

COMMUNITY-BASED ENTREPRENEURSHIP: FOSTERING LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL COHESION

JD Ngo Ndjama^{1,*}, J. Van Der Westhuizen²

¹ Human Resource Management, Vaal University of Technology, Vanderbijlpark, South Africa, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2472-2329>

² Human Resource Management, Vaal University of Technology, Vanderbijlpark, South Africa, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7140-0229>

Keywords

Entrepreneurship;
community-based
entrepreneurship;
local economic
development;
social cohesion;
entrepreneurial event
theory

Abstract

The challenges communities face such as poverty, social injustice, loss of culture, and environmental degradation, may seem daunting. Despite the efforts of governments, NGOs, and corporations to address sustainability issues, many problems remain unresolved. CBE is seen as a viable solution for improving the economic situation of communities facing crises. Built upon the entrepreneurial event theory, this study aims to provide a deeper understanding of how community-based entrepreneurship can contribute to local development and social cohesion. To achieve this, a systematic literature review methodology was employed. A thorough search of academic databases and relevant sources is conducted to identify and analyse scholarly articles, books, and reports that discuss community-based entrepreneurship. The selected materials are then critically reviewed and synthesised to extract key findings and insights. The findings of this study highlight the positive impact of community-based entrepreneurship on local development and social cohesion. It is observed that community-based entrepreneurship initiatives can create employment opportunities, enhance local economies, and strengthen social networks within communities. Moreover, these initiatives contribute to the preservation of cultural heritage and the empowerment of marginalised groups. Based on the findings, it

¹*Corresponding Author

* E-mail address: joellengo2009@gmail.com

² E-mail address: johanvdw@vut.ac.za

is recommended that policymakers and stakeholders should recognise the importance of community-based entrepreneurship and provide support through funding, training, and mentorship programs.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Entrepreneurship remains a popular subject in academic literature, as it garners significant attention for the valuable contributions entrepreneurs make to the broader economy and community (Hassan, Dahalan, Hilmi & Jaafar, 2021; Fortunato & Alter, 2015). Ebewo (2014) asserts that entrepreneurship involves identifying, assessing, and capitalising on opportunities to establish new ventures in the future. Parwez (2017) notes that development agencies and multinational organisations have played a significant role in addressing poverty in the developing world for several decades. However, a key challenge in these efforts is that projects are typically designed and executed by external agencies rather than involving the local community (Parwez, 2017). According to Hertel (2018), a local community is an aggregation of people that is not defined initially by the sharing of goals or the productive activities of the enterprise but, rather, by shared geographical location, generally accompanied by collective culture and/or ethnicity and potentially by other shared relational characteristics. This disconnect leads to a pronounced deficiency in ownership and engagement among the local population and beneficiaries, primarily stemming from the absence of their input in the decision-making processes (Parwez, 2017). Furthermore, Hertel (2018) notes that the challenges communities face such as poverty, social injustice, loss of culture, and environmental degradation, may seem daunting. Despite the efforts of governments, NGOs, and corporations to address sustainability issues, many problems remain unresolved. It is widely recognised that alternative solutions driven by citizens will be necessary to tackle these pressing and interconnected economic, social, and ecological problems (Hertel, 2018). Similarly, Pinheiro et al. (2020) observed that the relationship between entrepreneurs and communities has emerged as a fresh area of exploration in entrepreneurship research. Recent entrepreneurship research has focused on community-based enterprises (CBEs), highlighting the necessity for communities to address their economic challenges by seeking solutions collectively (Ebewo, 2014; Peredo & Chrisman, 2004; Lyons, 2002; Peredo, 2001; Nelson, 2000; Hazare, 1997; Tenenbaum, 1996).

Gurau and Dana (2018) define community-based entrepreneurship (CBE) as a form of local entrepreneurship that emphasises environmental stewardship, social responsibility, collective action, and traditional values of mutual support. Ebewo (2014) maintains that CBEs emerge when a community collaboratively works towards establishing or restoring a satisfactory balance. These initiatives utilise local natural resources, cultural heritage, and social strengths to enhance the community's quality of life; hence, CBEs act as a platform for local progress, offering services and prospects to residents (Ebewo, 2014). CBE is seen as a viable solution for improving the economic situation of communities facing crises (Suryani, Soedarso, Utomo, Endarko & Ahmad, 2022). In the same vein, Purusottama, Trilaksono and Soehadi (2018) comment that CBE has emerged as a viable solution for tackling poverty issues, demonstrating its effectiveness in poverty reduction. It has the potential to create new job opportunities, combat poverty, slow down urbanisation, and enhance the overall quality of life within the community (Suryani et al., 2022). However, the progress of rural CBE is hindered by significant obstacles. Nevertheless, in rural regions, the challenges faced by impoverished and marginalised individuals and communities persist and necessitate further attention and intervention (Purusottama et al., 2018).

1.2. Problem Statement

CBE has gained significant attention in both social science research and among economic agents, both nationally and internationally. According to Meyer (2019), it is seen as a potential driver of economic growth and development and is, therefore, a focus area for policymakers. Despite its global importance, various deficiencies in the existing dialogue impede progress and understanding. For instance, the existing literature often lacks comprehensive empirical studies that assess the long-term sustainability and scalability of CBE initiatives in diverse socio-economic contexts (Meyer, 2019). From addressing marginalised individuals and communities to poverty alleviation and environmental conservation, CBE has existed as a phenomenon since the beginning of entrepreneurial activities (Klarin & Suseno, 2022). Although the concept is not new, academic research on the topic has only recently gained traction in the last decade (Saebi, Foss & Linder, 2019). Existing work on CBE presents interesting discussions and contentions. For example, Klarin and Suseno (2022) argue that the diversity of actors involved in CBE, as well as their broad range of motivations from hybrid missions to not-for-profits, often lead to confusion about the CBE concept. The authors emphasise that the involvement of diverse actors with varying

motivations can lead to a lack of clarity and understanding regarding the core concept of CBE. They suggest that this confusion may hinder the effective implementation and realisation of CBE initiatives, ultimately impacting the overall success of community-based enterprises. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore the role of CBE in fostering local development and social cohesion.

1.3. Research objectives

This research aims to investigate the significance of Community-Based Education in promoting local development and enhancing social cohesion within communities.

2. Literature Review

Provide a detailed literature review, citing references in the reference list. Ensure you provide a literature background for the study.

2.1 Theoretical framework

Shapero's entrepreneurial event theory (EET) is highly relevant to this research as it provides a framework for understanding the process through which individuals become entrepreneurs. The Entrepreneurial Event model by Shapero and Sokol (1982) was created to explore how cultural and social influences can impact individuals' perceptions and lead to the creation of a new venture. According to Shapero (1982), entrepreneurial events are triggered by a combination of personal and environmental factors, such as the identification of opportunities, the perception of one's abilities, and the availability of resources and support networks. This model views entrepreneurship as a viable option that emerges in response to external changes (Ahuja, Akhtar & Wali, 2019). These external changes can encompass a wide range of factors, such as shifts in market demand, advancements in technology, changes in government regulations, or even social trends. For instance, a sudden increase in consumer interest towards sustainable products may create an opportunity for entrepreneurs to develop eco-friendly alternatives. Similarly, a disruption in an industry due to technological innovation can prompt individuals to identify gaps and create new ventures to address emerging needs.

Ahuja et al. (2019) point out that the model outlines two fundamental types of perceptions namely perceived desirability (PD) and perceived feasibility (PF). The PD is influenced by an

individual's attitudes, values, and emotions, and reflects their perception of the desirability of entrepreneurship. On the other hand, the PF is associated with an individual's perception of the resources available to them and measures their personal belief in their ability to engage in specific behaviours. Kushnirovich et al. (2018) contend that the perceived feasibility of setting up a new venture is influenced by one's perceived self-efficacy, which refers to the belief in one's ability to perform the necessary actions to achieve a desired outcome. As indicated by Kushnirovich et al. (2018), economically disadvantaged communities frequently experience challenges related to self-efficacy. Research on the psychology of poverty has revealed that poverty can negatively impact individuals' self-confidence, potentially hindering their ability to pursue entrepreneurial endeavours (Haushofer & Fehr 2014). The perception of feasibility is influenced by the belief in the collective capabilities of a group to organise and carry out the necessary actions to achieve specific goals (Bandura, 2000). This concept, known as perceived collective efficacy, has primarily been studied in the context of organisational teams. However, it can also be applied to communities, where it encompasses the belief in the collective capacity to take coordinated and interdependent action on community-related issues. According to Bandura (2000), many desired outcomes can only be achieved through collaborative efforts. Additionally, the model includes the Propensity to Act (PTA), which represents an individual's inclination to take action based on their decisions and encompasses the volitional aspects of intentions (Ahuja et al., 2019).

2.2 Community-based entrepreneurship

According to Hassan et al. (2021), entrepreneurship refers to an individual's capacity to implement an idea that involves qualities like risk-taking, creativity, and innovation to strategise and oversee activities aimed at achieving specific objectives. Fortunato and Alter (2015) observe that entrepreneurs are commonly viewed as drivers of economic growth, agents of change and creativity, and frequently significant contributors to the local community. Gallardo (2015) argues that a community is a defined geographical area where individuals engage in interactions. However, it is not solely a physical space for interactions but also serves essential functions and activities for its inhabitants (Gallardo, 2015). Consequently, community developers are increasingly focusing on entrepreneurship due to its recognised importance in economic progress, employment generation, and improvements in societal welfare within countries (Fortunato & Alter, 2015). Thus, the concept of CBE is gaining traction in entrepreneurship research as it leverages the need for community

involvement in the development of any business venture (Hassan et al., 2021). CBE refers to the identification, establishment, and utilisation of opportunities to collectively generate economic, social, and ecological advantages for local communities and society as a whole. Suryani et al. (2022) state that CBE is a type of entrepreneurial activity that arises from the specific needs of a local community to prosper through the use of their own resources, knowledge, and financial support. This concept emphasises that CBE is a dynamic process involving the creation of opportunities through a co-evolutionary approach that includes opportunity development, collectivisation, and evaluation. The outcome of this process is the establishment of enterprises that contribute to sustainable development, whether at a local or societal scale (Hertel, 2015). Ebewo (2014) elucidates that CBE involves a community collectively functioning as both an entrepreneur and an enterprise for the betterment of the community. The community acts entrepreneurially by identifying market opportunities and organising themselves to respond to them, while also working together to produce and exchange goods/services within the community's social structure (Ebewo, 2014). Consequently, Ebewo (2014) states that the community serves as both the foundation for entrepreneurial activities and a means to utilise social connections to enhance the standard of living. These functions include economic aspects such as providing goods and services, socialisation processes that transmit knowledge and values, social control mechanisms to influence behaviour, opportunities for social participation, and mutual support during times of need (Gallardo, 2015).

CBE underlines the rise of individuals who establish businesses within the framework of the local social environment (Mandrysz, 2020). Ebewo (2014) observes that entrepreneurship is focused on generating personal gain and profits for the entrepreneur and shareholders, while CBE is centred on creating benefits for the community. This type of entrepreneurship is driven by the desire to achieve economic and social goals for the community (Mandrysz, 2020). Hence, Ebewo (2014) explicates that entrepreneurs who operate within a community context leverage the resources available to them to address challenges related to poverty, including financial limitations, lack of expertise, and workforce shortages. Numerous CBEs have emerged to facilitate neighbourhood revitalisation and address the gaps resulting from reductions in government spending (Kleinhans, 2017). In the UK, a significant number of local shops and supermarkets shut down annually, leading to the establishment of over 350 CBEs (Plunkett Foundation, 2017). Hertel (2018) argues that residents collectively purchase

or lease properties, devise business strategies, formalise legal entities, and oversee the day-to-day operations of these enterprises. These CBEs often incorporate additional amenities like cafes, banks, or post offices, enhancing their value to the local community (Hertel, 2018). Ebewo (2014) specifies that the success of community-based entrepreneurs in mobilising resources is contingent upon the trust that others have in them. As society places trust in these individuals, their social capital increases in value, enabling them to effectively utilise it to attain their objectives (Ebewo, 2014).

2.3 Local Economic Development

Local economic development (LED) processes trace their origins back to integrated rural development and regional development strategies (Vandenberg, 2016). This approach concentrates on a specific territory or locality and entails supporting local stakeholders, including both private and public entities, in formulating a comprehensive development strategy that takes into account the unique opportunities and limitations of that particular area (Vandenberg, 2016). Gallardo (2015) argues that LED is an essential undertaking for every community, irrespective of its scale or geographical position. It is defined as the practice in which local government or community-based organisations actively participate to encourage or sustain business operations (Meyer, 2014). It refers to the strategic enhancement of the economy within a defined geographical region to promote prosperity and well-being for the residents (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2017). This initiative is spearheaded by individuals who reside, labour, and manage enterprises within the community (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2017). The primary objective of LED is to enhance local job prospects within sectors that enhance the community, by leveraging available human, natural, and institutional resources (Ebewo, 2014). Auriacombe and van der Waldt (2020) point out that LED is increasingly recognised by development experts and socio-economic theorists as a crucial tool in combating sluggish economic growth and societal issues like persistent poverty, inequality, and unemployment. It is now being viewed almost as a "new economy". Van der Waldt (2018) sees LED as a major factor in promoting urban resilience, the "urban revolution", and the "healthy cities" movement. Meyer (2014) notes that LED is a collective responsibility that involves residents, business owners, and government officials. It is widely recognised, particularly in developing nations, as a key strategy for enhancing quality of life, reducing unemployment, alleviating poverty, and addressing inequality (Meyer, 2014). When executed effectively, LED holds the power to not

only enable communities to stay competitive but also to successfully navigate through intricate and ever-changing circumstances (Gallardo, 2015).

2.4 Social cohesion

Mekoa and Busari (2018) posit that the sociological concept of social cohesion emerged prominently in the late 20th century, aiming to address how society maintains unity amidst significant diversity and intricacy. It is defined by Esenaliev et al. (2016:8) as “convergence across groups in society”. For Mekoa and Busari (2018), it is a term often used to describe the presence of social bonds that bring a community together and promote a harmonious and stable society. It therefore establishes a framework for communal living that enhances predictability and stability in relationships within and between groups (Esenaliev et al., 2016). Moustakas (2023) states that social cohesion is commonly viewed as a complex concept consisting of multiple dimensions that are essential for tackling shared societal issues. Schiefer and van der Noll (2017) note that social cohesion is commonly regarded as a favourable characteristic of a social unit, such as a community or society. Mekoa and Busari (2018) suggest that social cohesion is a valuable goal worth pursuing; it is commonly employed to signify the presence of social connections that bind a society together and contribute to the development of a cohesive and secure community. This implies that social cohesion represents a commendable objective that should be pursued. However, it is acknowledged that social cohesion is presently experiencing a decline (Schiefer & van der Noll, 2017). Archie Mafeje Research Institute for Social Policy (Amri) (2014) revealed that social cohesion can be achieved through three fundamental aspects: firstly, the acceptance and integration of certain cultural elements or groups by other groups or individuals. Secondly, cultural amalgamation or synthesis between different ethnic groups leads to the formation of a new group. Lastly, assimilation involves the fusion or integration of certain groups or ethnicities to the extent of creating a new identity. Therefore, Zakaria, Yaakob and Zawawi (2022) highlight that social cohesion must reach a certain level before true unity can be realised within a society. Academic research also highlights the significance of social cohesion, associating greater social cohesion with various beneficial social consequences such as environmental sustainability, social harmony, and improved public health (Moustakas, 2023).

2.5 Significance of the study

The growing competitiveness of the labour market has highlighted the importance of individuals being able to create their own employment opportunities (Suryani et al., 2022). The authors add that it is especially crucial to address the disparities that arise from overpopulation and unequal economic distribution, which can lead to significant differences between affluent and impoverished communities. This study is important since it promotes local development and social cohesion through entrepreneurship and underscores the need to address disparities resulting from overpopulation and unequal economic distribution. Therefore, the study advocates that entrepreneurship can bridge the gap between affluent and impoverished communities, ultimately promoting economic growth and social harmony. Individuals are encouraged to take the initiative and start their businesses within their communities as a sustainable solution to the challenges posed by disparities in wealth and resources. Furthermore, the study underscores the importance of CBE in not only creating employment opportunities but also in fostering a sense of ownership and empowerment among individuals. Entrepreneurship promotes local development and social cohesion and therefore contributes to building resilient and self-sustaining communities that are better equipped to address economic challenges and promote overall well-being.

Additionally, the study on CBE and its role in fostering local development and social cohesion is of great significance concerning the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) set by the United Nations. By emphasising the importance of individuals creating their employment opportunities, the study aligns with SDG 8 which aims to promote sustained, inclusive, and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment, and decent work for all. Furthermore, the study's focus on addressing disparities resulting from overpopulation and unequal economic distribution resonates with SDG 10, which seeks to reduce inequality within and among countries. By fostering entrepreneurship at the community level, the study contributes to narrowing the gap between affluent and impoverished communities, ultimately promoting more equitable economic development. In addition, the emphasis on social cohesion in the context of CBE is in line with SDG 16, which aims to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all, and build effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions at all levels. By fostering collaboration and cooperation within communities through entrepreneurship, the study contributes to building stronger social ties and promoting a sense of unity and solidarity among community members.

3. Research Methodology

A comprehensive literature review was conducted, focusing on scholarly articles published from the year 2000 to the present. This review aimed to identify key themes and insights that illustrate how entrepreneurial initiatives rooted in local communities can stimulate economic growth while simultaneously fostering a sense of unity and collaboration among residents. The selection of keywords and search terms such as “entrepreneurship”, “social entrepreneurship”, “local economic development”, and “social cohesion”. In this context, the term "community-based entrepreneurship" serves as the central focus. On one hand, the selection process for materials related to community-based entrepreneurship and its influence on local economic development and social cohesion was guided by specific inclusion criteria that emphasized the relevance of scholarly articles. Initially, a total of 204 articles were identified based on their titles; however, 26 of these were found to be duplicates. Following a meticulous review of the abstracts, 89 articles were eliminated due to their lack of pertinent content. Subsequently, a comprehensive examination of the remaining full articles revealed that only 21 provided significant insights and findings that were directly applicable to the research topic, thus qualifying them for in-depth analysis. This review encompasses a diverse array of rural communities, including the Lumajang community in Indonesia, Nkandla rural areas in South Africa, and the Friendly Mart initiative in North India. Additionally, it examines entrepreneurial activities in the province of Batangas and the city of Pasay in the Philippines, as well as the municipalities of Carmona and Malimono. The analysis further extends to rural regions in Kenya, 64 districts across Bangladesh, and various communities in the United Kingdom, the United States, and other parts of Africa. Through this comprehensive examination, the review highlights the significant impact of localised entrepreneurial efforts on fostering economic resilience and strengthening social ties within these communities.

4. Results and Findings

This section aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of how CBE initiatives contribute to the growth of the local economy and the strengthening of social bonds within the community as depicted in Table 1.

Table 1: The role of CBE in fostering local economic development and social cohesion

Categories	Initiatives	Sources	Methodology, sector and geographical area
1. The role of CBE in fostering local economic development	1.1 Creation of employment opportunities	Suryani et al. (2022)	Qualitative study The Rogotunan, Lumajang community service project, "Marketing and Packaging Design Development for Small and Middle Scale Community Enterprises" in Indonesia
		Mkhize et al. (2020)	Quantitative research approach A census of 209 members of three (3) agricultural cooperatives in Nkandlarural communities. Community-based agricultural enterprises in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa
		Parwez (2017)	Qualitative method (Friendly Mart case study) The community-based entrepreneurship in a marginal community(Muslim): many self-employed Muslim workers and small businesses in urban centres in non-Islamic societies creating local public goods (retail case study) in North India
		Sarreal (2013)	CBMS data was used for this exploratory research on the first-class province of Batangas (Region 4), the first-class city of Pasay (National Capital Region), the first-class municipality of Carmona (Region 3), and the fifth-class municipality of Malimono (Region 13) in the Philippines.
		Linna (2011)	Qualitative study Two case studies from rural Kenya (Nyumba Kumi-initiative and Renewable Energy Kiosk – concept) lead by UNIDO. there were 15 informants including community members, local government officials, and organisation representatives.

		Bygrave & Minniti (2000)	local entrepreneurial activity
	1.2 Reduction of poverty	Klarin & Suseno (2022)	Systematic literature review based on 5,874 scholarly publications utilising scientometrics
		Suryani et al. (2022)	
		Mkhize et al. (2020)	
		Sutter, Bruton & Chen (2019)	The literature review examines 77 leading academic journals over the period 1990 to 2017
		Parwez (2017)	
		Sarreal (2013)	
		Mair, Marti & Ventresca (2012)	Rural Bangladesh and the work of a local intermediary organisational actor, BRAC is present in all 64 districts of Bangladesh, operating in about 70,000villages
		Linna (2011)	
		Hackett (2010)	Local enterprise in Bangladesh. Literature review on the Grameen community-based enterprises
			Bygrave & Minniti (2000)
2. The role of CBE in nurturing social cohesion	2.1 Empowerment of marginalised groups	Klarin & Suseno (2022)	
		Qureshi, Pan & Zheng (2021)	
		Parthiban, Qureshi, Bandyopadhyay, Bhatt & Jaikumar (2020)	the case study of an entrepreneurial venture in India
		Parwez (2017)	
		Haugh & Talwar (2016)	Quantitative study 49 members of a rural social enterprise North India
		Vega & Keenan (2016)	Literature review

		Handy, Cnaan, Bhat & Meijs (2011)	Ase study Grassroots sustainable community-based enterprise in rural coastal Karnataka (India)
2.2 Uplifting of community's life quality & livelihood		Suryani et al. (2022)	
		Kleinhans (2017)	Qualitative study Dutch community enterprises (CEs) to provide services or other benefits for residents in deprived neighbourhoods
		Parwez (2017)	
		Sarreal (2013)	
		Somerville & McElwee (2011)	A theoretical exploration Two English community enterprises namely Coin Street Community Builders (London) and The Eldonians (Liverpool)
		Peredo & Chrisman (2006)	Interdisciplinary and multilevel approaches
		Welsch & Kuhns (2001)	Qualitative methods (Interviews, observation, public records and documents) Varied initiatives found in Indian nations in the U.S., East-Indian villages, Africa, and U.S. inner-city neighbourhoods

The findings in Table 1 revealed that CBE initiatives can create employment opportunities, reduce poverty, empower marginalised groups and uplift of community's life quality & livelihood.

4.1 The role of CBE in fostering local economic development

The role of CBE in fostering local economic development is achieved through the creation of employment opportunities and the reduction of poverty.

4.1.1 CBEs create employment opportunities

Communities often benefit from the utilisation of both community and entrepreneurship institutions by governmental agencies, as they aim to combat unemployment and stimulate

economic growth (Ebewo, 2014). Hertel (2018) asserts that entrepreneurship significantly impacts neighbourhoods and local communities by fostering the establishment of local businesses, which in turn provide employment opportunities for residents and generate income. This serves as an effective strategy in combating poverty within these areas (Hertel, 2018). CBE plays a crucial role in stimulating local economic growth by creating job opportunities for individuals within the community. The promotion of job creation involves the growth of small businesses, worker co-operatives, and self-employment (Torjman, 1998). By establishing small businesses and startups, entrepreneurs can hire residents, thereby reducing unemployment rates and providing a source of income for community members. The establishment of CBE stimulates additional entrepreneurial endeavours within the community through the cultivation of an entrepreneurial mindset among residents (Bygrave & Minniti, 2000). Additionally, it creates avenues for new entrepreneurial prospects to emerge (Hertel, 2018). However, Torjman (1998) emphasises that to encourage self-employment and the development of small businesses, access to capital is crucial. Technical assistance plays a vital role in providing support for community and business planning, marketing and financing, enterprise management, investment mechanisms, institution-building, human resource development, board development, trade opportunities, and information technology (Torjman, 1998).

4.1.2 Reduce poverty

In addition to creating employment opportunities, CBE also contributes to poverty reduction within the local area. By generating income through their businesses, entrepreneurs can reinvest in the community, support local initiatives, and provide financial assistance to those in need. This cycle of economic empowerment helps to uplift individuals and families out of poverty, leading to a more prosperous and sustainable community. Thus, CBE can alleviate poverty, enhance economic opportunities within the community, and bolster the capabilities of marginalised populations (Linna, 2011; Sarreal, 2013). The primary goal of CBE is to combat poverty, establish sustainable businesses that create employment opportunities, and elevate the social and economic well-being of the community (Mkhize et al., 2020). Purusottama et al. (2018) explain that CBE has emerged as a viable solution to address the persistent issue of poverty, and their effectiveness in alleviating poverty has been well-documented. These programs have demonstrated their ability to bring about positive change by empowering individuals and communities to actively participate in their development. Mkhize et al. (2020) point out that CBE has successfully reduced poverty levels and

improved the overall well-being of disadvantaged populations through enhancing access to education and healthcare and promoting economic opportunities. These programs have proven to be instrumental in creating sustainable pathways out of poverty and fostering long-term social and economic development.

4.2 The role of CBE in nurturing social cohesion

CBE plays a crucial role in fostering social capital and enhancing social cohesion within communities (Somerville & McElwee, 2011).

4.2.1 Empower marginalised groups

Communities commonly encounter complex challenges such as poverty, illiteracy, inadequate skills, and deficient healthcare systems, which require collective action for effective solutions (Parwez, 2017). CBE facilitates the mobilisation and empowerment of the underprivileged, enabling them to take control of their welfare and participate in economic endeavours. Bhandari, Sharma, Kunwar and Han (2021) found that CBEs have the potential to uplift the livelihoods of marginalised and low-income populations. The promotion of entrepreneurial activities plays a crucial role in the broader framework of economic advancement. This approach to entrepreneurship is characterised by its simplicity, sustainability in management, and focus on intensive entrepreneurial processes. (Parwez, 2017). The empowerment of marginalised communities, such as Indigenous people, is frequently a result of this phenomenon (Handy, Cnaan, Bhat & Meijs, 2011). It allows local communities to assume accountability for their living conditions and reclaim authority over their local resources (Vega & Keenan, 2016). This enables them to actively participate in decision-making processes and have a say in the management and utilisation of their resources. By assuming accountability, these communities can work towards improving their living standards and ensuring sustainable development that aligns with their specific needs and aspirations. This approach fosters a sense of ownership and empowerment among community members, leading to greater self-reliance and the potential for positive social and economic outcomes.

4.2.2 Uplifting of community's life quality & livelihood

A comprehensive approach to local development and improving rural livelihoods is essential for CBEs (Sarreal, 2013). Entrepreneurship rooted in the community has the potential to

enhance the quality of life, improve health outcomes, foster capacity building, and promote empowerment among community members (Sarreal, 2013). Additionally, CBE endeavours to enhance the quality of life and livelihoods of community members (Welsch & Kuhns, 2001; Sarreal, 2013). Although rural communities tend to possess abundant social capital (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006), urban communities often face a deficit in social connections, making them particularly receptive to the positive impact of CBE (Kleinhans, 2017). Parwez (2017) comments that community-driven entrepreneurship plays a crucial role in unlocking the potential of marginalised and disadvantaged communities who are often excluded from the formal economy, contributing significantly to social progress and empowerment. Through CBE, individuals who have been historically marginalised or overlooked are allowed to create sustainable livelihoods for themselves and their families (Parwez, 2017). This not only helps in reducing poverty levels but also promotes inclusivity and diversity within the economic landscape. Sarreal (2013) comments that community-based entrepreneurial ventures aim to achieve not only financial gains but also contribute to other community objectives, including enhancing health conditions, empowering local communities, and building their capacity. By prioritising these goals alongside profits, CBEs can have a more significant and sustainable impact on their communities (Sarreal, 2013).

5. Managerial Implications

The results indicated that CBE programs have the potential to generate job prospects, alleviate poverty, empower disadvantaged populations, and enhance the overall quality of life and livelihood within communities. These findings suggest that investing in CBE initiatives can lead to tangible benefits such as increased economic opportunities for individuals, particularly those from marginalised backgrounds. Furthermore, by supporting CBE programs, policymakers and stakeholders can contribute to poverty reduction efforts and promote social inclusion by empowering vulnerable groups to become self-sufficient and economically independent. Ultimately, the findings highlight the importance of fostering a supportive environment for CBE initiatives to thrive, as they can bring about positive social and economic changes within communities, leading to a more sustainable and equitable society.

The research findings highlight the potential of CBE initiatives to bring about positive change in communities. To fully harness these benefits, it is recommended that community leaders, government authorities, and researchers work together to promote, support, and further develop CBE initiatives.

Community leaders should actively promote and support the implementation of CBE initiatives within their communities. This can be achieved by organising awareness campaigns, workshops, and training programs to educate community members about the potential benefits of CBE initiatives and how they can actively participate in them. Additionally, community leaders should collaborate with relevant stakeholders to identify and prioritise specific CBE projects that align with the needs and aspirations of the community.

Additionally, government authorities should play a crucial role in creating an enabling environment for CBE initiatives to thrive. This can be done by formulating supportive policies, providing financial incentives, and establishing regulatory frameworks that encourage the establishment and growth of CBE initiatives. Furthermore, government agencies should actively engage with community leaders and other stakeholders to ensure that CBE initiatives are integrated into broader development plans and strategies.

Furthermore, researchers should continue to conduct in-depth studies and evaluations to further understand the impact and effectiveness of CBE initiatives. This will help in identifying best practices, addressing challenges, and refining existing models to maximise the benefits of CBE initiatives. Researchers should also collaborate with community leaders and government officials to ensure that their findings are effectively communicated and translated into actionable recommendations and policies.

6. Conclusions, Limitations and Future Research

The results indicated that CBE programs have the potential to generate job opportunities, alleviate poverty, empower disadvantaged populations, and enhance the overall quality of life and livelihood within communities. In conclusion, the study demonstrated that the implementation of CBE initiatives can have a positive impact on various aspects of community development. By creating employment opportunities, addressing poverty, empowering marginalised groups, and improving overall quality of life, CBE programs have the potential to contribute significantly to sustainable development and social progress.

The research employed a literature review methodology to gather relevant data, synthesizing insights from a total of 21 distinct studies. While this approach provided a comprehensive overview of existing knowledge, it is important to acknowledge certain limitations inherent in the study. Primarily, the reliance on previously published works may introduce biases based on the selection criteria for included studies, potentially overlooking relevant research that did not meet specific parameters.

Future research endeavours should aim to address these limitations by incorporating primary data collection methods, such as surveys or experiments, to validate the conclusions drawn from the literature review. Furthermore, expanding the scope of the review to include a broader range of studies across different contexts and populations could enhance the generalisability of the findings and provide a more nuanced understanding of the topic.

References

- Ahuja, V., Akhtar, A. & Wali, O.P. (2019). Development of a comprehensive model of social entrepreneurial intention formation using a quality tool. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(1): 1-27.
- Archie Mafeje Research Institute for Social Policy (Amri) (2014). Does Social Cohesion exist? Engaging Issues of Diversity and National Identity in South Africa. A Proceedings Report of the roundtable dialogue held at Nkwame Nkrumah Hall, Robert Sobukwe Building, UNISA.
- Auriacombe, C. & van der Waldt, G. (2020). Critical Considerations for Local Economic Development Strategy Design in South African Municipalities. *Administratio Publica*, 28(1): 25-43.
- Bhandari, R., Sharma, D., Kunwar, K. & Han, Y. (2021). Community based entrepreneurship education: a study of the Catet program in Nepal. *International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research*, 10(1): 15-29.
- Bygrave, W. & Minniti, M. (2000). The social dynamics of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(3): 25-36.
- Department for Communities and Local Government. (2017). *Community Economic Development: Lessons from two years' action research*. Co-operative UK.
- Ebewo, P.E. (2014). *Establishing community-based enterprises for sustainable development of impoverished communities: a theoretical perspective*. Pretoria: Tshwane University of Technology.
- Gallardo, R. (2015). *Community Economic Development: Key Concepts*. Mississippi State University.
- Hackett, M.T. (2010). Challenging social enterprise debates in Bangladesh. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 6(3): 210–224.
- Handy, F., Cnaan, R.A., Bhat, G. & Meijs, L.C. (2011). Jasmine growers of coastal Karnataka: Grassroots sustainable community-based enterprise in India. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23(5-6): 405-417.

- Hassan, F., Dahalan, N., Hilmi, F.M. & Jaafar, M. (2021). Understanding the concept of community-based entrepreneurship: a systematic review approach. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 27(2): 2817-2827.
- Haugh, H.M. & Talwar, A. (2016). Linking social entrepreneurship and social change: The mediating role of empowerment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133(4): 643–658.
- Hazare, A. (1997). *Ralegan Siddhi: A veritable transformation* (B. S. Pendse, Trans.). Ralegan Siddhi, India: Ralegan Siddhi Pariwar Publications.
- Hertel, C.J. (2018). *Community-Based Entrepreneurship - Toward a Legitimate Research Domain*. Doctor of Economics. Technical University of Munich.
- Klarin, A. & Suseno, Y. (2022). An Integrative Literature Review of Social Entrepreneurship Research: Mapping the Literature and Future Research Directions. *Business & Society*, 62(9): 1-34.
- Kleinhans, R. (2017). False promises of co-production in neighbourhood regeneration: the case of Dutch community enterprises. *Public Management Review*, 19(10): 1500-1518.
- Linna, P. (2011). Community-level entrepreneurial activities: Case study from rural Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Public Management*, 1(1): 8–15.
- Lyons, T. (2002). Building social capital for rural enterprise development: Three case studies in the United States. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 7(2): 193-217.
- Mair, J., Marti, I. & Ventresca, M.J. (2012). Building inclusive markets in rural Bangladesh: How intermediaries work institutional voids. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4): 819–850.
- Mandrysz, W. (2020). Community-Based Social Economy – Social Capital and Civic Participation in Social Entrepreneurship and Community Development. *Management Dynamic in the Knowledge Economy*, 8(1): 81–93.
- Mekoa, I. & Busari, D.A. (2018). Social Cohesion: Its Meaning and Complexities. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 14(1): 107-115.
- Meyer, D.F. (2014). Local Economic Development (LED), Challenges and Solutions: The Case of the NorthernFree State Region, South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(16): 624-634.
- Mkhize, M., Derera, E. & Ganiyu, I. (2020). The role of sense of belonging on the success of community-based agricultural enterprises in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 17(2): 472–491.
- Moustakas, L. (2023). Social Cohesion: Definitions, Causes and Consequences. *Encyclopedia*, 3: 1028–1037.

- Nelson, F. (2000). Sustainable development and wildlife conservation in Tanzanian Maasailand. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 2(2): 107-117.
- Parthiban, R., Qureshi, I., Bandyopadhyay, S., Bhatt, B., Jaikumar, S. (2020). Leveraging ICT to overcome complementary institutional voids: Insights from institutional work by a social enterprise to help marginalized. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 22(3): 633–653.
- Parwez, S. (2017). Community-based entrepreneurship: Evidences from a retail case study. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 6(14): 1–16.
- Peredo, A.M. & Chrisman, J.J. 2004. Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1190122>. Accessed: 25/06/2024.
- Peredo, A.M. (2001). Communal enterprises, sustainable development and the alleviation of poverty in rural Andean communities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Calgary.
- Pinheiro, S., Granados, M.L. & Assunção, M. (2020). Local incentive structures and the constitution of community-based enterprises in the forest. *World Development Perspectives*, 20: 100243.
- Fortunato, M.W-P. & Alter, T. (2015). Community entrepreneurship development: An introduction. *Community Development*, 46(5): 444–455.
- Meyer, (2019). Conceptualising South African Policy and Entrepreneurial Development: Female Perspective. *Administratio Publica*, 27(4): 158-177.
- Parwez, S. (2017). Community-based entrepreneurship: evidences from a retail case study. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 6(14): 1-16.
- Plunkett Foundation. (2017). Community shops. Available at: <https://plunkett.co.uk/community-shops>. Accessed: 25/06/2024.
- Purusottama, A., Teddy Trilaksono, T. & Soehadi, D.A.W. (2018). Community-based entrepreneurship: a community development model to boost entrepreneurial commitment in rural micro enterprises. *MIX: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 8(2): 429-448.
- Qureshi, I., Pan, S.L. & Zheng, Y. (2021). Digital social innovation: An overview and research framework. *Information Systems Journal*, 31(5): 647–671.
- Sarreal, E.R. (2013). Community Based Entrepreneurship: An Alternative Social Enterprise Model for Small Communities in Poor Municipalities (Policy Brief. AKI Research Grants on Poverty Issues, 5(2): 1–3.
- Saebi, T., Foss, N.J. & Linder, S. (2019). Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises. *Journal of Management*, 45(1): 70–95.

- Schiefer, D. & van der Noll, J. (2017). The Essentials of Social Cohesion: A Literature Review. *Social Indicators Research*, 132:579–603.
- Shapero, A. & Sokol, L. (1982). *The social dimensions of entrepreneurship: The encyclopaedia of entrepreneurship*, Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Esenaliev, D., Karabaeva, J., Tilekeyev, K., Aladysheva, A., Mirkasimov, B., Abdrazakova, N., Bolotbekova, A., Chalbasova, S., Pavan, F., Mogilevskii, R. & Bruck, T. (2016). Social Cohesion Through Community-Based Development Project in the Kyrgyz Republic. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 34: 1-51.
- Suryani, A., Soedarso, Utomo, C., Endarko & Ahmad, I.S. (2022). Strengthening Community-Based Entrepreneurship: The Significance of Community Capacity Building and Enabling Ecosystem. *Indonesian Journal of Development Studies (IJDS)*, 1-12.
- Sutter, C., Bruton, G.D. & Chen, J. (2019). Entrepreneurship as a solution to extreme poverty: A review and future research directions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(1): 197–214.
- Tenenbaum, D. (1996). Entrepreneurship with a social conscience. *Technology Review*, 99(4): 18-30.
- Torjman, S. (1998). *Can Communities Reduce Poverty?*. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy.
- Vandenberg, P. (2016). Poverty reduction through small enterprises: Emerging consensus, unresolved issues and ILO activities. • Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Vega, D.E.C., & Keenan, R.J. (2016). Situating community forestry enterprises within New Institutional Economic theory: What are the implications for their organization?. *Journal of Forest Economics*, 25(12): 1-13.
- Welsch, H.P. & Kuhns, B.A. (2001). *Community-based enterprises: Propositions and cases*. Chicago: DePaul University.
- Zakaria, J., Yaakob, A.F. & Zawawi, H.Y. (2022). Social Cohesion for Community Development in Malaysia: Impact to National Integration. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(11): 1293 – 1305.