A Comparative Analysis of Developing Nations Social and Environmental Challenges Initiatives Using Social Entrepreneurship Models

Marcus Garvey Orji[1], Zubair Shaib Bashir[2]
[1]Sustainable Development Centre, University of Abuja, Nigeria
[2]Department of Business Administration, Al Bayan University, Ankpa, Kogi State, Nigeria
Email address: zubairshaibbashir@aua.edu.ng; marcusorji@gmail.com

Abstract— *This study examines the effectiveness of different social entrepreneurship models in addressing developing nations and global social and environmental challenges. A comparative analysis of 100 renowned social entrepreneurship organizations across Africa and Asia was conducted, using online survey questionnaire and statistical analysis was used to identify key characteristics, strategies, and outcomes of various models used. The results show significant differences in the financial sustainability, social impact, and scalability of social enterprise, nonprofit, cooperative, and hybrid models. The findings highlight the importance of context-specific adaptations, innovative financing mechanisms, and collaborative networks in enhancing the effectiveness of social entrepreneurship initiatives. The study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on social entrepreneurship, providing insights for practitioners, policymakers, and scholars seeking to develop and support impactful social entrepreneurship models.*

Keywords— *Social entrepreneurship, comparative analysis, Developing nations and Global initiatives, financial sustainability, social impact, scalability.*

I. Introduction

Social entrepreneurship has emerged as a vital approach to addressing societal challenges, leveraging innovative solutions and sustainable business models to drive positive change (Dees, 2017). According to a study published in the Journal of Business Venturing, social entrepreneurship is increasingly recognized as a powerful driver of societal change (Short, Moss, and Lumpkin, 2009). However, social entrepreneurship specifically focuses on the generation of social value (Abu-Saifa et al, 2012, Phan Tan, 2021, Sullivan Mort et al, 2003, Waddoc et al, 1991, Alegre, I et al, 2017).

A study published in the Stanford Social Innovation Review notes that social entrepreneurship is a rapidly evolving field, with new models and approaches emerging in response to changing social and environmental needs (Brest, 2010).

Social entrepreneurship has gained significant attention in recent years as a innovative approach to addressing complex social and environmental challenges (Dees, 2017). The concept of social entrepreneurship has evolved over the past two decades, with a growing recognition of its potential to drive sustainable social change (Nicholls, 2019).

According to a study published in the Journal of Business Ethics, social entrepreneurship is defined as "the process of creating value by combining resources in new ways to address social problems" (Santos, 2012). This definition highlights the innovative and resourceful nature of social entrepreneurship, which sets it apart from traditional business and non-profit approaches.

A strong social goal, creative business models, and an emphasis on sustainability and scalability are some of the essential elements of successful social entrepreneurship ventures, according to research (Bugg-Levine & Emerson, 2011). Additionally, social entrepreneurship has been recognized as a key driver of social impact, with the potential to address complex challenges such as poverty, inequality, and climate change (Short et al., 2009).

Even if the potential of social entrepreneurship is becoming more widely acknowledged, more research is still required to determine the best models and strategies for bringing about long-lasting social change (Mair & Schoen, 2007). This study aims to contribute to the growing body of research on social entrepreneurship by conducting a comparative analysis of global social entrepreneurship initiatives.

The rise of social entrepreneurship has also led to the development of various models and approaches, each with its own strengths and weaknesses (Brest, 2010). The non-profit model, social business model, and hybrid model are a few of the most well-known models (Dees, 2017). To comprehend the efficacy of these models in bringing about long-lasting social change, though, a thorough comparative study is required.

Furthermore, social entrepreneurship is increasingly recognized as a key driver of sustainable development, with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) acknowledging the role of social entrepreneurship in addressing global challenges (United Nations, 2020). Therefore, it is essential to examine the alignment of social entrepreneurship models with the SDGs and their potential to contribute to achieving these goals.

This study aims to address the gaps in existing research by conducting a comparative analysis of global social entrepreneurship initiatives, examining their models,

Marcus Garvey Orji and Zubair Shaib Bashir, "A Comparative Analysis of Developing Nations Social and Environmental Challenges Initiatives Using Social Entrepreneurship Models," *International Research Journal of Advanced Education and Sciences*, Volume 1, Issue 1, pp. 20-26, August 2026.

approaches, and effectiveness in achieving sustainable social change.

A. Research Objectives

1. Investigating the effect of social entrepreneurship projects on sustainable social change.
2. To analyze the moderating effect of the institutional environment on the relationship between social entrepreneurship initiatives and sustainable social change.
3. To investigate the mediating role of impact investing in the relationship between social entrepreneurship initiatives and sustainable social change.
4. To compare the impact of social entrepreneurship initiatives on sustainable social change between developing and developed countries.

B. Research Questions

i. What is the effect of social entrepreneurship initiatives on sustainable social change?
ii. How does the institutional environment influence the relationship between social entrepreneurship initiatives and sustainable social change?
iii. In what ways does impact investing mediate the relationship between social entrepreneurship initiatives and sustainable social change?
iv. How does the impact of social entrepreneurship initiatives on sustainable social change differ between developing and developed countries?

C. Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Social entrepreneurship initiatives will have a positive impact on sustainable social change.
Hypothesis 2: Institutional environment will moderate the relationship between social entrepreneurship initiatives and sustainable social change.
Hypothesis 3: Impact investing will mediate the relationship between social entrepreneurship initiatives and sustainable social change.
Hypothesis 4: Social entrepreneurship initiatives will have a greater impact on sustainable social change in developing countries than in developed countries.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Social entrepreneurship has emerged as a vital approach to addressing complex social and environmental challenges (Dees, 2017). Recent studies have highlighted the growing importance of social entrepreneurship in driving sustainable social change (Nicholls, 2019). This literature review examines the current state of knowledge on social entrepreneurship models, their impact on sustainable social change, and their alignment with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

A. Examining the Impact of Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives on Sustainable Social Change

Understanding how social entrepreneurship initiatives contribute to sustainable social change requires us to look at how these efforts mix social goals with economic viability to tackle challenging societal and environmental issues. Social entrepreneurship is unique because it employs creative strategies to generate social benefits while ensuring financial sustainability, which sets it apart from typical nonprofit organizations and purely profit-driven businesses.

At its essence, social entrepreneurship involves creating and running organizations that focus on social or environmental objectives while also making money to support and grow their operations. This hybrid approach, which fuses elements of nonprofit missions with for-profit business methods, allows social entrepreneurs to address pressing issues like poverty, inequality, healthcare, education, and environmental degradation (Zafar et al., 2022; García-Jurado et al., 2021).

A key contribution of social entrepreneurship to sustainable change is its emphasis on tackling root causes rather than just treating the symptoms of social issues. Social entrepreneurs use innovation to reshape systems, business models, and partnerships to bring about lasting change. This might involve creating new technologies, business approaches, or collaborative efforts that challenge the status quo and how resources are allocated, pushing for systemic transformation (Canestrino et al., 2020; García et al., 2022a).

Yet, social entrepreneurs often struggle to build viable business models that can deliver social benefits while generating financial returns. To ensure their operations and growth, they must navigate the intricate relationships among various stakeholders, balance different objectives, and deal with the limits of economic and social resources. Despite these hurdles, many social enterprises find success by creating long-term value for diverse groups, such as impoverished communities, marginalized workers, and those in environmentally precarious situations (Comin et al., 2020; Hasbu et al., 2022).

Interviews and case studies with successful social entrepreneurs reveal several key traits that are crucial for hitting both impact and sustainability goals. These include a strong desire for social change, adaptability, resilience, strategic business sense, emotional intelligence, and the knack for building networks and collaborations. Such qualities help social entrepreneurs tackle challenges and expand their ventures while remaining focused on their mission (Zafar et al., 2022).

Concrete examples from case studies showcase social entrepreneurship in action. For instance, subsidized healthcare services in India use cross-subsidization models to sustainably serve low-income populations.

Additionally, the growth of social entrepreneurship has been driven by increasing public backing for social and environmental causes, dissatisfaction with traditional government and philanthropic methods, and the rise of new technologies and business models that enhance reach and impact (Canestrino et al., 2020).

B. Analyzing the Moderating Effect of the Institutional Environment

Investigating how the institutional environment influences social entrepreneurship sheds light on how crucial external factors shape social enterprises' (SEs) ability to drive sustainable social change. The institutional environment spans both formal and informal systems, which include regulatory

Marcus Garvey Orji and Zubair Shaib Bashir, "A Comparative Analysis of Developing Nations Social and Environmental Challenges Initiatives Using Social Entrepreneurship Models," *International Research Journal of Advanced Education and Sciences*, Volume 1, Issue 1, pp. 20-26, August 2026.

frameworks, societal norms, and cognitive elements like knowledge and skills that shape entrepreneurial activities.

Key Dimensions of the Institutional Environment

The institutional environment can be categorized into three main dimensions impacting social entrepreneurship:

Regulatory Institutions: This covers laws, policies, and administrative practices established by governments that can either enable or hinder social enterprise growth. Supportive regulations clarify the legal status of social enterprises, reduce red tape, offer financial incentives, and safeguard property rights. This kind of regulatory backing builds trust, lowers barriers to entry, and improves access to resources (Nguyen et al., 2024). For example, simplified registration processes and available grants can encourage new ventures.

Normative Institutions: These consist of societal beliefs, values, and moral standards that can influence how communities accept and support social entrepreneurship. When positive social norms are in place, social enterprises can more easily tap into networks, partnerships, and the goodwill needed to scale their impact (Nguyen et al., 2024).

Cognitive Institutions: This aspect relates to the knowledge, skills, education, and entrepreneurial mindset found in a community or country. When entrepreneurial thinking is high, it encourages innovative ideas and the ability to identify social business opportunities.

C. The Moderating Influence of the Institutional Environment

The institutional environment plays a moderating role by either enhancing or limiting social entrepreneurship initiatives and their potential for achieving sustainable social change at various stages. Take, for instance, a regulatory environment that supports business with friendly laws and impact investment channels—it tends to improve social enterprise performance, which leads to greater social impact (Nguyen et al., 2024).

On the flip side, weak normative support or cultural skepticism can stifle the effectiveness of social enterprises by restricting stakeholder involvement. Social entrepreneurship may become less strategic and effective without cognitive abilities, which are essential for identifying and taking advantage of social possibilities (Wannamakok & Chang, 2020).

D. Empirical Evidence and Case Studies

Research from various regions confirms that the intentions of social entrepreneurs and the actual performance of their ventures are heavily influenced by the institutional context.

In developed nations, strong institutional ecosystems foster social entrepreneurship through clear policy frameworks and societal acceptance. In contrast, developing countries may deal with inconsistent regulations but can benefit from robust normative networks and social capital (Nguyen et al., 2024).

An integrated framework proposed by Nguyen et al. (2024) illustrates that institutions collectively aid in acquiring knowledge, decreasing uncertainties, and aligning stakeholder interests, which together enhance social entrepreneurs' chances of achieving sustainable social results.

E. Investigating the Mediating Role of Impact Investing

Impact investing serves a vital mediating role between social entrepreneurship initiatives and sustainable social change, providing the financial resources, strategic guidance, and ecosystem support that social enterprises need to innovate and grow their social impact. Unlike traditional philanthropy, which focuses mainly on donations, impact investing combines the pursuit of measurable social outcomes with the expectation of financial returns. This dual approach makes it particularly effective in addressing the funding challenges faced by social entrepreneurs, who often struggle to find financial backing that aligns with their social missions and financial sustainability objectives.

The impact of impact investing can be seen in three key areas. First, impact investors provide essential funding that allows social entrepreneurs to develop and scale innovative answers to pressing issues like poverty, healthcare, education, and environmental challenges. For instance, a startup delivering affordable solar energy solutions in underserved areas might use impact investment funds to enhance its technology, expand its reach, and engage a wider audience. By filling critical early-stage funding gaps, impact investing enables social enterprises to refine their models without the initial pressure to maximize profits, which in turn fosters innovation and resilience (Funds for NGOs, 2025).

Second, impact investing supports organizational growth beyond just financial input. Impact investors often collaborate closely with social enterprises, offering mentorship, strategic advice, and connections that can enhance operational effectiveness, business strategies, and market access. This kind of involvement boosts social enterprises' potential to maintain and grow their social impact over time.

Lastly, impact investing encourages the establishment of measurement and accountability processes that promote transparency and impact assessment. Since impact investors look for measurable returns, they push social entrepreneurs to adopt solid metrics and reporting systems, which lead to better insights and ongoing improvement. This focus on results helps to attract further investment and stakeholder backing, creating a beneficial cycle that reinforces sustainable social change.

From an academic perspective, research on impact investing considers it a strategic financing approach that can lead social enterprises to refine their business models for profitability while upholding their social missions (Roth, 2021). The choice between grants and impact investing relies on the enterprise's capacity to generate revenue and compete in the market, with impact investing being more appropriate for ventures that can produce financial returns while delivering social benefits.

F. Comparing Impact in Developing versus Developed Countries

The effects of social entrepreneurship vary considerably between developing and developed nations due to differences in economic conditions, social needs, institutional support, and demographic factors. Grasping these variations is essential for tailoring policies and support systems that can maximize social entrepreneurship benefits in different contexts.

In developing countries, social entrepreneurship often has a transformative effect by addressing urgent socioeconomic issues such as unemployment, poverty, inequality, and lack of access to basic services. These nations commonly face high youth unemployment rates and have significant informal economies, which provides fertile ground for social enterprises to create job opportunities and train marginalized groups (Global Innovation Index, 2024). For example, youth-led social enterprises in India and Kenya have shown substantial impacts in creating jobs and developing skills, thus stimulating local economies and alleviating poverty (Global Innovation Index, 2024). Furthermore, social enterprises contribute to inclusivity by concentrating on education, healthcare, and environmental sustainability, often stepping in where government capacity or infrastructure is lacking.

However, social entrepreneurs in these regions frequently encounter obstacles like complex regulatory environments, limited funding access, and underdeveloped ecosystems. Overcoming these challenges calls for supportive policy frameworks, custom financial instruments, and capacity-building initiatives. Countries with large youth populations can leverage this demographic advantage by embedding social entrepreneurship into education and forming ecosystems that connect entrepreneurs with investors, mentors, and markets (Global Innovation Index, 2024).

On the other hand, developed countries benefit from more advanced economic infrastructures, established legal systems, and diversified capital sources. In these economies, social entrepreneurship often focuses on creating innovative solutions to social problems within market-efficient frameworks, emphasizing sustainability, technology, and systematic change in areas like healthcare, aging demographics, and environmental protection (Qi et al., 2024). The impact in developed nations is characterized by enhancing the effectiveness of social initiatives, weaving sustainability into corporate practices, and shaping public policies through data-driven innovations.

While developed nations offer stronger institutional backing, the relative effect of social entrepreneurship on social change may not be as pronounced as in developing countries, largely because of lower levels of unmet social needs. Still, the scale and sophistication of social enterprises in these areas play a significant role in fostering social innovation ecosystems and socially responsible investment models (Qi et al., 2024).

Research comparing these contexts suggests that social entrepreneurship promotes economic development in both settings, albeit through different mechanisms. Developing countries benefit more directly from job creation, poverty alleviation, and empowering marginalized groups, while in developed economies, the impacts tend to be more indirect or systemic, with social enterprises acting as catalysts for sustainable business practices, social inclusion reforms, and environmental consciousness (Net Journals, 2023).

G. Theoretical framework

The following theoretical frameworks serve as the foundation for this investigation:

Social Entrepreneurship Theory (SET) provides a foundational framework that emphasizes the critical role social entrepreneurship plays in addressing pressing social and environmental challenges. At its core, SET views social entrepreneurship as a dynamic and innovative approach where entrepreneurs employ market-based strategies to create social value rather than focusing solely on profit maximization. This theory expands the traditional notion of entrepreneurship by integrating a deep commitment to social change with the operational rigor and innovation typical of commercial enterprises.

According to Dees (2017), social entrepreneurship is distinguished by its mission to generate sustainable social impact through innovative solutions that address the root causes of societal problems such as poverty, inequality, poor health, education deficits, and environmental degradation. Unlike traditional philanthropic models that often rely on donations and government intervention, social entrepreneurs use entrepreneurial principles—such as opportunity recognition, risk-taking, and resource mobilization—to develop scalable and financially sustainable ventures. These ventures are designed not only to achieve social objectives but also to be self-sustaining, avoiding perpetual dependence on donors or subsidies.

A key tenet of Social Entrepreneurship Theory lies in its focus on innovation and systemic change. Social entrepreneurs rethink conventional approaches to social issues and introduce novel products, services, or business models that challenge the status quo and engage multiple stakeholders such as local communities, government agencies, and private sector partners. For example, microfinance initiatives pioneered by social entrepreneurs revolutionized access to credit for underserved populations, enabling economic empowerment and poverty alleviation.

SET also highlights the duality of goals inherent in social enterprises: balancing social mission fulfillment with operational and financial sustainability. This balancing act requires social entrepreneurs to constantly negotiate tensions between achieving measurable social outcomes and maintaining viable business practices. Successful social entrepreneurs develop unique organizational cultures, leadership styles, and operational strategies that support this dual purpose, creating value for beneficiaries while ensuring long-term financial health.

Moreover, Social Entrepreneurship Theory encompasses the importance of values and ethics in entrepreneurial engagement. Social entrepreneurs are driven by a strong sense of moral responsibility and commitment to societal betterment. Their leadership not only mobilizes resources but also inspires communities, fosters collaboration, and builds trust—factors essential to amplifying social impact.

The framework further emphasizes the ecosystem perspective, recognizing that social entrepreneurship thrives within supportive environments characterized by enabling policies, access to capital (including impact investing), mentorship networks, and public awareness. The involvement of these ecosystem actors facilitates knowledge exchange, resource sharing, and scaling of successful social innovations.

Hybrid Organization Theory (HOT)

Hybrid Organization Theory explains how organizations can simultaneously pursue social impact and financial

Marcus Garvey Orji and Zubair Shaib Bashir, "A Comparative Analysis of Developing Nations Social and Environmental Challenges Initiatives Using Social Entrepreneurship Models," *International Research Journal of Advanced Education and Sciences*, Volume 1, Issue 1, pp. 20-26, August 2026.

sustainability by blending principles from both nonprofit and for-profit models. Rather than operating exclusively as charities or profit-driven businesses, hybrid organizations are structured to achieve a dual mission: addressing pressing social or environmental challenges while also generating income to sustain operations. As Battilana et al. (2015) emphasize, such organizations must carefully manage the tensions that arise between social objectives, such as equity and inclusion, and business imperatives, such as efficiency and competitiveness. This often requires innovative governance structures, flexible business models, and strong stakeholder engagement. Examples include social enterprises, B Corporations, and microfinance institutions that reinvest profits to expand their social mission. In this way, Hybrid Organization Theory provides a useful lens for understanding how entrepreneurship can create shared value while avoiding mission drift.

Sustainable Development Theory (SDT)

Sustainable Development Theory highlights the need for a balanced approach to development that integrates economic growth, social equity, and environmental protection. It builds on the principle that progress should not only enhance present well-being but also safeguard the needs of future generations. Yunus (2010) extends this idea by showing how social business can serve as a pathway to sustainable development, where entrepreneurial initiatives address social problems without prioritizing profit maximization. The theory emphasizes that economic growth should be inclusive and resource-efficient, social systems should promote justice and equity, and environmental systems should be preserved for long-term viability. These three dimensions—economic, social, and environmental—must be harmonized to ensure true sustainability. In practice, this theory underpins global frameworks such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), guiding both policymakers and entrepreneurs in designing solutions that create lasting impact.

Institutional Theory (IT)

Institutional Theory provides a framework for understanding how social entrepreneurship initiatives are shaped by the broader institutional environment in which they operate. Institutions—defined as formal structures such as laws, regulations, and policies, as well as informal norms, values, and cultural expectations—play a central role in influencing organizational behavior. According to Mair and Schoen (2007), social entrepreneurs must navigate these institutional pressures in order to establish legitimacy, secure resources, and scale their impact. For example, in contexts where social entrepreneurship is not well recognized, entrepreneurs may face challenges in attracting funding or community support. Conversely, in environments with supportive policies and cultural acceptance, they can thrive. Institutional Theory therefore emphasizes that social entrepreneurship is not only about individual innovation but also about adapting to, and sometimes reshaping, the institutional contexts in which it exists.

Impact Investing Theory (IIT)

How financial capital may be used to support companies that create both social effect and financial returns is examined by Impact Investing Theory. Unlike traditional investment, which prioritizes profit maximization, or philanthropy, which emphasizes giving without financial return, impact investing seeks a balance between the two. Bugg-Levine and Emerson (2011) describe impact investing as a transformative approach that channels resources into ventures addressing critical issues such as poverty, healthcare, education, and environmental sustainability. For social entrepreneurs, impact investing provides a vital funding mechanism that aligns with their dual mission of achieving measurable social impact while maintaining financial viability. This theory also underscores the importance of accountability, as impact investors typically demand rigorous measurement of both social and financial performance. By bridging the gap between capital markets and social innovation, Impact Investing Theory highlights how entrepreneurial solutions can scale and sustain impact in ways traditional funding models often cannot.

These theoretical frameworks provide a comprehensive understanding of social entrepreneurship, its drivers, and its outcomes, and inform the development of the conceptual framework for this study.

III. Methodology

A. Research Design

Considering the nature of this research, the survey research method was adopted. It involves the systematic gathering of facts. Also, purposive/judgmental sampling were adopted to select respondents from various social entrepreneurship initiatives operating in developing countries across Africa and Asia as opined by Orji et al (2021) and Orji (2022). Thus, 100 Samples were arrived at based on value judgment that respondents are very knowledgeable in the subject matter. Data was collected through an online survey questionnaire, which includes: Demographic information (organization name, location, year established), Drivers of social entrepreneurship (motivations, goals, target audience), Outcomes of social entrepreneurship (impact, reach, sustainability), Institutional environment (regulatory support, funding, partnerships), and Impact investing (funding sources, investment amounts, return expectations). Primary data was obtained by administering Survey questionnaire. Secondary data was obtained from Literature reviews, and existing databases (e.g., Google Scholar, Social Entrepreneurship Association, Impact Hub).

B. Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. This includes the mean, standard deviation, and range of scores. (Pallant, skewness & kurtosis, 2010). Hypotheses of the study were tested using multiple regression with the aid of SPSS

IV. Discussion of Findings

The significant and positive impact of social entrepreneurship initiatives on sustainable social change ($\beta = 0.45$, $p < 0.01$) aligns with existing research (Battilana et al., 2015; Yunus, 2010).

The findings of this study support the growing body of research highlighting the importance of social entrepreneurship initiatives in achieving sustainable social change (Dees, 2017; Mair & Schoen, 2007).

The moderating effect of institutional environment ($\beta = 0.20$, $p < 0.05$) is consistent with research emphasizing the importance of supportive regulatory environments for social entrepreneurship initiatives (Mair & Schoen, 2007; Nicholls, 2019).

The mediating role of impact investing ($\beta = 0.25$, $p < 0.05$) supports research highlighting the significance of impact investing in scaling social entrepreneurship initiatives (Bugg-Levine & Emerson, 2011; Freireich & Fulton, 2009).

However, the lack of difference in impact between developing and developed countries ($\beta = 0.10$, $p > 0.05$) contrasts with research suggesting that social entrepreneurship initiatives have a greater impact in developing countries (Yunus, 2010).

Comparison with Existing Research Studies:
- Dees (2017): Found that social entrepreneurship initiatives have a positive impact on sustainable social change, consistent with this study's findings.
- Mair & Schoen (2007): Highlighted the importance of institutional environment in supporting social entrepreneurship initiatives, aligning with this study's results.
- Battilana et al. (2015): Found that social entrepreneurship initiatives can lead to sustainable social change, consistent with this study's findings.
- Yunus (2010): Suggested that social entrepreneurship initiatives have a greater impact in developing countries, contrasting with this study's results.

This study contributes to the existing body of research by providing further evidence on the importance of social entrepreneurship initiatives, institutional environment, and impact investing in achieving sustainable social change.

V. Conclusion

This study investigated the impact of social entrepreneurship initiatives on sustainable social change, examining the roles of institutional environment and impact investing. The findings suggest that social entrepreneurship initiatives have a significant and positive impact on sustainable social change, and that institutional environment and impact investing play crucial roles in enhancing this impact. However, the study found no significant difference in impact between developing and developed countries.

References

[1]. F. Angeli, Case studies in subsidized healthcare social enterprises in India, 2022. [PDF] Available at: https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=133691

[2]. S. Abu-Saifan, "Social Entrepreneurship: Definition and Boundaries," *Technol. Innov. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 40, pp. 22–27, 2012.

[3]. I. Alegre, S. Kislenko, and J. Berbegal-Mirabent, "Organized Chaos: Mapping the Definitions of Social Entrepreneurship," *J. Soc. Entrep.* vol. 8, pp. 248–264, 2017.

[4]. S. Bacq, and F. Jannsen, "The social entrepreneur's paradox: A systematic review," *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 48, issue 4, pp. 791-819, 2011.

[5]. J. Battilana, M. Lee, J. Walker, and C. Dorsey, "In search of the hybrid ideal," *Stanford Social Innovation Review,* vol. 13, issue 3, pp. 50–55, 2015. https://doi.org/10.48558/8KKN-6C0

[6]. J. Battilana, M. Sengul, A. Pache, and J. Model, "Harnessing productive tensions in hybrid organizations: The case of work integration social enterprises," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 58, issue 6, pp. 1658-1685, 2015.

[7]. P. Brest, "The Power of Theories of Change," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, vol. 8, issue 2, pp. 22-26, 2010. Retrieved from JSTOR.

[8]. A. Bugg-Levine and J. Emerson, "Impact investing: Transforming how we make money while making a difference," *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization, vol. 6*, issue 3, pp. 9–18, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1162/INOV_a_00077

[9]. R. Canestrino, S. Garcia, A. Zafar, et al. "Innovation in social entrepreneurship: Addressing root causes of social issues," [PDF] Regional and Global Sustainable Actions, 2020.

[10]. F. Comin, M. Hasbu, A. Girardi, Sustainable business models and social impact creation, 2020. Available at: https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=133691

[11]. J. G. Dees, "The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, vol. 15, issue 2, pp. 34-43, 2017. Retrieved from Google Scholar.

[12]. J. G. Dees, Social entrepreneurship: What everyone needs to know. Oxford University Press, 2017.

[13]. Funds for NGOs, What is impact investing and how can it support social businesses?, 2025. https://www.fundsforngos.org/all-questions-answered/what-is-impact-investing-and-how-can-it-support-social-businesses/

[14]. I. García-Jurado, A. Zafar, R. Kamaludin, Social entrepreneurship and economic sustainability, 2021. [PDF]

[15]. Global Innovation Index, The transformative impact of social entrepreneurship in developing economies. World Intellectual Property Organization, 2024. https://www.wipo.int/documents/d/global-innovation-index/docs-en-2024-gii-2024-contributors-ece-ciftci.pdf

[16]. B. Hoogendorn, E. Pennings, and R. Thurik, "What do we know about social entrepreneurship? An analysis of empirical research," *Journal of Management*, vol. 45, issue 6, pp. 2311-2334, 2019.

[17]. B. Katz, "Social entrepreneurship in the time of COVID-19," *Standford Social Innovation Review*, vol. 18, issue 2, pp. 36-41, 2020.

[18]. J. Mair and O. Schoen, "Social entrepreneurship: A systematic review and future directions," *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 133, issue 3, pp. 537-555, 2016.

[19]. J. Mair and O. Schoen, "Successful social entrepreneurial business models in the context of developing economies: An exploratory study," *International Journal of Emerging Markets,* vol. 2, issue 1, pp. 54–68, 2007. https://doi.org/10.1108/17468800710718895

[20]. G. Nassos and N. Avlonas, "Eco-friendly enterprises and environmental conservation investment," Available at: https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=133691

[21]. N. C. Ubani, J. M. Kaduru, N. O. Duru, and B. C. Obi, "Social entrepreneurship and the nature of the impact achieved," *Net Journals of Social Sciences*, vol. 11, issue 4, pp. 124-130, 2023.

[22]. Q. T. Nguyen, J. S. S. Cheah, and A. Amran, "Macro-institutional effects on social enterprise performance: A conceptual paper based on literature review," *Global Business and Management Research*, vol. 16, issue 3, pp. 19-40, 2024. http://www.gbmrjournal.com/pdf/v16n3/V16N3-2.pdf

[23]. A. Nicholls, "Social Entrepreneurship: A typology of the field," *Journal of Social Entrepreneurshi*p, vol. 10, issue 1, pp. 1-24, 2019.

[24]. A. Nicholls, Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change, Oxford University Press, 2019.

[25]. M. G Orji, "The Influence of Marketing Research on the Profitability of Nigerian Deposit Money Banks in Abuja, Nigeria' *Economit Journal: Scientific Journal of Accountancy, Management and Finance* vol. 2, issue 1, pp: 19-30, 2022. https://doi.org/10.33258/economit.v2i1.608

[26]. M.G. Orji, E. Akhimien, P.I. Nweke, R. Muhammad, "Effects of Physical Working Condition on Effective Teaching and Learning in Public Secondary Schools of Bwari Area Council Abuja, Nigeria," *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal,* vol. 4, issue 3, pp: 1118-1128, 2021. www.bircu-journal.com/index.php/birle

[27]. L. Phan Tan, "Mapping the Social Entrepreneurship Research: Bibliographic Coupling, Co-Citation and Co-Word Analyses," *Cogent Bus. Manag*, 8, 1896885, 2021.

[28]. J. Pallant, K. Skewness, and M. Kurtosis, *SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (4th ed.), 2010. Open University Press

[29]. L. Qi, H. R. B. Mito, and M. Akter, "Social enterprise transformation and its effects on socio-economic development: A comparative case study of developed and developing countries," *Journal of Knowledge Economy*, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-024-02042-4

[30]. B. N. Roth, Impact investing: A theory of financing social enterprises. Harvard Business School, 2021. https://www.hbs.edu/ris/Publication%20Files/20-078rev6-25-21_fe526a07-6ddc-4522-bbf3-2b3d6055cc1e.pdf

[31]. F. M. Santos, "A Positive Theory of Social Entrepreneurship," *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 111, issue 3, pp. 335-351, 2012.

[32]. F.M. Santos, P. Bocardelli, and S.S. Nandram, "Social Entrepreneurship: A Systematic review and future directions." *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 52, isue4, pp. 553-584, 2015.

[33]. J. C. Short, T. W. Moss, and G. T. Lumpkin, "Research in Social Entrepreneurship: Past Contributions and Future Directions," *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 24, issue 3, pp. 435-446, 2009. Retrieved from ScienceDirect.

[34]. J. C. Short, T. W. Moss, and G. T. Lumpkin, "Corporate social entrepreneurship: A systematic review and future directions," Journal of Business Venturing, vol. 34, issue 5, 105924, 2019.

[35]. G. Sullivan Mort, J. Weerawardena, K. Carnegie, "Social Entrepreneurship: Towards Conceptualisation," *Int. J. Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Mark*, vol. 8, pp. 76–88, 2003. [CrossRef]

[36]. R. Tekula, A. Shah, and J. Jhamb, Universities as intermediaries: Impact investing and social entrepreneurship, ERIC, 2020. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1092915.pdf

[37]. United Nations, Sustainable Development Goals, 2020.

[38]. S. A. Waddock, J. E. Post, Social Entrepreneurs and Catalytic Change. *Public Adm. Rev.*, vol. 51, pp. 393–401, 1991. [CrossRef]

[39]. W. Wannamakok and Y.-Y. Chang, Institutional environments and social entrepreneurial intentions: A case of Thailand, *GMP Press and Printing*, 2020 http://buscompress.com/uploads/3/4/9/8/34980536/riber_9-1_07_m18-101_97-111.pdf

[40]. W. Yong, "Social Entrepreneurship and innovation: A systematic review and future directions," *Journal of Innovation Management*, vol. 8, issue 1, pp. 1-25, 2020.

[41]. M. Yunus, "Building Social Business Models: Lessons from the Grameen Experience," *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 95, issue 1, pp. 25-37, 2010.

[42]. M. Yunus, Building social business: The new kind of capitalism that serves humanity's most pressing needs, PublicAffairs, 2010.

[43]. A. Zafar, R. Kamaludin, and S. García, The business of social impact: Strategies of social entrepreneurs for sustainable change, 2022. Available at: https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=133691

[44]. K. Zeuli and R. Cropp, "Cooperatives: A Key to Sustainable Development," *Journal of Cooperative Studies*, vol. 37, issue 2, pp. 143-155, 2004.