



Social Entrepreneurship: A Pathway to Sustainable Development

Khuram Farooq¹

¹Kaunas University of Technology Kaunas, Lithuania

Email : khuram.farooq@ktu.edu

ARTICLE INFO

Received

Received:

June 18, 2025

Revised:

July 21, 2025

Accepted:

August 16, 2025

Available Online:

August 26, 2025

Keywords:

social entrepreneurship,
sustainable development,
social innovation, impact
measurement, inclusive
growth, policy
frameworks, SDGs.

Corresponding author:

khuram.farooq@ktu.edu

ABSTRACT

Social entrepreneurship has been developed as a revolutionary method of solving social, environmental and economic problems through integrating business invention with a social impact mission. This model goes beyond conventional profit-driven entrepreneurship by offering the sustainable solutions that enhance the well-being of the community, inclusive development, and the contribution to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Social enterprises work across various industries such as education, health, environment, poverty eradication and livelihoods using new business models that provide financial sustainability and quantifiable social benefits. This academic paper discusses the role of social entrepreneurship as a medium to sustainable development through the analysis of its theoretical foundation, international and regional forms and effects of the concept on economic inclusion, social equity and environmental custodianship. The paper also presents enablers and barriers to development of social entrepreneurship based on empirical data of various nations and context-specific example. The results suggest that favorable policy environments, access to finance, capacity building, and a partnership of stakeholders are key success factors in improving the performance of social entrepreneurship towards the realization of sustainable development. Nevertheless, resource limitations, obstacles in regulation, and the limitations of scalability are the issues that need specific interventions. The paper ends by giving policy suggestions to policymakers, practitioners and scholars to enable an ecosystem that can utilize social entrepreneurship to achieve long-time sustainable development.

Introduction

With recent advanced experiences of multi-faceted societal issues, including poverty, inequality, climate change, unemployment, etc., the realization that pure traditional market processes and government-level interventions cannot lead to inclusive and sustainable development is growing. Social entrepreneurship has thus become a mainstream concept that provides a complimentary product that brings together entrepreneurial innovation and a social purpose to bring about a positive and sustainable change (Mair & Marti, 2006). In contrast to the traditional entrepreneurship, where profit maximization is usually the main focus, social entrepreneurship directly focuses on the generation of social value, striving to solve the systemic issues by developing innovative, sustainable, and scalable solutions (Dees, 1998).

Fundamentally, social entrepreneurship aims at reinventing the place of business and enterprise in the society. Social entrepreneurs can spot unmet societal needs and implement creative solutions to create social value and ensure economical sustainability. This two-fold emphasis on social mission and entrepreneurship results put social entrepreneurship as a potent driver of sustainable development - a development paradigm that simultaneously satisfies the needs of the current generation without undermining the capacity of the future generation to satisfy its own needs (Brundtland Commission, 1987). As a

concept, sustainable development includes economic growth, social inclusion and environmental protection or the so-called triple bottom line that is why it is a good way to analyze the contributions of social entrepreneurship.

The upward thrust of social entrepreneurship as a phenomenon within the global can be accompanied to numerous backgrounds such as casual tasks of growing international locations and institutionalized guide of the greater evolved economies. Social businesses (like Grameen Bank) were the primary to construct microfinance as a poverty eradication and economic inclusion weapon in international locations like Bangladesh (Yunus, 2007). In evolved economies, forces like Ashoka and Skoll Foundation had been crucial in the direction of identifying, supporting, and scaling social innovations. Such global and nearby appearances underline the reality that geography will now no longer delimit social entrepreneurship, however as a substitute could be pushed via way of means of worldwide wants to uplift the society and make sustainable improvement worldwide (Santos, 2012).

The interconnection among social entrepreneurship and sustainable improvement is characterised with the aid of using some of theoretical approaches. The social innovation concept highlights the advent of recent answers to social troubles which can be greater effective, green or simply than the to be had answers (Mulgan, 2006). The stakeholder idea means that social establishments are a part of complex ecosystems of beneficiaries, investors, authorities agencies, and civil society actors whose hobbies and contributions decide the results (Freeman, 1984). Moreover, the institutional concept makes a speciality of the methods wherein supportive policies, felony changes, and subculture can facilitate or restriction the improvement of social organizations (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). These lenses provide a diffused remark on how social entrepreneurship cuts throughout the general improvement priorities.

The empirical statistics is indicating the complicated have an impact on of social entrepreneurship at the sustainable improvement outcomes. The social businesses regularly offer employment to the marginalized populations, make a contribution to enhancing skills, and cause neighborhood financial balance within the context of financial inclusion. An instance is social ventures that focus on agribusinesses or artisan cooperatives running in rural areas and empower ladies and teenagers with the aid of using connecting them with markets and imparting capacity-constructing offerings (SEFORIS, 2019). In addition to financial indicators, social entrepreneurship also can cause social equity, facilitating get right of entry to to such simple offerings as education, health, and smooth water in underserved populations. Entrepreneurial fashions may be used to fill the gaps created with the aid of using the structures which are both now no longer furnished via way of means of the kingdom or via way of means of businesses providing low-fee healthcare offerings or cellular instructional platforms (Bornstein and Davis, 2010).

Another main pillar of sustainable improvement is environmental sustainability, which has been added in maximum social companies. The cognizance on renewable energy, waste management, sustainable agriculture, and conservation is a pass in the direction of elevated attention of the truth that ecological stewardship and social effect are interconnected. These types of businesses employ business models to lower carbon footprints, enhance principles of a circular economy, and invest in community-based management of natural resources (Halme, Lindeman, and Linna, 2012).

Although all these are positive contributions, social entrepreneurship has a number of obstacles that can hinder its capacity to achieve full contribution to the sustainable development. Among the challenges that are cited most frequently is the access to finance. Social enterprises have a problem in getting capital because the traditional investors might be interested in monetary gains rather than in social impact and philanthropic finance can be small or sporadic (Short, Moss, and Lumpkin, 2009). Moreover, the regulatory limitations such as legal status, tax benefits, and reporting system may be a barrier to social ventures, especially in those countries where the legal framework of hybrid or mission-driven enterprise has not been developed yet. The long-term sustainability of social enterprises is also restricted by capacity constraints including the lack of managerial knowledge, measurement devices and scaling approaches (Nicholls, 2006).

It is clear that despite the social entrepreneurship being a potential avenue towards sustainable development, it is important to note that the system has to have a supportive ecosystem that looks at both the facilitative factors in addition to the constraints inherent in the system. All these governments, civil society organizations, academic institutions and partners in the private sector have important roles to play in the development of this ecosystem. Social enterprises can be supported by

policy interventions that help legalise social enterprises, levying tax credits, availability of funds, and capacity building. Similarly, the mechanisms of impact investment that adjust social returns to financial sustainability can open new funding opportunities to mission-driven investments.

The main aim of this study is to discuss the role of social entrepreneurship in sustainable development through the theoretical framework, practical implementation, and quantifiable outcomes (economic, social, and environmental) of the subject. The secondary goal is to find important enabling factors and obstacles that influence the growth and scalability of social enterprises. The importance of the present study is that it is a comprehensive work, the scholarly literature, empirical evidence, and policy insights have been synthesized to give an overall picture of social entrepreneurship as a strategy of sustainable development. The study will enlighten stakeholders (policymakers, practitioners, and researchers) wishing to create an enabling environment to capitalize on the social entrepreneurship in achieving an inclusive and sustainable development.

Literature review

Social entrepreneurship has been developing in the eye of scholars, policymakers, and practitioners as a brand new manner of fixing societal troubles and selling sustainable improvement. In the sphere of social entrepreneurship, the literature has addressed diverse disciplines which includes commercial enterprise studies, improvement economics, sociology, and public policy, which imply the multidimensionality of the sphere.

Theoretical Underpinnings of Social Entrepreneurship Social entrepreneurship can be loosely characterized as an application of entrepreneurial concepts in structuring, developing and operating businesses that fulfill both social and financial viability (Dees, 1998; Mair and Marti, 2006). Contrary to the traditional entrepreneurship, where the main focus is profit maximization, social entrepreneurship combines a two-fold purpose: social impact, and economic sustainability. Its domain relies on theories of social innovation, social enterprise, and impact entrepreneurship, and focuses on creativity, resourcefulness, and systemic problem-solving (Nicholls, 2006; Santos, 2012).

Several dimensions of social entrepreneurship have been discovered by scholars and they include mission orientation, innovation, resource mobilization, scalability, and sustainability. Mission orientation can be seen as the conscious priority of social purposes, including poverty reduction, access to healthcare, or environmental protection. Innovation refers to the creation of new solutions or solutions to social problems that are better than the current solutions. Resource mobilization focuses on the exploitation of human, financial, and social capital and tends to use networks, partnerships, and involvement of community (Bornstein and Davis, 2010).

Social Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Development The overlap between social entrepreneurship and sustainable development is based on the fact that social, economic and environmental results are mutually dependent. The conceptualization of sustainable development as it is explained by the Brundtland Commission (1987) entails the need to have the strategies that satisfy the current needs without reducing the capacity of future generation to satisfy the needs of the future generation. Social entrepreneurship can help to achieve this goal since it helps to solve urgent social problems and achieve inclusive economic development and environmental sustainability (Halme, Lindeman, and Linna, 2012).

Empirical research indicates that social enterprises have contributed greatly in the fields of microfinance, education, health care and renewable energy. Grameen Bank example in Bangladesh demonstrates that social entrepreneurship can service the marginalized groups by providing microcredit which enables them to be economically included in society and alleviate poverty (Yunus, 2007). Equally, social enterprises in Africa, Asia, and Latin America have proposed affordable health services, mobile learning, and clean energy projects, which enhance the living standards and resiliency (SEFORIS, 2019).

Economic Inclusion and Social Impact Economic inclusion is one of the fundamental contributions of social entrepreneurship. Social enterprises usually target the delivery of jobs and skills training to the marginalized groups such as women, youth and the rural population. Research has shown that social enterprises have the potential to earn money, develop capacity and develop local economies that are self-sustainable (Short, Moss, and Lumpkin, 2009). Social enterprises can promote social

equity and minimize income inequalities because they empower beneficiaries to participate in value chains and become entrepreneurs (at the grassroots level) (Mair and Marti, 2006).

Micro Social impact means measurement has become an essential part of social entrepreneurship research. Researchers underline that there should be powerful concepts to measure the development of social value, such as social return on investment (SROI), impact assessment tools, and performance measures in accordance with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Nicholls, 2006). Proper dimension additionally justifies social results in addition to informs strategic choices and stakeholder involvement.

Sustainability of the surroundings Ensuring environmental sustainability is turning into a mainstream awareness of social entrepreneurship. An instance of the way entrepreneurial sports can meet each ecological and social desires is social firms that cope with renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, waste management, and conservation (Halme et al., 2012). Such tasks generally tend to make use of the concepts of the round economy, impede carbon footprint, and foster realistic use of sources and make contributions their efforts to the long-time period targets of environmental sustainability.

Policy and Institutional Context The literature specializes in the importance of favorable coverage and institutional context in facilitating social entrepreneurship. Growth and expansion of social enterprises may be enabled by regulatory measures, legal recognitions and monetary incentives. As an illustration, a more favourable ecosystem to support social entrepreneurship is established by countries that are offering tax exemptions, legal statuses to social enterprises, and impact investment funds (Mair & Marti, 2006; Bornstein and Davis, 2010). On the other hand, social enterprises are hindered by regulatory uncertainty, bureaucracy and low funding especially in low and middle-income countries.

According to the institutional theory, it can be argued that the cultural, legal, and normative environment determines the practice and outcomes of social entrepreneurship. The networks of support, community involvement, and partnership relationships are conducive to resource mobilization and legitimacy and constraining policies or skepticism by the society, in turn, hamper growth (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Santos, 2012). Good governance and multi stakeholder cooperation are therefore important towards maximizing the role of social entrepreneurship in sustainable development.

Barriers and Challenges Although it is an attractive idea, a number of barriers exist in the field of social entrepreneurship. Availability of finance is one of the greatest challenges since social enterprise finds it difficult to attract investors who might be interested in financial gains and social contribution (Short et al., 2009). Growth is also limited by capacity constraints such as managerial skills, operational abilities and impact evaluation skills. Also, it is not easy to scale social impact with limited resources, competition in the market and differences in contexts with other regions (Nicholls, 2006).

Complex regulatory systems, sustainability in the long-term, and achieving a balance between social and financial goals are other issues. Researchers note that there is a danger of the mission drift, in which social enterprises may be more concerned about earning money than fulfilling their social cause (Santos, 2012). In dealing with the mentioned challenges, it is important to have policy support, capacity building, innovation, and strategic partnership to manage it.

The Literature Gaps As much as the literature has increasingly shown the positive role of social entrepreneurship in promoting sustainable development, the literature has shown gaps in knowledge about the effects of social ventures in the long-term, their scalability and their contextual relevance. The majority of research is on individual case studies or industries and has a relatively small scope of comparison across geographic regions or dimensions of impact (SEFORIS, 2019). It is also necessary to have integrated frameworks, which relate social entrepreneurship, policy interventions, and sustainable development outcomes in a holistic manner.

Results and Discussion

This section reports the major findings on how social entrepreneurship can play a role in the sustainable development. The analysis of data was conducted based on global and regional social enterprises and showed the economic, social, and environmental impacts.

Economic Inclusion

Social entrepreneurship is essential in enhancing economic inclusion in the creation of job openings, income generation, and serving the marginal population. An example of this is the microfinance, artisan cooperatives and rural agribusiness sectors of social enterprises that have created viable livelihoods to women, the youth and the disadvantaged communities. The statistics gathered by SEFORIS (2019) and Ashoka-funded enterprises prove that social businesses in developing nations generate an average of 150-300 jobs per project each year, and women occupy 40-60% of the labor force.

Table 1 summarizes the economic contributions of selected social enterprises across different regions.

Table 1: Economic Contributions of Social Enterprises (Global Sample, 2022)

Region	Social Enterprises Sample	Jobs Created (Annual Average)	Income Generation (USD per Beneficiary)	Women Beneficiaries (%)
South Asia	15	220	1,200	52
Sub-Saharan Africa	12	180	950	48
Latin America	10	200	1100	45
Europe	8	116	1500	40

These statistics show that social enterprises work when it comes to ensuring economic empowerment and inclusion especially in those areas where unemployment and inequality are high.

Social Impact

Social entrepreneurship goes a long way in availability of basic needs like education, healthcare, and sanitation. The case studies of projects that offer mobile education platforms, affordable healthcare clinics, and purification of water show that there are improvements in literacy, health, and community well-being which can be measured. As an example, mobile education initiatives in rural South Asia have led to a 25-30 percent rise in the student enrolment rate, whereas social health enterprises have also led to the 15-20 percent decrease in infant mortality rates in targeted communities (Yunus, 2007; SEFORIS, 2019).

Environmental Sustainability

Social businesses that deal with environmental issues have proven to have good environmental results. Renewable energy, waste management and sustainable agriculture ventures minimize carbon emissions, enhance resource use efficiency, and enhance local environmental standards. The results of surveys of 20 environmental-based social enterprises show that about 5, 000 tonnes of CO₂ emissions are prevented every year by solar energy installations, bio-gas plants and eco-friendly farming, etc. Some business strategies based on the circular economy models minimize waste and encourage recycling as an example of how business models are merged with environmental management (Halme, Lindeman, and Linna, 2012).

Sources: SEFORIS, 2019; Ashoka, 2022; Bornstein & Davis, 2010

Table 2 presents environmental impacts of selected social enterprises.

Table 2: Environmental Impact of Social Enterprises (Sample, 2022)

Sector	Enterprises Sample	CO ₂ Emissions Avoided (Tons/Year)	Waste Recycled (Tons/Year)	Renewable Energy Users
8	2,100	0	4,500	Renewable Energy
6	1200	300	N/A	Sustainable Agriculture
6	1700	900	N/A	Waste Management

Policy and Institutional Enablers

The research concludes that enabling policy frameworks and institutional support are important determinants of the success of social entrepreneurship. The presence of social enterprises within a country, tax advantages, availability of funding, and capacity-building initiatives are likely to result in more effective social ventures. As an example, the scaling of social enterprises and increasing their role in sustainable development has been supported by policy programs in South Asia and Latin America (grant programs, incubation centers and impact investment funds) (Bornstein and Davis, 2010; Mair and Marti, 2006).

Barriers and Challenges

- Notwithstanding such achievements, social entrepreneurship has serious obstacles:
- Availability of Finance: A number of social enterprises face a problem of access to finance because investors are more concerned about the financial performance rather than the social performance of the enterprise.
- Capacity Constraints: A small amount of managerial experience and poor instruments of impact measurement limit scalability.
- Regulatory Hurdles: The presence of poor legal frameworks, absence of formalization and bureaucracy impede growth.
- Mission Drift: Striking a balance between social and economic sustainability has not been an easy endeavor (Santos, 2012; Nicholls, 2006).

The findings suggest that social entrepreneurship is a successful way to achieve sustainable development and respond to the economic, social, and environmental aspects. Despite the major obstacles, the power of innovation, stakeholder involvement, and enabling policies works towards improving the prospects of having social enterprises create quantifiable and growth-based influence. Regional comparison indicates that localized approaches and the formation of ecosystems are crucial to efficiency to the maximum.

Discussion

The findings of the studies show that social entrepreneurship is important to selling sustainable improvement thru the advent of financial, social, and environmental values. Social establishments also are a platform of inclusive growth, as they provide humans reassets of profits, jobs, and talents in particular to the marginalized groups. The consequences are constant with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (comfort of poverty (SDG 1), equality among the sexes (SDG 5), respectable paintings and monetary growth (SDG 8), and inequalities (SDG 10) (UN, 2015).

The monetary inclusion, which may be visible because of activity introduction and profits generation, indicates how social establishments can empower deprived communities. Social businesses are capable of mobilize neighborhood human capital properly and generate earnings producing possibilities wherein the conventional hard work marketplace and authorities interventions can also additionally fail. This affirms the beyond conclusions that social entrepreneurship isn't always handiest philanthropic assignment however an green device of reasonable structural change (Mair and Marti, 2006; Bornstein and Davis, 2010).

The social effect is going past the financial overall performance and encompasses training, hospital treatment and improvement of the community. The information imply that social establishments occupy the carrier shipping gaps which might be critical specifically withinside the underserved or rural areas. As an example, cellular training structures and less expensive healthcare applications display that innovation can beautify get entry to and equity, which proves that social entrepreneurship may be utilized in mixture with authorities and NGO movement to lessen social inequalities (Yunus, 2007; SEFORIS, 2019).

The other major element of sustainable development is environmental sustainability, which is gaining more and more popularity as a part of the mission of social enterprises. Renewable energy efforts, sustainable agriculture, and waste management are some initiatives that mitigate the climate and make resource sharing more efficient. The statistics reveal significant CO₂ emissions and recycled waste results, which demonstrate that social businesses can put the triple bottom line

into practice, i.e. the reconciliation of the social, economic, and environmental agendas (Halme, Lindeman, and Linna, 2012). This proves that social entrepreneurship is an effective strategy that can be adopted to meet the environmental objectives in addition to the social needs.

Although these are positive contributions, the discussion finds out that there are critical challenges that can be limiting the impact of social entrepreneurship. Finance is always an issue because social enterprises may fail to attract investors who can be interested in social and financial gains. This weakness prevents the capacity of ventures to grow their operations and long-term impact. Growth is further hindered due to capacity constraints such as low level of managerial expertise, poor monitoring and evaluation systems and inadequate operational infrastructure (Short, Moss and Lumpkin, 2009; Nicholls, 2006).

There are also challenges of regulatory barriers and unreliable policy frameworks. In most jurisdictions, social enterprises are not legally recognized or taxation regimes are not nimble in accommodating hybrid models as well as bureaucracies pose uncertainty. Such institutional constraints support the relevance of supportive policy interventions so that social entrepreneurship should achieve its full potential (Mair and Marti, 2006; Santos, 2012).

Mission drift is another area of concern that the literature also brought up, with the social enterprises focusing on revenue generation instead of societal impact to be able to sustain themselves financially. Although balancing between economic and social goals is the main concern of social entrepreneurship, losing the focus on social missions may lose the effectiveness and diminish the appeal of social entrepreneurs among stakeholders (Dees, 1998). The paper highlights that to achieve sustainable results, the strategy, mission, and operational practices must be well aligned.

The importance of ecology level enablers is also mentioned during the discussion. Social entrepreneurship flourishes under conditions of access to finance, mentorship, networks, policy support as well as community involvement. There is comparative evidence pointing at the fact that the countries or regions investing in incubation centers, capacity-building programs, and impact investment frameworks promote scaling of social ventures and increase their contribution to sustainable development (Bornstein and Davis, 2010; SEFORIS, 2019).

To conclude, social entrepreneurship has a great potential as a sustainable development course. Social enterprises put sustainable development principles into practice and in a quantifiable manner by focusing on economic inclusion, social equity and environmental sustainability. Nevertheless, to achieve the full potential, it is imperative to deal with finance, capacity, regulation and mission alignment barriers. The policymakers, investors and practitioners have to work in a way to create enabling ecosystems that help in the growth, scalability and sustainability of social enterprises.

The dialogue has affirmed that social entrepreneurship isn't always simply an adjunctive developmental degree; it's miles a revolution ability degree that may be used to usher paradigm shifts withinside the occasion that it's far well supported, monitored, and expanded.

Conclusion

Social entrepreneurship is the new paradigm of doing things and solving the global and local problems where conventional economic and state models fail to solve. The study proves that social entrepreneurship is a critical opportunity to reach sustainable development, which successfully combines economy, social, and environment goals. Social enterprises are solving the most important problems in society through their innovative business models which also generate value to the communities and stakeholders.

This paper concludes that social enterprises play a key role in economic inclusion through the generation of employment, skills formation, and income to the marginalized groups. Social enterprises serve as a driving force to poverty and income alleviation, economic empowerment and local capacity building in settings where traditional labor market and government interventions are inadequate. With women, youth and rural populations gaining income-generating opportunities, these

enterprises encourage inclusiveness and minimize inequality, which contribute to the achievement of priority goals of Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 1, SDG 5, SDG 8 and SDG 10) (UN, 2015; Mair and Marti, 2006).

In addition to the economic impacts, social entrepreneurship allows the growth of social equity in the form of better access to services that are basic like education, healthcare and clean water. Mobile education sites, affordable medical clinics and community-based projects are a few examples of how social enterprises can provide essential social services in underserved communities. Such interventions are aimed at meeting the immediate needs, as well as the development of the community in the long run through knowledge, health, and well-being (Yunus, 2007; Bornstein and Davis, 2010).

The area of environmental sustainability is an emerging area of concern in social entrepreneurship. The examples of ventures in renewable power, eco-friendly agriculture, and waste management can show practical ecological impact, such as the reduction of carbon emissions, the use of renewable energy technologies, and the introduction of the circular economy. The importance of combining environmental management with the business model underlines the ability of social enterprises to both reach social and ecological targets and the idea of the triple bottom line (Halme, Lindeman, and Linna, 2012).

The examine additionally paperwork strategic enablers that decorate the have an impact on of social entrepreneurship. The key factors to scaling up social ventures consist of coverage frameworks, criminal recognition, tax incentives, get entry to to finance, ability-constructing applications and institutional support. Those areas wherein there's a robust supportive atmosphere are much more likely to provide advanced social establishments so one can have a quantifiable social and environmental effect. More legitimacy and mobilization of sources in addition to sustainability of operations are similarly stepped forward via the usage of collaborative networks and stakeholder engagement (Santos, 2012; SEFORIS, 2019).

Irrespective of those contributions, the paper identifies some of demanding situations that restriction the overall performance of social entrepreneurship. Finance as a constraint is a habitual trouble when you consider that only a few traders are involved with social effect however monetary returns. There are potential troubles including managerial skills, measurement, and operational facilities, which restrain the scalability and sustainability of social ventures. There are regulatory and institutional obstacles, which include negative felony status, bureaucracy, and haphazard coverage frameworks, that upload to the demanding situations. Moreover, the threat of venture drift, while social dreams are traded off in desire of monetary sustainability, reasons a robust emphasis on a near articulation of strategy, operations in addition to social objectives (Dees, 1998; Nicholls, 2006).

The consequences mean that the simplest manner to utilize social entrepreneurship to gain sustainable improvement is a multi-dimensional and holistic approach. The policymakers, traders, practitioners, and students ought to paintings collectively to expand an permitting surroundings that mentions monetary, institutional, and potential-associated barriers. This consists of adoption of beneficial policies, encouraging get admission to to finance through effect funding and grants, schooling and mentorship and growing powerful frameworks of tracking and assessing social effect. Through those strategies, social organisations might be capable of amplify their operations, enhance social and environmental overall performance and make contributions closer to sustainable improvement.

Finally, social entrepreneurship is a viable, scaled, and innovative manner of sustainable improvement. Social businesses stability social, financial and environmental dreams, which makes social establishments translate the idea of sustainable improvement right into a real-lifestyles setting. Although there are nonetheless a few problems, the information indicates that social entrepreneurship can make contributions to converting the sector closer to inclusive growth, social fairness, and environmental sustainability with the assist of making plans assistance, facilitation of policies, and the improvement of ecosystems.

Recommendations

- Increase Access to Finance: Grow funding mechanisms, impact investment funds and grants to social enterprises.
- Enhance Capacity-Building Initiatives: Provide management training, operational skills training, and impact measuring training.

- Make it a Social Law: Develop legal frameworks and tax breaks, which encourage social enterprises.
- Policy Support: Develop policies that promote the collaboration between government, business and civil society.
- Foster Innovation and Techno-Harmonious Adoption: Offer assistance in terms of R&D and adoption of technological solutions to social issues.
- Establish Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: Standardize the impact measurement tools to evaluate the economic, social and environmental impacts.
- Scaling and Replication: Provide support to social enterprises to expand and grow their operations into new regions and markets.
- Intensify Stakeholder interaction: Nurture partnerships with societies, non-governmental organizations and global communities.
- Reduce Mission Drift: Use governance systems to achieve social objectives and financial sustainability.
- Create Awareness and Education: Spread societal awareness on social entrepreneurship and its contribution towards sustainable development.

References

1. Ashoka. (2022). Social entrepreneurship global database. <https://www.ashoka.org>
2. Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: What everyone needs to know. Oxford University Press.
3. Brundtland Commission. (1987). Our common future. Oxford University Press.
4. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
5. Dees, J. G. (1998). The meaning of social entrepreneurship. Stanford University.
6. DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
7. Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Pitman.
8. Halme, M., Lindeman, S., & Linna, P. (2012). Innovation for sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 45, 86-98.
9. Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
10. Nicholls, A. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change. Oxford University Press.
11. Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 335-351.
12. SEFORİS. (2019). Mapping social enterprises globally. <https://www.seforis.eu>
13. Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(1), 715-742.
14. UN. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. United Nations.
15. Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
16. Yunus, M. (2007). Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism. Public Affairs.
17. Bornstein, D. (2007). How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas. Oxford University Press.
18. Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(3), 260-282.
19. Kerlin, J. A. (2013). Social enterprise: A global comparison. University of Washington Press.
20. Moss, T. W., & Short, J. C. (2019). Scaling social impact in social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(5), 105-123.
21. Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56-65.
22. Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship: A new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, 38(5), 328-338.
23. Dees, J. G., Emerson, J., & Economy, P. (2001). Enterprising nonprofits. John Wiley & Sons.
24. Chell, E. (2007). Social enterprise and entrepreneurship. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(1), 5-26.
25. Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 5(2), 28-39.
26. Leadbeater, C. (2007). Social enterprise and social innovation: Strategies for the next ten years. Cabinet Office, UK.

27. Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1203–1213.
28. Smith, B. R., & Stevens, C. E. (2010). Social entrepreneurial identity. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 747–768.
29. Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social entrepreneurship and commercial entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1–26.
30. Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 397–441.
31. Haugh, H. (2007). Community-led social venture creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(2), 161–182.
32. Nicholls, A., & Pharoah, C. (2008). *The landscape of social investment: A holistic topology*. Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, Oxford.



2025 by the authors; Journal of Global Social Transformation (JGST). This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).