

Електронний журнал «Ефективна економіка» включене до переліку наукових фахових видань України з питань економіки (Категорія «Б», Наказ Міністерства освіти і науки України № 975 від 11.07.2019). Спеціальності – 051, 071, 072, 073, 075, 076, 292.
Ефективна економіка. 2026. № 1. ISSN 2307-2105

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32702/2307-2105.2026.1.11>
УДК 334.72:364.4

M. Salun,

*Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor of the Department of Entrepreneurship,
Trade and Tourism Business,*

Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1216-0648>

K. Zaslavska,

*PhD in Economics, Associate Professor of the Department of Entrepreneurship,
Trade and Tourism Business,*

Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1323-6325>

TYPOLOGY OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP MODELS: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

M. M. Салун,

*д. е. н., професор кафедри підприємництва,
торгівлі та туристичного бізнесу,*

Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця

K. A. Заславська,

*к. е. н., доцент кафедри підприємництва, торгівлі та туристичного бізнесу,
Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця*

ТИПОЛОГІЗАЦІЯ МОДЕЛЕЙ СОЦІАЛЬНОГО ПІДПРИЄМНИЦТВА: ТЕОРЕТИКО-МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ

The objective of this study is to establish a comprehensive, multi-criteria typology of social entrepreneurship models and to conduct a detailed analysis of their modern transformation trends. The study focuses specifically on unique crisis-adaptation mechanisms observed in transitional economies.

The core finding establishes that the construction of a correct and robust social entrepreneurship typology must be based on a three-dimensional framework: the resource dimension (capital origin and income strategies), the teleological dimension (the priority and depth of the social mission), and the institutional dimension (legal form, governance, and operating environment). This multi-criteria approach was developed to move beyond simplistic binary categorisations and to accurately capture the sector's inherent complexity and hybridity.

A fundamental dichotomy is identified between the American model, known as the «Earned Income School», which prioritises commercial output, and the European EMES model, which emphasises governance, stakeholder participation, and primary social purpose.

The analysis delineates three key operational archetypes based on the integration of social and commercial activities: the embedded model, the integrated model, and the external model (profit donation).

The study also examines contemporary transformation trends. Digitalisation has given rise to novel cooperative forms, such as platform cooperativism, which enhance collective ownership and social impact. Concurrently, institutionalised processes of conformity drive social enterprises to adopt mainstream structures to gain legitimacy, though this carries the risk of mission dilution.

Importantly, the research identifies distinctive crisis-adaptation models among social enterprises in Ukraine. These models are characterised by a shift from significant reliance on donor financing to an integrated earned-income model. This transition, precipitated by conflict and funding disruptions, exemplifies the remarkable resilience of Ukrainian social enterprises in securing revenue and

reorienting their missions to address urgent humanitarian needs. This experience serves as a valuable case study in crisis-driven institutional change.

Метою дослідження є створення комплексної, багатокритеріальної типології моделей соціального підприємництва та проведення детального аналізу сучасних тенденцій їх трансформації та розвитку. Дослідження зосереджується, зокрема, на унікальних механізмах адаптації до криз, що спостерігаються останнім часом.

Основний висновок полягає в тому, що побудова правильної та надійної типології соціального підприємництва повинна базуватися на тривимірній структурі: ресурсний вимір (походження капіталу та стратегії отримання доходу), телевологічний вимір (пріоритетність та глибина соціальної місії) та інституційний вимір (юридична форма, управління та операційне середовище). Цей багатокритеріальний підхід був розроблений, щоб вийти за межі спрощених бінарних категоризацій і точно відобразити властиву соціальному підприємництву складність та гібридність.

Виявлено фундаментальну дихотомію між американською моделлю, відомою як «школа заробленого доходу», яка надає пріоритет комерційній продукції, та європейською моделлю EMES, яка наголошує на управлінні, участі зацікавлених сторін та первинній соціальній меті.

Аналіз окреслює три ключові операційні архетипи соціального підприємництва: вбудована модель, інтегрована модель та зовнішня модель (пожертвування прибутку).

У дослідженні також розглядаються сучасні тенденції трансформації. Цифровізація породила нові форми кооперації, такі як платформна кооперація, які посилюють колективну власність та соціальний вплив. Одночасно інституціоналізовані процеси спонукають соціальні підприємства до прийняття загальноприйнятих структур для отримання легітимності, хоча це несе ризик розмивання місії.

Важливо, що дослідження визначає характерні моделі адаптації до кризи серед соціальних підприємств в Україні. Ці моделі характеризуються переходом від значної залежності від фінансування донорів до інтегрованої моделі заробленого доходу. Цей перехід, спричинений конфліктом і перебоями у фінансуванні, є прикладом надзвичайної стійкості українських соціальних підприємств у забезпеченні доходів та переорієнтації їх місій на задоволення нагальних гуманітарних потреб. Цей досвід є цінним прикладом інституційних змін, спричинених кризою.

Keywords: *Social Entrepreneurship, Social Entrepreneurship Typology, Earned Income Models, Digitalization, Crisis Adaptation, Resource Dimension, EMES/American Model.*

Ключові слова: соціальне підприємництво, типологія соціального підприємництва, моделі заробленого доходу, цифровізація, кризова адаптація, ресурсний вимір, EMES/Американська модель.

Formulation of the problem in its general form and its connection with important scientific or practical tasks. The modern development of the global economy is characterised by a rise in socio-ecological challenges that require innovative approaches extending beyond the classical dichotomy of the public or charitable sectors [13]. In this context, social entrepreneurship acquires strategic significance as a mechanism capable of combining economic sustainability with the targeted resolution of social problems.

However, as evidenced by the experience of Ukraine, particularly under conditions of military aggression and demographic crisis [1, 2], the absence of a unified theoretical-methodological approach to identifying and classifying social enterprises constitutes a significant obstacle to the formation of effective public policy and support mechanisms. An imperfect typology complicates: legal regulation, that is, the differentiation of social entrepreneurship from traditional business and charity; financial support, specifically the development of funding mechanisms oriented toward concrete business models (for example, subsidising

work-integration models or platform cooperatives); and impact assessment, understood as the quantitative and qualitative evaluation of social outcomes.

Thus, the theoretical conceptualisation and systematisation of the classificatory features of social entrepreneurship models require a key scientific task with direct practical significance for enhancing the resilience and effectiveness of the third sector in Ukraine.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The phenomenon of social entrepreneurship has remained at the forefront of international economic scholarship over the past decades. The core theoretical framework of social entrepreneurship emerged from research that defined its hybrid nature and fundamental characteristics [5, 7, 8].

A considerable part of existing studies is devoted to the problem of typology, underscoring its scientific relevance. International literature is mainly structured around two major analytical orientations: the resource-based approach, which concentrates on revenue structure and the degree of mission–business integration [6, 11], and the institutional approach, which highlights governance models and stakeholder participation [9, 12].

Ukrainian scholars have also actively contributed to the study of this issue, concentrating primarily on identification criteria and regional challenges in the development of social entrepreneurship [3, 4]. Particular focus has been directed to studies analysing the adaptation of social enterprises to emerging challenges, especially in conditions of crises and digital transformation [10, 14, 16].

Despite the significant theoretical contributions, a comprehensive methodological analysis that synthesises diverse criteria (resource-based, teleological, institutional) into a unified classificatory matrix, while simultaneously taking into account the dynamics of transformational processes, including platform-based models and Ukraine's unique crisis-driven hybrids, remains insufficiently developed. This creates a gap between established Western typologies and the practical needs of real-world application.

Formulation of the article's objectives. The purpose of this article is to provide a theoretical and methodological substantiation and systematisation of the

typology of social entrepreneurship models by synthesising key classificatory criteria and applying them to the analysis of contemporary transformation trends.

The core objective of the study is to develop a comprehensive systematisation of social entrepreneurship model typologies. This entails the integration of methodological criteria grounded in the concept of hybridity to enable a comparative analysis of the fundamental differences between the American and European scholarly traditions. Furthermore, the study seeks to examine the dynamic transformation of conventional models under the influence of technological change and to identify distinctive adaptive archetypes emerging in the context of the ongoing crisis in Ukraine.

Key findings.

The problem of typologising social entrepreneurship in contemporary economic scholarship stems from the inherent difficulty of achieving an unambiguous identification of this phenomenon. Unlike traditional business, where the system of classificatory criteria is well established, social entrepreneurship operates within a zone of conceptual indeterminacy. The academic discourse of recent decades, represented in both Western and domestic scholarly traditions, indicates the impossibility of applying a one-dimensional approach to the classification of social entrepreneurship.

A fundamental methodological basis for distinguishing types of social entrepreneurship is the theory of hybridity. According to the views articulated by J. Austin and co-authors, social enterprises are not static entities but are positioned along a continuum between purely charitable organisations and conventional commercial enterprises [7]. This dual nature requires the use of a multi-criteria approach in which economic efficiency and social impact are treated not as mutually exclusive, but as mutually reinforcing variables.

In international academic studies the approach proposed by K. Alter is dominant. She identifies the degree of integration between business activities and social programmes as the key classificatory criterion [6]. The methodological value of this approach lies in its transition from legal formalism (i.e., legal form) toward a functional analysis that examines how income is generated and how it relates to

the organisation's mission. This allows researchers to group enterprises not by ownership form but by their underlying value-creation mechanisms.

Another equally influential methodological vector is represented by the European EMES research network. J. Defourny and M. Nyssens emphasise institutional and governance-related criteria. For them, the decisive markers in typologisation extend beyond financial characteristics to include the degree of democratic governance and organisational autonomy [9]. This approach makes it possible to distinguish a separate cluster of social-economy enterprises (cooperatives, associations), which is particularly relevant in the European context.

Ukrainian scholarship, while adapting Western concepts, focuses on the specificities of a transitional economy. For instance, H. Mishchuk and R. Pylypchuk argue that, under Ukrainian conditions, the most significant typological criterion should be the specific utilisation of profit [3]. The researcher maintains that, in the absence of specialised legislation, the mechanism of profit reinvestment serves as the only valid indicator for distinguishing social enterprises from conventional businesses.

At the same time, A. Kornetskyi and H. Shvets propose broadening the methodological boundaries by incorporating an innovation component into the system of classification criteria. Drawing on the Schumpeterian understanding of entrepreneurship, they suggest differentiating social entrepreneurship models according to the type of innovation, that is whether the enterprise introduces a new product or implements a new model of providing social services [4, 5]. This position correlates with the views of G. Dees, who characterised social entrepreneurs as change agents for whom innovation is a key tool for addressing market failures [8].

Synthesising the existing methodological approaches allows asserting that the creation of a valid typology is possible only through the integration of three analytical dimensions:

- the resource dimension - the balance between market and non-market income;
- the teleological dimension - the prioritisation of the social mission over commercial objectives;

- the institutional dimension - the mode of stakeholder involvement in governance.

The intersection of these dimensions forms the analytical framework required to identify specific models of social entrepreneurship.

Applying these criterial dimensions (resource, teleological, and institutional) enables the conceptualisation of the fundamental distinction between the two dominant scholarly traditions: the American model (the “Earned Income School”) and the European model (EMES, the “Social Economy School”). This dichotomy is not merely geographical but primarily value-based, as it shapes distinct approaches to the design of business models.

The results of the comparative analysis of these approaches according to the defined criteria are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparative Characteristics of the American and European Models of Social Entrepreneurship

Comparison Criterion	American School (Earned Income School)	European School (EMES / Social Economy)
Teleological (core purpose and driving logic)	Market-oriented. Social problems are addressed through market mechanisms. The social mission is achieved primarily via income generation.	Socially oriented. Strengthening civil society is central. Social benefit is the priority, while economic sustainability serves only as a means of organisational viability.
Resource-based (sources of financing)	Commercialisation. Striving for near-complete self-sufficiency through the sale of goods/services. Minimisation of grant dependency.	Resource hybridisation. Combination of revenue from market activity, public subsidies, and voluntary labour.
Institutional (governance and ownership)	Entrepreneurial leadership. Emphasis on the individual social entrepreneur. Any ownership form is acceptable, including for-profit structures.	Collective governance. Emphasis on democratic decision-making (“one member – one vote”). Stakeholder participation in governance is central.
Legal form	Flexible. Ranges from non-profit organisations to business corporations.	Tendency toward cooperatives, associations, and mutual societies.

Source: developed by the authors based on [9, 12]

As shown in Table 1, the American model is centred on the resource dimension – the organisation’s ability to generate revenue in order to fulfil its mission. Within this paradigm, a social enterprise is conceptualised as a more efficient alternative to traditional charity.

In contrast, the European model places emphasis on the institutional dimension. According to the EMES approach, a social enterprise is, first and foremost, a community that democratically manages resources for the common good [9]. For the Ukrainian context – given the historical legacy of the cooperative movement and the contemporary role of volunteer communities – the European approach appears more relevant from the perspective of governance, whereas the American model is more applicable in terms of financial sustainability.

However, irrespective of school affiliation, at the operational level any social enterprise must define the specific architecture of its activity. The most substantive operational typology detailing the resource dimension is the model proposed by Kim Alter [6]. The scholar classifies social enterprise models based on the degree of integration between business activity and social programmes, distinguishing three core archetypes: the embedded model, the integrated model, and the external model.

The embedded model is characterised by full synchronisation between business processes and the social mission. The social impact is generated directly through the enterprise’s core economic activity [6]. For example, an organisation employing people with mental disabilities cannot separate its business from its mission, i.e. if production stops, both the workplace and the socialisation service disappear.

The integrated model involves business activity and social programmes intersecting and sharing assets, while remaining non-identical. Frequently, the business component functions as a mechanism for cross-subsidisation. For instance, a medical centre may provide paid services to affluent clients and redirect the resulting profit toward free treatment for low-income beneficiaries [15]. In this

case, the business finances the social mission, while servicing a paying client does not itself produce direct social impact.

The external model is defined by a clear separation: the business operates independently (often both legally and physically) and functions solely as a financial donor for the parent non-profit organisation [10]. For example, a charitable foundation may own real estate and lease it out. The leasing activity has no inherent social component, but the proceeds are used to support the foundation's statutory goals.

European researchers J. Defourny and M. Nyssens, examining the practices of EU member states, propose a typology grounded in the nature of the social mission and the modes of stakeholder engagement [9]. Their analysis identifies two fundamental models that dominate the European landscape of social entrepreneurship.

The first is the work-integration model (Work Integration Social Enterprises – WISEs), which represents the most widespread form of social entrepreneurship in Europe. The central objective of WISEs is the labour-market integration of individuals at risk of social exclusion – such as persons with disabilities, the long-term unemployed, migrants, and former inmates. This model is characterised by a combination of productive activity with vocational training and social support. From the perspective of resource mobilisation, WISEs exemplify classical resource hybridisation. They generate income through the sale of goods and services, yet often rely on public subsidies or wage-compensation schemes for employing vulnerable groups [9]. In the Ukrainian context, this model is particularly relevant in light of the reintegration needs of veterans and internally displaced persons.

The second dominant model is the social-services model (Social Services of General Interest – SSGI), which emerged as a response to the crisis of the welfare state. Within this framework, social enterprises assume functions previously performed by the state or fill gaps that public institutions are unable or unwilling to address [9]. These activities include elder care, early-childhood services, medical and rehabilitation services, and cultural initiatives. A defining feature of this model

is its multi-stakeholder governance structure. Unlike private firms, where decisions are made by shareholders, governance in SSGI enterprises involves a broad range of actors: employees, service users (or their families), representatives of local communities or municipalities, and volunteers. This governance arrangement enhances organisational trust and ensures that profits are reinvested into improving service quality rather than distributed to beneficiaries.

A comparative analysis demonstrates a clear convergence of models, as contemporary social enterprises frequently represent hybrids of the typologies described above. An enterprise may, for example, operate as a WISE under the European classification while simultaneously employing an embedded business model according to Alter's framework. Understanding these distinctions is essential for Ukrainian policymakers and practitioners. Blind replication of the American external model risks eroding the social identity of organisations, whereas disregarding the European experience of WISEs may hinder the development of adequate state support mechanisms for the sector.

Classical typologies of social entrepreneurship – including K. Alter's models and the EMES approach – were developed under conditions of relative economic stability in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. However, the contemporary global economic environment, characterised by technological singularity and heightened turbulence (the so-called VUCA world), has catalysed a transformation of traditional models [14]. Theoretical analysis makes it possible to identify two critical vectors of this transformation: digitalisation, which has given rise to platform-based models, and adaptation to crisis conditions, which shapes the specificity of the Ukrainian context.

Traditional theory viewed social entrepreneurship primarily as a local phenomenon. The development of digital ecosystems, however, has led to the emergence of a new theoretical concept – digital social entrepreneurship. Its fundamental distinction lies in the transformation of mechanisms for scaling social impact. While traditional embedded models are limited by the availability of

physical capital, digital models expand their impact through the amplification of network effects.

Particular scholarly attention has been directed toward the concept of platform cooperativism, introduced by T. Scholz [16]. This model represents a contemporary digital reincarnation of the European social-economy tradition. In contrast to the gig economy, where profits are concentrated among platform owners, platform cooperatives are collectively owned by worker-users who control algorithms and participate in profit distribution. Such an approach shifts the architecture of the model from hierarchical to distributed, which, in turn, requires refreshed methodological approaches to classification.

Another important trend is the phenomenon that institutional theory refers to as isomorphism, that is social enterprises are becoming increasingly similar to traditional businesses, while traditional businesses are becoming more similar to social enterprises. On the one hand, the influence of market forces induces social enterprises to professionalise their operations and adopt aggressive marketing strategies [10]. On the other hand, the corporate sector is incorporating the concept of Creating Shared Value proposed by M. Porter and M. Kramer [13]. This complicates typologisation, as the integrated model of social entrepreneurship becomes almost indistinguishable from socially responsible business. The core differentiating factor between the two remains the prohibition on the distribution of assets for private gain, which is a defining principle of social enterprises.

Under the conditions of full-scale war and a prolonged economic crisis, the Ukrainian social entrepreneurship sector demonstrates a unique developmental trajectory that may be described as forced hybridisation. There is a widespread shift of civic and volunteer initiatives from grant-based or donor-dependent models to earned-income models. This shift is driven by the phenomenon of “donor fatigue” and by the need for sustainable financing of humanitarian needs.

Theoretically, this represents a movement from the external model, in which the business operates separately as a donor, to an embedded model. A representative example is the emergence of volunteer hubs that engage in the

production of tactical equipment or souvenir goods, distributing some outputs to the frontline and marketing others externally to secure resources for further operations. [1, 2]. A distinctive feature of the Ukrainian model is the exceptionally high role of social capital. Whereas in Western theories trust is viewed as the outcome of social entrepreneurial activity, the Ukrainian case demonstrates that a previously accumulated level of public trust in volunteer groups serves as the primary intangible asset enabling the launch of business projects without substantial initial investment.

Summarising the theoretical and methodological analysis, it can be argued that the typologisation of social entrepreneurship is not a static system. It is evolving from simple dichotomies (business vs. charity) toward complex multidimensional matrices that incorporate digitalisation, institutional context, and crisis-related factors. For future empirical research in Ukraine, the most promising direction appears to be a synthetic approach that integrates K. Alter's operational criteria (for assessing financial sustainability) with the value-based criteria of the EMES school (for assessing social impact).

Conclusions and prospects for further research

The synthesis of the theoretical and methodological results obtained in this study of social entrepreneurship model typologisation allows formulating several key conclusions that reflect both the fundamental principles of the concept and the directions of its contemporary transformation.

Firstly, it has been established that designing a valid typology of social entrepreneurship is impossible without usage of a multi-criteria approach that accounts for the hybrid nature of the phenomenon. The essential classificatory dimensions include the resource dimension (the ratio of market and non-market income), the teleological dimension (the prioritisation of the social mission), and the institutional dimension (forms of ownership and governance).

Secondly, the analysis reveals a stable and persistent dichotomy between two global paradigms: the American model (the “Earned Income School”, centred on commercialisation and financial sustainability) and the European model

(EMES, emphasising collective governance and social inclusion). This divergence shapes the strategic design of business models within the sector.

Thirdly, at the operational level, the typology of social entrepreneurship can be reduced to two principal groups of models: structural-financial models (K. Alter's embedded, integrated, and external models), differentiated by their mechanisms of income generation; and socio-institutional models (EMES: WISEs and community-based forms), defined by the type of social impact and governance architecture.

Fourthly, it has been demonstrated that under the influence of digitalisation and global crisis-related factors, traditional models are undergoing significant transformation. New organisational forms as platform cooperativism are emerging, while the boundaries between social entrepreneurship and corporate social responsibility are becoming increasingly blurred. This dynamic environment demands continual refinement of the theoretical and methodological criteria used for classification.

Fifthly, the study identifies the emergence of a specific crisis-driven adaptive model within Ukraine under conditions of military aggression and economic instability. This model is characterised by the compelled transition of volunteer initiatives to earned-income activities (a shift from the external to the embedded model) in order to ensure organisational resilience. The exceptionally high role of social capital as a primary intangible asset is a distinctive feature of the Ukrainian context.

Future research should focus on empirically validating the described transformational models through case studies of Ukrainian social enterprises in the post-war period.

Література

1. Гурочкина В., Браунагель А. (2024). Соціальні підприємства в умовах війни VS ринок праці та демографічна ситуація України. *Сталий розвиток економіки*, 3(50), С. 271-282. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2308-1988/2024-50-41> (дата звернення: 12.11.2025).

2. Каширікова І., Спіріонова К., Кірнос О. (2024). Соціальне підприємництво у сучасній Україні. *Економічний простір*, (190), С. 62-65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2224-6282/190-11> (дата звернення: 12.11.2025).

3. Мішук Г. Ю., Пилипчук Р. Р. (2017) Соціальне підприємництво: критерії ідентифікації та проблеми розвитку. *Demography and Social Economy*. № 2 (30). С. 152-165 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/dse2017.02.152> (дата звернення: 20.11.2025).

4. Соціальне підприємництво: посібник для викладачів курсу / за наук. редакцією к.е.н. А. О. Корнецького – К. : Фамільна друкарня Huss, 2019. – 160 с. URL: <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/f709abdc-971c-42b1-9f14-4df944c16378/content> (дата звернення: 7.11.2025).

5. Швець Г. (2021). Соціальне підприємництво: теоретичні та практичні аспекти. *Економіка і організація управління*. № 3(39). С. 243-251. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31558/2307-2318.2020.3.21> (дата звернення: 13.11.2025).

6. Alter K. (2007). Social enterprise typology. Virtue Ventures LLC. URL: <https://isfcolumbia.uniandes.edu.co/images/201519/LRD31.pdf> (дата звернення: 13.11.2025).

7. Austin J., Stevenson H., Wei-Skillern J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), pp. 1-22. URL: <https://scispace.com/pdf/social-and-commercial-entrepreneurship-same-different-or-48kmzqadg5.pdf> (дата звернення: 13.11.2025).

8. Dees, J. G. (1998). The meaning of social entrepreneurship. URL: https://web.stanford.edu/class/e145/2007_fall/materials/dees_SE.pdf (дата звернення: 7.11.2025).

9. Defourny J., Nyssens M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences. URL: https://iae.univ-nantes.fr/medias/fichier/communication_j_1224259083400.pdf?ID_FICHE=296308&INLINE=%20FALSE (дата звернення: 19.11.2025).

10. Doherty B., Haugh H., Lyon F. (2014). Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: a review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16(4), pp. 417-436. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12028> (дата звернення: 19.11.2025).
11. Grassl W. (2012). Business models of social enterprise: A design approach to hybridity. *ACRN Journal of Entrepreneurship Perspectives*, 1(1), pp. 37-60. URL: https://join.ifte.at/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Grassl_SE-Hybridity.pdf (дата звернення: 20.11.2025).
12. Kerlin J. A. (2006). Social enterprise in the United States and Europe: Understanding and learning from the differences. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. 17(3). pp. 247-263. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225759566_Social_Enterprise_in_the_United_States_and_Europe_Understanding_and_Learning_From_the_Differences (дата звернення: 13.11.2025).
13. Porter M. E., Kramer M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. URL: <https://www.communitylivingbc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Creating-Shared-Value.pdf> (дата звернення: 16.11.2025).
14. Salun M., Zaslavska K. (2024) Strategies for resilience in a dynamic world: from VUCA to BANI. *Proceedings of Socratic Lectures*. 10. pp. 185-189. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55295/PSL.2024.I23> (дата звернення: 26.11.2025).
15. Santos F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 111(3). pp. 335-351. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1553072> (дата звернення: 13.11.2025).
16. Scholz T. (2016). Platform cooperativism: Challenging the corporate sharing economy. Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung. URL: https://rosalux.nyc/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/RLS-NYC_platformcoop.pdf (дата звернення: 20.11.2025).

References

1. Hurochkina, V. and Braunahel, A. (2024), “Social Enterprises in Wartime Conditions VS Labor Market and Demographic Situation in Ukraine”,

Stalyj rozvytok ekonomiky, vol. 3(50), pp. 271-282. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2308-1988/2024-50-41>.

2. Kashyrnikova, I. Spiridonova, K. and Kirnos, O. (2024), “Social Entrepreneurship in Modern Ukraine”, *Ekonomichnyj prostir*, vol. 190, pp. 62-65. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2224-6282/190-11>.
3. Mischuk, H.Yu. and Pylypcuk, R.R. (2017), “Social Entrepreneurship: Criteria of Identification and Problems Of Development”, *Demography and Social Economy*, vol. 2 (30), pp. 152-165. <https://doi.org/10.15407/dse2017.02.152>.
4. Kornets'kyi, A.O. (2019), *Sotsial'ne pidpryiemnytstvo* [Social Entrepreneurship], Famil'na drukarnia Huss, Kyiv, Ukraine, available at: <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/f709abdc-971c-42b1-9f14-4df944c16378/content> (Accessed 7 Nov 2025).
5. Shvets, H. (2021), “Social Entrepreneurship: Theoretical and Practical Aspects”, *Ekonomika i orhanizatsiia upravlinnia*, vol. 3(39), pp. 243-251. <https://doi.org/10.31558/2307-2318.2020.3.21>.
6. Alter, K. (2007), *Social enterprise typology*. Virtue Ventures LLC, available at: <https://isfcolumbia.uniandes.edu.co/images/201519/LRD31.pdf> (Accessed 13 Nov 2025).
7. Austin, J. Stevenson, H. and Wei-Skillern, J. (2006), “Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both?”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 30(1), pp. 1-22, available at: <https://scispace.com/pdf/social-and-commercial-entrepreneurship-same-different-or-48kmzqadg5.pdf> (Accessed 13 Nov 2025).
8. Dees, J.G. (1998), “The meaning of social entrepreneurship”, available at: https://web.stanford.edu/class/e145/2007_fall/materials/dees_SE.pdf (Accessed 7 Nov 2025).
9. Defourny, J. and Nyssens, M. (2010), “Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences”, available at: https://iae.univ-nantes.fr/medias/fichier/communication_j_1224259083400.pdf?ID_FICHE=296308&INLINE=%20FALSE (Accessed 19 Nov 2025).

10. Doherty, B. Haugh, H. and Lyon, F. (2014), “Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: a review and research agenda”, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 16(4), pp. 417-436, available at <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12028>).
11. Grassl, W. (2012), “Business models of social enterprise: A design approach to hybridity”, *ACRN Journal of Entrepreneurship Perspectives*, vol. 1(1), pp. 37–60, available at: https://join.ifte.at/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Grassl_SE-Hybridity.pdf (Accessed 20 Nov 2025).
12. Kerlin, J.A. (2006), “Social enterprise in the United States and Europe: Understanding and learning from the differences”, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, vol. 17(3), pp. 247-263, available at URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225759566_Social_Enterprise_in_the_United_States_and_Europe_Understanding_and_Learning_From_the_Differences (Accessed 13 Nov 2025).
13. Porter, M.E. and Kramer, M.R. (2011), *Creating shared value*, available at: <https://www.communitylivingbc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Creating-Shared-Value.pdf> (Accessed 16 Nov 2025).
14. Salun, M. and Zaslavska, K. (2024), “Strategies for resilience in a dynamic world: from VUCA to BANI”, *Proceedings of Socratic Lectures*, vol. 10, pp. 185-189. <https://doi.org/10.55295/PSL.2024.I23>.
15. Santos, F.M. (2012), “A positive theory of social entrepreneurship”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 111(3), pp. 335-351. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1553072>.
16. Scholz, T. (2016), *Platform cooperativism: Challenging the corporate sharing economy*, Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung, NY, USA, available at: https://rosalux.nyc/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/RLS-NYC_platformcoop.pdf (Accessed 20 Nov 2025).