outreach education services can use the popular education adult learning strategies for both formal and non-formal learning sessions at formal or informal settings.
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