

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATION INNOVATION AND ORGANIZATION CULTURE ON NON-PROFIT SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ENTERPRISE

Jun Wang, Chayanan Kerdpitak

Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Bangkok, Thailand

Email: 178055505@qq.com; chayanan.ke@ssru.ac.th

ABSTRACT

The sustainable development of nonprofit organization all over the world is closely related to the heritage preservation of human civilization. Innovative business models are being developed to build non-profit art groups to cope with the precarious living conditions that exist today. The goal of this article is to use the nonprofit arts community to propose a new framework for innovation. The framework is called nonprofit organization Business Model Innovation. The staff and volunteers of nonprofit arts organizations are critical to their revenue and long-term survival; recognition affects innovation and overall revenue; Several important findings highlight business model innovation and the direct and indirect benefits of external business partners. Organizational Innovation, technological innovation, and innovation in value creation all have the potential to improve economic, market, and social performance. This will make future nonprofit organization easier to practice and develop in a sustainable manner.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the role played by the market economy in the overall economic system has become increasingly important, increasing the diversity of economic actors and necessitating the existence of several social groups, at the same time, a variety of grass-roots groups emerged. People are very actively involved in a variety of grass-roots nonprofit organization such as environmentalism, Charity, culture, education, care for the disabled, health care for the elderly and so on. There are art organizations, non-profit art organizations, galleries, art centers, art institutions, and art non-profit art organizations in major cities around the world. Art organizations have made great contributions to the cultural life of cities. They are part of the cultural spirit of cities. The increase in the number of nonprofit arts organizations over the past few decades, in conjunction with the expansion of the leisure industry, has had a profound impact on the competitive environment for nonprofit arts organizations, to the point where these organizations now compete with one another in limited markets, as well as with other emerging venues and attractions (Burton and Scott 2003). Some artistic groups that are not-for-profit have had certain services that they provide privatized (Kawashima 1999). Many nonprofit contemporary art organizations become sources of creativity by acquiring, preserving, and passing on their heritage. As a result of the fact that the size of nonprofit art organizations has had an impact, at least partially, on the importance of their collections as well as the level of innovation in for-profit organizations, a number of studies have been conducted in an effort

to determine the impact that scale has on innovation (Cohen and Klepper 1996; Bertschek and Entorf 1996; Stocks, etc. 2002; Laforet 2008). This linkage is largely uncharted territory in the non-profit sector.

Over the years, non-profit arts organizations have faced growing demand to meet a variety of public roles. The government has strict eligibility requirements for nonprofit organization. Tighter rules and regulations have constrained the creation of foundations, making it difficult for nonprofit organization to obtain adequate financial support and qualified personnel. Some non-profit art organizations are trying to reinvent themselves and introduce new ideas. There is a distinction to be made between Innovation and Process Innovation, Technological Innovation, and Administrative Innovation (Camison et al. 2009). The most common types of innovation implemented by non-profit art groups are modifications to certain services and technological advances adopted. Hull and Lio (2006) contend that process innovation, which has been proven to be less hazardous and less expensive, is a better fit for the goals of these organizations than product innovation. Relatively little economic research has been done on non-profit art groups, providing a viable fund-raising technique. Two of the most important factors to consider when examining the financial status of arts charities are ethics and personal income. Financing non-profit art organizations is almost never discussed. The question of whether something is economically feasible is another idea. Given the diversity of events and the complexity of financial systems, it seems more challenging to study whether a non-profit arts organization is financially sustainable. This is true regardless of the scale or resources of the operation the organization is performing. The combination of business and business model innovation creates funding that allows for the provision of diverse research tailored to individual needs and is important for future research that may be conducted on the earnings of non-profit art groups.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

For now, cultural entrepreneurs see themselves only as creative; they do not see themselves as managers responsible for delivering services to the market at the right price. In addition, various researchers working in the field of art management are skeptical about the feasibility of applying management concepts directly to the art industry. Additionally, both Margreta (2018) and Muller-stevens & Font (2019) support the idea of continuing to talk about the concept of business models. They stressed how important it was to align elements of the business model with the company's overall strategic direction. For example, if the revenue pattern and the service pattern do not correspond to each other, there may be negative interdependencies. Gemunden and Schulz (2018) discuss the following interdependencies in their article: "In order to describe the interdependencies that exist within the concept of business models, we ask the following questions: Which interdependencies are there, and how do these interdependencies influence the configuration of the business model?" There is a new research gap in the field of success factors, which brings us to the final point. Some were sceptical about the relevance and quality of the data generated, questioning whether the characteristics identified as contributing to success really had any impact.

The study will contribute to the ongoing discussion of the rigor and usefulness of the success factor study. This is supported by Kieser and Nicolai (2017), who wrote that success factor studies are considered a model method to readjust rigor and relevance. Research projects

undertaken in academic settings can have one of three goals: to identify/describe, interpret, or assess (Tomczak & Dyllick, 2017, p. 67). To sum up, the aim of this study is to develop information on the optimal business model configuration of art institutions.

SOCIAL ENTERPRISE AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION

In today's Society, the nonprofit organization has developed into a major player in the field of organizations providing social services. The government and corporate sector can not provide the same breadth and depth of service as the nonprofit organization. They contribute to the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the resolution of global problems in order to realize a sustainable future (Svensson et al. 2018; World Health Organization (WHO) 2015) through the provision of social services that are of benefit to either their members or the community as a whole (Bromley and Meyer 2017; Brown et al. 2019; Shier and Handy 2015).

On the other hand, nonprofit organization providing social services and working to solve social problems are in a precarious position in terms of their ability to continue to function as they rely on stakeholders, such as donors, funders and government agencies. They have to compete with other organizations by demonstrating excellent social performance in order to obtain funding or contracts from the government (Hackler and Saxton 2007; Miller 2018). The attainment of social performance refers to the successful creation of the intended social value and the targeted social purpose. Developing public awareness and education to improve the community's sociocultural perceptions (Brown et al. 2019); promoting health and peace (Millar and Doherty 2016; Sobeck and Agius 2007) are examples of social missions that are beneficial to the community. These missions include helping with the development of new programs and activities that address unmet needs (Bryan. 2017); developing public awareness and education to improve the community's sociocultural perceptions (Brown et al). Therefore, in order to obtain funds, grants or donations, nonprofit organization need to provide a high level of social performance.

In order to be competitive for financing or government contracts, non-profit organizations are required to demonstrate a high degree of social performance (Becker et al. 2020; Lall 2017). However, previous research has identified a number of factors that influence social performance. These factors include management practices (Amirkhanyan et al. 2014; Kim and Peng 2018), board directors' characteristics (Dula et al. 2020), government support, leadership (Igalla et al. 2020), and organizational capacity. Specifically, these factors include: (Gazley et al. 2010; Svensson and Hambrick 2016). In spite of this, organizational capacity has quickly risen to the top of the list of numerous characteristics that influence social performance (Cornforth and Mordaunt 2011; Daniel and Moulton 2017).

On the basis of research conducted on hybrid organizations (Epstein, M.J, 2010), The following characteristics of the social business model should be considered: (1) the mission statement must emphasize a social purpose. It supports long-term thinking. Creating a synergy between social and economic interests could be a solution to the dilemma of having to choose between the two. (2) the importance of the organization's interaction with its many stakeholders can not be emphasized. (3) mixed social organizations do not seek to develop by monopolizing

industries or markets, but they know that the ability to expand and expand is a necessary condition for social transformation. In addition, these organizations can serve as role models for other groups. These characteristics of social enterprises can also be seen in hybrid organizations. According to the results of a number of researchers (Tortia, E.C.; Degavre, F.; Poledrini, S. 2020), social enterprises may produce value through cooperation and collective action, multi-stakeholder governance, asset socialization, and the motivation of the enterprise's founders and employees.

SUSTAINABILITY OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

For years, non-profit arts organizations have faced a growing need to meet a range of public responsibilities. At the same time, some non-profit art organizations have begun to try to reinvent themselves and introduce new ideas. In this study, we investigated whether it is feasible to determine whether a nonprofit arts organization is financially sustainable. This assessment seems challenging given the diversity of events and the complexity of the financial system. Therefore, it seems more appropriate to focus on topics that have a beneficial impact on the revenue of non-profit arts organizations. This is true regardless of the scale or resources of the organization's ongoing activities. The combination of business and business model innovation creates funding that enables diverse learning based on individual needs. This article has important implications for future research into the revenue generated by non-profit art groups. The composition and configuration of business models, either responding to and capitalizing on environmental dynamics or failing to adapt appropriately, are the reasons for business success or failure. However, as Barton and Court (2012) point out, many organizations are unsure how to proceed with BMI, and there is still a lack of clarity as to the exact makeup of these new business models and how businesses can reconfigure their own business models. At the moment, cultural entrepreneurs only regard themselves as creative forces; they do not consider themselves to be managers who are responsible for providing services to the market at the appropriate price.

The structure, design, or framework that a company follows to provide value to consumers and customers is called its "Business model." However, the success of a business model can be measured in at least three different ways: the ability of the model to make a profit for its owners; the ability of the model to make a positive difference in the world; and And the model's ability to strike a balance between making a profit and making a positive change. The first strategy is used by traditional for-profit enterprises; the second strategy is used by traditional charities; and the third strategy is used by social enterprises, this strategy involves striking a healthy balance between profitability and good change. As described earlier, a social business model is a structure, design, or framework that social business uses to achieve good change while still generating healthy financial returns. However, although they all share this basic structure, social entrepreneurs have a variety of viable social business models to choose from.

The idea that non-profit art organizations can also act as "Third spaces" is closely related to the idea that such organizations can act as social enterprises (Bloom et al. , 2017) . The third space is a public space, rather than a person's home or workplace, where casual interaction can take place. They encourage people, known and unknown, to talk to each other. The third space includes exhibitions and commercial sections, such as a coffee shop run by a non-profit art

organization. Considering exhibitions organized by commercial areas and non-profit art organizations may help redefine how visitors relate to the organization. According to Connolly (2010) , one of the main functions of non-profit art groups as community stakeholders may be to provide a“Third space” for the community to take advantage of. This allows non-profit arts organizations to go beyond traditional ideas and increase visitor numbers and revenue streams. In this survey, the idea of a“Third space” revealed some indirect advantages that might come from income, which allowed me to consider the possibility of generating cash to improve the participant's experience.

In numerous qualitative studies of American, French and Chinese nonprofit organization, some art organizations and museums have found that visitors or participants seek an entertainment experience in their leisure time, others want deeper artistic, intellectual, and emotional contact. This is true despite the fact that some visitors or participants in art organizations and museums want to have an entertainment experience in their leisure time. Based on the findings, they found that experience provided them with better value. Immersing yourself in a work of art is a great way to get rid of the pressures of daily life, and you can vent your emotions by sharing experiences. The lifetime happiness of these clients is one of the study's findings, and it's particularly striking. Through the arts, people are better able to connect with others and their communities, which also creates the space for these connections to occur and encourages diversity, social inclusion and civic pride, and promote economic growth through community reconstruction, employment, tourism and economic multipliers (Guetzkow, 2002; Australia, 2019) . It is the interplay of all these outcomes that makes it possible for non-profit arts organizations to fulfill their social mission.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings derived from quantitative analysis, the researcher came to the following conclusions.

1) This research result is consistent with the concept of Sacchetti, S.; Tortia, E., (2019) found that the growing sense of responsibility that individuals have toward their communities to contribute in some manner, combined with the requirement to generate cash in order to maintain their standard of living, is one of the most significant factors that has led to the development of social businesses. The combination of having a social impact on society and the requirement for a certain amount of economic revenue for long-term survival is what differentiates non-profit organizations from social businesses, also known as social enterprises. This section the researcher provides the recommendation to the focal organization for business model innovation, organization culture, and non- profit development for the further research.

2) The results show that enterprises must have certain social influence and the ability to generate certain financial profits. These elements of organizational structure also demonstrate the existence of this balance. On the other hand, some aspects of society also play a role. However, according to Saebi, T. , Foss, N. J. , Linder, SDacinet al. . (2019) found different meanings associated with the issue of social entrepreneurship. The concept of social entrepreneurship is far from complete. The quality of the activities on which the definition is based seems to be the common denominator.

3) Business Model Innovation has a significant predictive effect on the development of nonprofit organization society, and there is a statistically significant positive correlation between organizational culture and the development of nonprofit organization society. Haffar, Al-Karaghoul, Djebarni, and Gbadamosi,(2019) show evidence that is consistent with this viewpoint as a framework of what constitutes shared values and how things actually function in relation to individuals who are a part of the organization, as well as organizational structure and control mechanisms for the purpose of establishing standards of behaviour within organizations. Haffar, Al-Karaghoul, Djebarni, and Gbadamosi (2019) argued that organizational culture should be It was also characterized as a framework of what comprises shared values and how things really function in respect to individuals that are a member of the organization.

4) A nonprofit organization business plan is a road map that identifies the goals and objectives of the organization and how to achieve them. Non-profit social capital includes trust, norms and networks, which can improve organizational performance to achieve goals.

This section the researcher provides the recommendation to the focal organization for business model innovation, organization culture, and non- profit development for the further research.

1. The researchers concluded that when generational, experiential, and job differences occur, managers become more reliable about their employees, they also have an internal drive to improve their leadership. These changes will not be sustainable if management does not recognize the need for additional training and mentoring at the right time and at the right time.

2. According to the findings, business models increasingly determine market differentiation. Business models should be based on their expected impact, value production and delivery, and value capture. Therefore, a marketing strategy for a charity or nonprofit organization should use marketing strategies to achieve a range of goals, such as publicizing the organization and its message, increasing membership, and motivating volunteers.

3. According to the findings of this study, the practice and operation of non-profit art groups and innovative business models are likely to overlap and support each other. So, if these organizations are managed well. Innovative business strategies and non-traditional revenue streams can provide non-profit arts organizations with additional advantages over financial returns and contribute to the development of sustainable arts communities.

4. Based on the findings, the vision and employees should consider major changes. Therefore, should establish the vision and sense of mission. Employees should continue to engage in training, mentoring, and other forms of professional development that they have personally and professionally made and strive to maintain.

REFERENCES

- Albi, E. (2003). *Economía de las Artes y Política Cultural*.
- Argyris,C., & Schon, D. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A Theoretical Perspective on Action*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison
- Bertschek,I, & Entorf H. (1996). Nonparametric estimates of the Schumpeterian link between innovation and firm size: evidence from Belgium, France and Germany. *Journal of Empirical Economics*, 21(3), 401–426.

- Boons, F.; Lüdeke-Freund, F. Business models for sustainable innovation: State-of-the-art and steps towards a research agenda. *J.Clean. Prod.* 2013, 45, 9–19.[CrossRef]
- Borzaga, C.; Defourny, J. Conclusions. Social enterprises in Europe: A diversity of initiatives and prospects. In *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*; Routledge:England, UK, (2001). pp. 350–370. ISBN 9780415339216.
- Burton, C. & Scott C. (2003). Nonprofit Arts Organizations: Challenges of the 21st Century. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 5(2), 56-68.
- Camiso'n, C., Lapiedra, R., Segarra, M., & Boronat,M. (2009).A meta-analysis of innovation and organizational scale.*Organizational Research*, 25(3), 331–361.
- Canestrino, R.; Raven, R.P.; Royakkers, L.M. (2019). Creating social value through entrepreneurship: The social business model of La. Paranza. *Kybernetes* 2019,48, 2190–2216. [CrossRef]
- Cohen, W.M., & Klepper, S. (1996). Company Size and Re- emergence of R&D,*Economic Journal*, 106, 925-951.
- Dacin, P.A.; Dacin, M.T.; Matear, M. Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Acad. Manag. Perspect.* (2010,)24, 37–57.
- Dacin, M.T.; Dacin, P.A.; Tracey, P. (2011).Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organ. Sci.* 2011, 22, 1203–1213.
- Dart, R. The legitimacy of social enterprise. *Nonprofit Manag. Leadersh.* 2004, 14, 411–424. [CrossRef]
- Dentchev, N.; Moingeon, B.; Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2016). Embracing the variety of sustainable business models: Social entrepreneurship,corporate intrapreneurship, creativity, innovation, and other approaches to sustainability challenges. *J. Clean. Prod.* 2016, 113, 1–4.[CrossRef]
- Eva Balan-Vnuk and Peter Balan, (2016) Business model innovation in nonprofit social enterprises, Published online by Cambridge University Press: 05 February 2016
- Gandhi, T.; Raina, R. Social entrepreneurship: The need, relevance, facets and constraints. *J. Glob. Entrep. Res.* (2018). 8, 1–13.[CrossRef]
- Georgieva, K. The Great Reset. Remarks to World Economic Forum, June 2020.
- Hoogendoorn, B. ; Pennings, E. ; Thurik, R. What do we know about social entrepreneurship:An Analysis of Empirical Research.*Int. Rev. Entrep.* (2010). 8, 1–42.
- Paranza. *Kybernetes.* (2019). 48, 2190–2216. [CrossRef]
- Hoogendoorn, B.; Pennings, E.; Thurik, R. (2010). What do we know about social entrepreneurship: An Analysis of Empirical Research.*Int. Rev. Entrep.* 2010, 8,1–42.
- Hull, C., & Lio, B. (2006). Innovation in nonprofit and for-profit organizations: with visionary, strategic, and financial considerations. *Journal of Change Management*, 6(1), 53-66.
- Jonker, J.; Tap, M.; van Straaten, T. Nieuwe. (2012)*Business Modellen: Een Exploratief Onderzoek naar Veranderende Transacties die Meervoudige Waarde Creëren*;Radboud Universiteit: Nimegen, The Netherlands, 2012.
- Kawashima, N. (1999). Privatize the services of a non-profit arts organization for local authorities in the UK. *New managerialism in action? JMP*, 1(2), 157–178.
- Kirchne,LaForette, S. (2008). In pablos, & M. D. Lytras (Eds.), *Chinese consumers' attitudes and adoption of online and mobile banking*.

- Kerlin, J.A. Defining social enterprise across different contexts: A conceptual framework based on institutional factors. In *Social enterprises*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2012; pp. 91–117.
- Keizer, A.; Stickers, A.; Heijmans, H.; Carsouw, R.; van Aanholt, W. *Scaling the Impact of the Social Enterprise Sector*; McKinsey & Company Research Report; McKinsey & Company: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, (2016).
- Kerlin, J.A. Social enterprise in the United States and Europe: Understanding and learning from the differences. *Volunt. Int. J. Volunt. Nonprofit Organ.* (2006)., 17,246. [CrossRef]
- Lambert, S. A business model research schema. *BLED Proc.* (2006). 7, 43.
- Nina Simon and Translated by Yu Xiang, *Participatory Nonprofit Art Organizations: Entering the Era of Nonprofit Art Organizations 2.0*, Zhejiang University Press, 2018, p. 15.
- Michelle. (2019). *Research on the Communication Power of New Media Platforms of National First-class Non-profit Art Organizations Based on MWCI[J]*. *New Media Research*,2019,5(14): 4-6.
- Michellini, L.; Fiorentino, D. (2012). New business models for creating shared value. *Soc. Responsib. J.* 2012, 8, 561–577. [CrossRef]
- Petra C. M. Neessen, Cosmina L. Voinea and Els Dobber, *Business Models of Social Enterprises: Insight into Key Components and Value Creation*. *Sustainability* 2021, 13, 12750. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212750>
- Porter, M.; Kramer, M.(2006). *Strategy and Society: The Link Between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility*. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* 2006, 48, 78–92.
- Phillips, W.; Moingeon, B.; Lehmann-Ortega, L. Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review. *Group Organ. Manag.* (2015). 40, 428–461. [CrossRef]
- Rauf, F.; Tap, M.; van Straaten, T. Moderating effect of political embeddedness on the relationship between resources base and quality of CSR disclosure in China. *Sustainability* 2020, 12, 3323. [CrossRef]
- Rauf, F.; Dacin, P.A.; Tracey, P. CSR Disclosure: Effects of Political Ties, Executive Turnover and Shareholder Equity. Evidence from China. *Sustainability* 2021, 13,3623. [CrossRef]
- Rey-Martí, A.; Ribeiro-Soriano, D. (2016). ; Palacios-Marqués, D. A bibliometric analysis of social entrepreneurship. *J. Bus. Res.* 2016, 69,1651–1655. [CrossRef]
- Sandberg, J. (2011). Alvesson, M. Ways of constructing research questions: Gap-spotting or problematization? *Organ. Sci.* 2011, 18,23–44. [CrossRef]
- Sacchetti, S.; Tortia, E. The notion of social responsibility in social enterprises and non-profit organizations. In *Corporate Governance: Search for the Advanced Practices*, Conference Proceedings, Virtus Interpress; Sumi; 2019.
- Available online:<https://virtusinterpress.org/IMG/pdf/cpr19p13.pdf> (accessed on 1 June 2021).
- Salamon, L.M.& Anheier, H.K. (1994). *The emerging sector: an overview*, Institute for Policy Studies, The Johns Hopkins University Press
- Salamon, L.M. (1995). *Partners in public Service:Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern welfare state*, The Johns Hopkins University Press
- Salamon, L.M. (1999), *Global Civil Society*, The Johns Hopkins University Press
- Schaltegger, S. ;
- Lüdeke- Freund, F. ; Hansen, E. G. Business models for sustainability: A co- evolutionary analysis of sustainable entrepreneurship,innovation, and transformation. *Organ.*

- Environ. 2016, 29, 264–289. [CrossRef]
- Santos, F.; Pache, A.-C.; Birkholz, C. Making hybrids work: Aligning business models and organizational design for social enterprises. *Calif. Manag. Rev.* 2015, 57, 36–58.
- Saebi, T.; Foss, N.J.; Linder, S. Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises. *J. Manag.* (2019). 45, 70–95. [CrossRef]
- Social Enterprise. *Sociale Ondernemingen: Wat Zijn Het?* Available online: <https://www.social-enterprise.nl/over-sociaalondernemen/wat-zijn-het#> (accessed on 6 July (2019)).
- Spieth, P.; Tap, M.; van Straaten, T. Value drivers of social businesses: A business model perspective. *Long Range Plan.* (2019)., 52,427–444. [CrossRef]
- Stock, G. N., Greis, N. P., & Fischer, W. A. (2002). Enterprise scale and dynamic technological innovation. *Technological Innovation*, 22,537– 549.
- Spieth, P.; Tap, M.; van Straaten, T. Value drivers of social businesses: A business model perspective. *Long Range Plan.* 2019, 52, 427–444. [CrossRef]
- Tortia, E.C.; Degavre, F.; Poledrini, S. Why are social enterprises good candidates for social innovation? Looking for personal and institutional drivers of innovation. *Ann. Public Coop. Econ.* 2020, 91, 459–477. [CrossRef]
- Teece, J.D. Business Models. *Bus. Strategy Innov. Long Range Plan.* 2010, 43, 2–3.
- Tukker, A., Woudstra, J., Boons, F., Beute, N., Eds.; Faculty of Industrial Design Engineering, (2010). Delft University of Technology: Delft, The Netherlands,2010; pp. 25–29.
- United Nations. *About the Sustainable Development Goals.* 2018. Available online: <https://sdgs.un.org/> (accessed on 1 June 2021).
- Weisbrod , B.A. (1986), *Toward a theory a theory of Voluntary Nonprofit Sector in a three-Sector*, in Rose- Ackerman S. (ed.) , *The Economics of Nonprofit Institutions: Studies in Structure and Policy*, Oxford University Press
- Witkamp, M.J.; Raven, R.P.; Royakkers, L.M. (2011). Strategic niche management of social innovations:The case of social entrepreneurship. *Technol. Anal. Strateg.Manag.* 2011, 23, 667–681. [CrossRef]
- Wilson, E., MacGregor, J., Macqueen, D., Vermeulen, S., Vorley, B., Zarsky, L.(2020). *Business models for sustainable development: innovation for society and environment.* IIED, London
- Wilson, F.; Post, J.E. (2013). Business models for people, planet (& profits): Exploring the phenomena of social business, a market-based approach to social value creation. *Small Bus. Econ.* 2013, 40, 715–737.
- Young, D.R.; Leczy, J.D. Defining the universe of social enterprise: Competing metaphors. *Volunt. Int. J. Volunt. Nonprofit Organ.* (2014). 25, 1307–1332. [CrossRef]
- Yunus, M.; Moingeon, B.; Lehmann-Ortega, L. Building social business models: Lessons from the Grameen experience. *Long Range Plan.* (2010). 43, 308–325.[CrossRef]
- Zott, C.; Amit, R.; Massa, L. The business model: Recent developments and future research. *J. Manag.* (2011). 37, 1019–1042.
- Zhongze Wu & Jinluo Chen. (1996). , *Managing social groups*, China Society Press, Beijing