

Social Entrepreneurship: Driving Sustainable Social Impact Through Innovation- An Economic Perspective

Dr. N. Renthungo Patton, Dr. Roland K. Kikon

Associate Professor, Mount Tiyi College Wokha

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11050200>

Received: 18 March 2026; Accepted: 24 March 2026; Published: 15 June 2026

ABSTRACT

Social entrepreneurship represents a hybrid economic model that blends entrepreneurial principles with a social mission. It has emerged as a critical force in addressing market failures, promoting inclusive development, and fostering sustainable innovation. This paper explores the role of social entrepreneurship in delivering public goods, correcting externalities, and creating inclusive economic value. Drawing from institutional economics, innovation theory, and empirical studies, it highlights how social entrepreneurship contributes to sustainable development. The paper also discusses key challenges such as access to finance, regulatory barriers, and impact measurement, and outlines policy recommendations to support the ecosystem. The findings underscore social entrepreneurship's potential as a vehicle for equitable and sustainable economic growth.

Keywords: Social entrepreneurship, innovation, inclusive development, market failure, institutional economics, sustainable development

INTRODUCTION

Persistent global challenges such as poverty, inequality, healthcare disparities, and environmental degradation continue to undermine economic development and human well-being. Despite decades of interventions by state and market institutions, billions of people remain excluded from formal economies and access to basic services. As of 2023, approximately **9.2% of the world's population—over 700 million people—still live on less than \$2.15 per day**, the international poverty line (World Bank, 2023). Global inequality, as measured by the Gini index, has worsened in many regions, while climate-related disasters and underfunded healthcare systems strain public budgets and deepen systemic vulnerabilities (UNDP, 2021).

Conventional institutions have struggled to address these issues holistically. Markets, driven by profit-maximization, tend to underinvest in public goods and social externalities, while state responses are often constrained by bureaucratic inertia, fiscal limitations, and political fragmentation (Weisbrod, 1975; Salamon, 1994). This institutional inefficacy has created a fertile ground for alternative socio-economic paradigms—most notably, **social entrepreneurship**.

Social entrepreneurship is defined as the application of innovative, market-based approaches to solve social and environmental problems, where social value creation is prioritized over profit distribution (Dees, 1998). Unlike traditional enterprises that measure success purely in financial terms, social enterprises aim to generate both economic and social returns, frequently operating in institutional voids where state and market actors are absent or ineffective (Mair & Marti, 2006). Empirical data reflect the rise of this model: the **Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM, 2020)** reports that **43% of early-stage entrepreneurs globally are engaged in activities with explicit social or environmental objectives**, representing a significant shift in entrepreneurial motivation and behavior.

From an economic standpoint, social entrepreneurship represents a **corrective mechanism for market failures**—such as the under-provision of public goods, presence of externalities, and imperfect information (Armendáriz & Morduch, 2010). It leverages **Schumpeterian innovation** to disrupt entrenched systems,

particularly in “base-of-the-pyramid” markets underserved by both governments and private firms (Prahalad, 2005). Additionally, by cultivating **social capital** and institutional trust, social enterprises foster inclusive, participatory development (Putnam, 1993; Ostrom, 1990).

This paper examines the evolution and economic implications of social entrepreneurship with a focus on how it **addresses systemic inefficiencies, creates inclusive value chains, and mobilizes innovation for sustainable development**. Through theoretical insights and empirical case studies—spanning sectors such as microfinance, education, renewable energy, and healthcare—the paper provides an in-depth analysis of the **structural contributions and limitations** of social enterprises within modern economic systems.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

➤ Market Failures and Social Value Creation

Market failure, characterized by the inefficient allocation of resources, often leads to the under-provision of public goods and services. Social enterprises emerge as corrective mechanisms in such contexts (Weisbrod, 1975; Salamon, 1994). They address issues where traditional businesses see low profitability and where governmental efforts fall short due to inefficiencies or lack of reach. For instance, Grameen Bank in Bangladesh pioneered microcredit to address failures in rural banking by offering small loans without collateral, thereby stimulating economic activity among the poor (Yunus, 2007).

➤ Innovation and Schumpeterian Dynamics

Schumpeter (1934) defined entrepreneurship as the act of 'creative destruction' through innovation. Social entrepreneurship aligns with this concept by introducing innovations that disrupt traditional methods of addressing social issues. These innovations are especially impactful in base-of-the-pyramid (BoP) markets where conventional solutions are absent. Mulgan (2006) emphasizes that social innovation—new ideas, models, or processes aimed at meeting social needs—is a cornerstone of social entrepreneurship.

➤ Institutional Economics and Social Capital

Institutional theory (North, 1990) and theories of social capital (Putnam, 1993) underscore the role of informal and formal institutions in shaping economic behavior. Social entrepreneurs often operate in institutional voids where legal and infrastructural support is weak. They foster cooperation, trust, and community participation. For example, waste-picker cooperatives in Latin America, such as Colombia's Recuperar, integrate informal workers into formal economies, enhancing livelihoods and institutionalizing sustainable practices (Medina, 2007).

EMPIRICAL CASE STUDIES

➤ Grameen Bank: Financial Inclusion

Grameen Bank has disbursed over \$25 billion in microloans to 10 million borrowers, 97% of whom are women (Yunus, 2007; Armendáriz & Morduch, 2010). Studies show significant improvements in household income, female empowerment, and children's education (Pitt & Khandker, 1998). These outcomes underscore microfinance as a tool for social impact and market efficiency.

➤ SELCO India: Renewable Energy Access

SELCO India has deployed more than 500,000 solar energy systems in underserved communities. According to IRENA (2019), households with access to solar power experienced a 25% increase in income and 30% improvement in educational outcomes. This demonstrates the internalization of positive externalities and the promotion of green infrastructure.

➤ **Bridge International Academies: Low-Cost Education**

Bridge Academies operate in several African and South Asian countries, offering affordable education using standardized, tech-based pedagogy. A World Bank RCT (Bold et al., 2017) revealed that students in Bridge schools scored significantly higher in core subjects, equivalent to one extra year of learning. This highlights education innovation as a social investment with high returns.

➤ **Aravind Eye Care: Healthcare Efficiency**

Aravind Eye Care System provides more than 400,000 surgeries annually, 60% of which are free or subsidized. The organization sustains itself by cross-subsidizing services, achieving cost levels one-tenth that of Western equivalents (Pralhad, 2005). This showcases how economies of scale and social innovation can create sustainable healthcare models.

ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

➤ **Social Return on Investment (SROI)**

The SROI metric quantifies the social value generated for each dollar invested. Social Value UK (2016) reports SROI ratios of 2:1 to 11:1 across various sectors. For example, the Educate Girls DIB in India produced a 52% improvement in student learning, leading to full investor repayment (Brookings, 2018).

➤ **Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA)**

CBA assesses interventions based on long-term economic value. d.light's solar kits reduce household fuel expenses and improve productivity, yielding high returns relative to investment (Lighting Global, 2018). The monetized benefits justify the initial outlay, indicating allocative efficiency.

➤ **Local Economic Multipliers**

Social enterprises contribute to job creation, local procurement, and service access. British Council (2016) finds that every £1 invested in UK social enterprises generates £2.50-£3.00 in local economic activity, amplifying regional development.

BARRIERS TO SCALE AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION

➤ **Access to Capital**

ANDE (2020) notes that 65% of social enterprises in emerging markets face a financing gap. Many are too large for microfinance but too risky for banks. Blended finance, combining grants and impact investments, is gaining traction but remains underutilized.

➤ **Legal and Regulatory Constraints**

In countries like India, lack of legal status for hybrid organizations complicates compliance and fundraising. Conversely, nations like the UK and South Korea have enacted laws to facilitate social enterprise development (OECD, 2023).

➤ **Scalability and Mission Drift**

Scaling social innovation is difficult due to contextual differences and operational complexity. OECD (2020) reports only 22% of surveyed social enterprises operate beyond regional boundaries. Rapid expansion may also dilute social missions.

➤ Measurement Limitations

Small organizations often lack the capacity to conduct rigorous impact evaluations. While tools like IRIS+, SROI, and B-Analytics exist, their adoption is inconsistent, limiting visibility and investor confidence.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Policymakers should recognize and support social entrepreneurship through the following measures:

- **Legal Recognition:** Establish formal legal categories for social enterprises, with associated tax benefits and reporting flexibility.
- **Blended Finance:** Promote public-private partnerships, guarantees, and social impact bonds to bridge capital gaps.
- **Capacity Building:** Support education and incubation programs to train impact-driven entrepreneurs.
- **Impact Infrastructure:** Develop national and regional data platforms to standardize and share performance metrics.
- **Procurement Integration:** Mandate social enterprise participation in public procurement to ensure inclusive service delivery.

CONCLUSION

Social entrepreneurship merges the efficiency of markets with the compassion of civil society. It addresses systemic failures through innovation, builds institutions in underserved regions, and drives inclusive economic growth. Empirical cases demonstrate its efficacy across sectors such as finance, education, energy, and healthcare. Nonetheless, to harness its full potential, targeted interventions in financing, regulation, and capacity-building are essential. Social entrepreneurship is not merely a policy option but a paradigm for reimagining development in the 21st century.

REFERENCES

1. Armendáriz, B., & Morduch, J. (2010). *The economics of microfinance* (2nd ed.). MIT Press. <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262513982/the-economics-of-microfinance/>
2. Aspen Network of Development Entrepreneurs (ANDE). (2020). *State of the sector report*. <https://www.andeglobal.org/page/stateofthesector>
3. Bold, T., Kimenyi, M., Mwabu, G., Ng'ang'a, A., & Sandefur, J. (2017). *Experimental evidence on scaling education reform in Kenya* (CGD Working Paper No. 482). Center for Global Development. <https://www.cgdev.org/publication/experimental-evidence-scaling-education-reform-kenya>
4. British Council. (2016). *Social enterprise: An overview of the policy framework*. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/social-enterprise-policy-overview-report.pdf>
5. Brookings Institution. (2018). *Measuring success: Learnings from the Educate Girls DIB*. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/measuring-success-learnings-from-the-educate-girls-dib/>
6. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM). (2020). *Social entrepreneurship report*. <https://www.gemconsortium.org/report/gem-2020-2021-global-report>
7. International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA). (2019). *Off-grid renewable energy solutions: Maximizing impact through innovation*. <https://www.irena.org/publications/2019/Jan/Off-grid-renewable-energy-solutions>
8. Lighting Global. (2018). *Global off-grid solar market trends report 2018*. <https://www.lightingglobal.org/resource/2018-global-off-grid-solar-market-trends-report/>
9. Medina, M. (2007). *The world's scavengers: Salvaging for sustainable consumption and production*. AltaMira Press. Available at: <https://www.worldcat.org/title/worlds-scavengers-salvaging-for-sustainable-consumption-and-production/oclc/76945863>
10. Mulgan, G. (2006). The process of social innovation. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization*, 1(2), 145–162. <https://doi.org/10.1162/itgg.2006.1.2.14>

11. North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/institutions-institutional-change-and-economic-performance/44DF72EDC0340A4CB1E15BB2FA3ADDD6>
12. OECD. (2020). *Social impact measurement for the social and solidarity economy*.
<https://www.oecd.org/publications/social-impact-measurement-for-the-social-and-solidarity-economy-6898ea71-en.htm>
13. OECD. (2023). *Boosting social enterprise development: South Korea*.
<https://www.oecd.org/industry/boosting-social-enterprise-development-south-korea-8a801be8-en.htm>
14. Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/governing-the-commons/9EFD8BBAE2C4C5EF1E7D3A3B16361E3C>
15. Pitt, M. M., & Khandker, S. R. (1998). The impact of group-based credit programs on poor households in Bangladesh: Does the gender of participants matter? *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(5), 958–996.
<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/250037>
16. Prahalad, C. K. (2005). *The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid*. Wharton School Publishing. Available at: <https://www.pearson.com/store/p/fortune-at-the-bottom-of-the-pyramid/P100000123949>
17. Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton University Press.
<https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691037387/making-democracy-work>
18. Salamon, L. M. (1994). The rise of the nonprofit sector. *Foreign Affairs*, 73(4), 109–122.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/20046747>
19. Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Harvard University Press. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/theoryofeconomic00schu>
20. Social Value UK. (2016). *A guide to social return on investment*.
<https://www.socialvalueuk.org/resources/sroi-guide/>
21. UNDP. (2015). *Human development report: Work for human development*.
<https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2015>