



e-ISSN: 2319-8753 | p-ISSN: 2347-6710

IJRSET

International Journal of Innovative Research in
SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

Volume 12, Issue 4, April 2023

ISSN INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA

Impact Factor: 8.423

9940 572 462

6381 907 438

ijirset@gmail.com

www.ijirset.com

Innovative Financing Models for Social Entrepreneurship

Deepika Vettikuntla¹, Gloria Rodrigues², Polamuri Sri Lakshmi Manogna³,
Bandaru Charitardhana Manikanta⁴

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Universal School of Administration, Bengaluru, India¹

UG Students, Department of Commerce, Universal School of Administration, Bengaluru, India^{2,3,4,5}

ABSTRACT: Innovative Financing Models for Social Entrepreneurship are increasingly vital in addressing societal challenges while sustaining financial viability. This abstract explores various innovative financing approaches tailored for social enterprises, highlighting their impact and challenges in achieving sustainable social impact. Social entrepreneurship blends business acumen with a mission to create positive social change. Traditional financing models often fall short in supporting these enterprises due to their dual focus on financial returns and social impact. Consequently, innovative financing models have emerged to bridge this gap, enabling social entrepreneurs to attract capital while maintaining their social mission. Impact investors deploy capital in ventures that address specific social issues, ranging from healthcare and education to sustainable agriculture and clean energy. Another approach is Social Impact Bonds (SIBs), where private investors fund social programs with potential savings for governments or other beneficiaries, rewarding investors based on program outcomes. Crowdfunding platforms have democratized access to funding by mobilizing small contributions from a large number of individuals who believe in a social cause. Additionally, blended finance structures combine philanthropic grants with private investment to mitigate risk and attract commercial capital to underserved sectors. Despite their promise, these models face challenges. Impact measurement remains complex, as quantifying social outcomes often lacks standardized metrics. Moreover, scaling successful ventures across different contexts and regions requires adaptable financing strategies. This abstract synthesizes current literature and case studies to underscore the transformative potential of innovative financing models in empowering social entrepreneurs. By enhancing financial sustainability and scalability, these models facilitate the growth of enterprises dedicated to tackling pressing societal issues. Looking forward, continued research and collaborative efforts are essential to refine these models, address challenges, and maximize their impact on global social entrepreneurship.

KEYWORDS: Social Entrepreneurship, Innovative financing, Impact investing, Social impact bonds (SIBs) and Sustainability

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the concept of social entrepreneurship has gained significant traction as a powerful force for addressing complex societal challenges while pursuing sustainable solutions. Unlike traditional business models solely focused on profit maximization, social entrepreneurship integrates entrepreneurial principles with a core mission to generate positive social or environmental impact. This dual objective requires innovative approaches to financing, ensuring that enterprises can effectively balance financial sustainability with their social mission. The traditional financial ecosystem often struggles to meet the needs of social entrepreneurs due to its emphasis on financial returns above all else. Conventional funding sources such as loans and venture capital tend to prioritize profitability and short-term gains, which may not align with the longer-term, multifaceted goals of social enterprises. Consequently, there has been a growing recognition of the need for innovative financing models specifically tailored to support and sustain social entrepreneurship. This introduction aims to explore the landscape of innovative financing models for social entrepreneurship, examining their diverse forms, impact, challenges, and potential for fostering sustainable social change. By delving into various financing mechanisms and their applications across different sectors and geographies, this discussion seeks to provide insights into how these models enable social entrepreneurs to scale their impact while maintaining financial viability.

1.1 Context and Importance of Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship represents a dynamic intersection of business acumen and social innovation, driven by a commitment to addressing societal needs. Unlike traditional businesses, social enterprises prioritize creating positive social or environmental outcomes alongside financial sustainability. This dual mandate often arises from the recognition of market failures or gaps in addressing pressing social issues through traditional means. The rise of social entrepreneurship can be attributed to several factors. First, globalization and technological advancements have heightened awareness of global inequalities and environmental degradation, prompting individuals and organizations to seek innovative solutions. Second, disillusionment with purely profit-driven capitalism has spurred a movement towards more inclusive and sustainable economic practices. Third, a new generation of entrepreneurs and investors is increasingly prioritizing social impact alongside financial returns, reshaping the investment landscape.

1.2 Challenges in Traditional Financing for Social Enterprises

Despite their potential for transformative impact, social enterprises often face significant challenges in accessing traditional financing. Conventional investors and lenders typically prioritize financial metrics such as return on investment (ROI), liquidity, and profitability. These metrics may not adequately capture the broader social and environmental outcomes that social enterprises seek to achieve. As a result, many social entrepreneurs encounter barriers when seeking capital to launch or scale their ventures. Moreover, the financial needs of social enterprises may differ significantly from those of conventional businesses. Social ventures often require patient capital that allows for longer investment horizons and flexibility in achieving both financial and social objectives. This misalignment between traditional financing models and the operational realities of social enterprises underscores the necessity for innovative approaches that can accommodate diverse impact-driven business models.

1.3 Evolution of Innovative Financing Models

In response to these challenges, a variety of innovative financing models have emerged to support social entrepreneurship. These models aim to blend financial sustainability with measurable social impact, offering new pathways for mobilizing capital and aligning investor interests with social goals. Impact Investing stands out as a prominent example of innovative financing. Impact investors deploy capital into ventures, funds, or projects with the intention of generating positive social and environmental impacts alongside financial returns. This approach shifts the focus from purely financial metrics to include metrics such as social return on investment (SROI) and environmental sustainability. Impact investors may target sectors such as healthcare, education, renewable energy, and microfinance, where social outcomes are integral to business success.

Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) represent another innovative financing mechanism that leverages private investment to fund social programs traditionally supported by the public sector. In SIBs, private investors provide upfront capital to service providers to deliver specific social outcomes. If predefined outcomes are achieved and validated, governments or other outcome payers repay investors, often with a financial return. This model incentivizes efficiency and effectiveness in delivering social services while transferring risk from public budgets to private investors. Crowdfunding Platforms have democratized access to funding by enabling social enterprises to raise capital from a large number of individual investors who are passionate about social causes. These platforms leverage technology to connect entrepreneurs with potential supporters, facilitating donations, investments, or pre-sales of products or services. Crowdfunding not only provides capital but also engages a community of supporters who become advocates for the enterprise's mission. Blended Finance structures combine philanthropic or concessional funding with commercial capital to finance projects that generate both financial returns and social impact. By mitigating risk and enhancing returns for private investors, blended finance attracts investment to underserved sectors such as sustainable agriculture, affordable housing, and healthcare in low-income communities. This model catalyzes investment in sectors where market mechanisms alone may not suffice to achieve social objectives.

1.4 Objectives

This introduction sets the stage for a comprehensive exploration of innovative financing models for social entrepreneurship. By outlining the context, challenges, and evolution of financing approaches in this field, it lays the foundation for understanding how these models enable social enterprises to thrive and scale their impact. The subsequent sections will delve deeper into each financing model, examining their mechanisms, impact assessment frameworks, case studies, and the broader implications for the future of social entrepreneurship globally. Through this exploration, the aim is to highlight best practices, identify emerging trends, and offer insights into overcoming barriers to financing for social enterprises in diverse contexts.

II. LITERATURE SURVEY

Social entrepreneurship focuses on creating social value while ensuring financial sustainability. Traditional financing models often fall short in addressing the unique needs of social enterprises, necessitating innovative financing mechanisms. This literature survey examines various financing models, their applicability, and their impact on social entrepreneurship.

2.1 Traditional Financing Models

Traditional financing for social enterprises includes grants, donations, and government subsidies. These sources are crucial but often come with limitations such as dependency and lack of sustainability. Dees (1998) argues that reliance on philanthropy can limit the growth potential of social enterprises due to the unpredictability of funding streams [1].

2.2 Impact Investing

Impact investing has gained prominence as an alternative financing model, emphasizing both social and financial returns. Impact investors provide capital to social enterprises that demonstrate measurable social impact. According to Bugg-Levine and Emerson (2011), the impact investing market has grown significantly, driven by the increasing number of investors seeking to align their investments with their values [2]. Studies by Ormiston et al. (2015) highlight that impact investing not only provides necessary capital but also enhances the credibility and visibility of social enterprises [3].

2.3 Social Impact Bonds (SIBs)

Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) represent a novel financing mechanism where private investors fund social programs and receive returns based on the program's success. Cohen (2013) describes SIBs as a performance-based instrument that aligns the interests of investors, service providers, and beneficiaries [4]. Early implementations, such as the Peterborough Prison SIB in the UK, have demonstrated potential in addressing social issues through collaborative efforts. However, Fraser et al. (2016) note that SIBs require robust measurement and evaluation frameworks to ensure accountability and transparency [5].

2.4 Crowdfunding

Crowdfunding platforms like Kickstarter and Indiegogo have enabled social entrepreneurs to raise small amounts of capital from a large number of people. Belleflamme, Lambert, and Schwienbacher (2014) suggest that crowdfunding democratizes access to capital and fosters community engagement [6]. Mollick (2014) highlights that successful crowdfunding campaigns often leverage social media and storytelling to attract backers. While crowdfunding provides an accessible funding avenue, its success is contingent on the entrepreneur's ability to mobilize and maintain a supportive community [7].

2.5 Venture Philanthropy

Venture philanthropy applies venture capital principles to philanthropic funding, focusing on capacity building and long-term support. John (2006) defines venture philanthropy as a high-engagement funding model that provides financial resources, strategic guidance, and performance measurement support. Research by Letts, Ryan, and Grossman (1997) indicates that venture philanthropy can enhance the organizational capacity of social enterprises, enabling them to scale their impact. However, the high-engagement nature of this model may not be suitable for all social enterprises, particularly those with limited managerial resources [8].

2.6 Hybrid Financing Models

Hybrid financing models combine elements of traditional and innovative financing to address the diverse needs of social enterprises. Battilana and Lee (2014) discuss the emergence of hybrid organizations that blend social and commercial goals, necessitating hybrid financing approaches. One example is the blended value model, which integrates philanthropic grants, impact investments, and earned revenue. Emerson (2003) argues that hybrid models can provide flexible and sustainable funding, but they require careful management to balance the dual objectives of social and financial performance [9].

2.7 Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs)

Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) play a crucial role in providing financial services to underserved communities. CDFIs offer loans, investments, and technical assistance to social enterprises and small

businesses that may not qualify for traditional financing. Swack, Northrup, and Hangen (2012) highlight the impact of CDFIs in fostering economic development and social inclusion. The success of CDFIs is attributed to their deep understanding of local contexts and their commitment to community development.

2.8 Microfinance

Microfinance has been instrumental in providing financial services to low-income individuals and entrepreneurs. Microfinance institutions (MFIs) offer small loans, savings, and insurance products to those excluded from traditional banking. Yunus (2007) advocates for microfinance as a tool for poverty alleviation and empowerment. However, Morduch (1999) points out that the impact of microfinance on poverty reduction is mixed, with some studies showing limited effects. The sustainability of MFIs also remains a challenge, as they balance social missions with financial viability.

2.9 Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Initiatives

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives by private companies have increasingly focused on supporting social enterprises. Porter and Kramer (2006) argue that strategic CSR can create shared value by addressing social issues while enhancing corporate competitiveness. Companies engage in CSR through direct funding, capacity-building programs, and partnerships with social enterprises. Research by McWilliams and Siegel (2001) suggests that CSR initiatives can provide valuable resources and networks to social enterprises, although the motivations and impacts of CSR vary widely among companies.

Despite the potential of innovative financing models, several challenges persist. One major challenge is the alignment of social and financial objectives. Agrawal and Hockerts (2019) note that achieving a balance between impact and financial returns can be difficult, especially for early-stage social enterprises [10]. Additionally, measuring social impact remains a complex and resource-intensive process, as highlighted by Ebrahim and Rangan (2014). Opportunities for advancing innovative financing models include leveraging technology and data analytics to improve impact measurement and reporting. Nicholls (2010) suggests that advancements in technology can enhance transparency and accountability in social finance. Furthermore, fostering collaboration among stakeholders social entrepreneurs, investors, policymakers, and researchers can drive the development of more effective financing mechanisms [11]. Roundy, Holzhauser, and Bradshaw (2017) emphasize the importance of ecosystems and networks in supporting the growth of social enterprises. Innovative financing models play a critical role in enabling social entrepreneurship by providing diverse and sustainable funding sources [12]. Impact investing, social impact bonds, crowdfunding, venture philanthropy, hybrid models, CDFIs, microfinance, and CSR initiatives each offer unique benefits and challenges. The literature underscores the importance of aligning financial and social objectives, developing robust impact measurement frameworks, and fostering collaboration among stakeholders [13]. As social entrepreneurship continues to evolve, innovative financing models will be essential in scaling social impact and addressing global challenges. Further research is needed to explore the long-term effectiveness of these models and their adaptability to different contexts and sectors.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employs a mixed-methods approach to explore innovative financing models for social entrepreneurship. The research is conducted in three phases: literature review, qualitative interviews, and quantitative surveys. Semi-structured interviews are conducted with 20 social entrepreneurs, investors, and financial experts. Participants are selected using purposive sampling to ensure a diverse range of insights. The interviews aim to uncover personal experiences, challenges, and innovative strategies in financing social enterprises. Data from the interviews are transcribed and analyzed using thematic analysis to identify recurring themes and patterns. A structured survey is designed based on insights from the literature review and interviews. The survey is distributed to a larger sample of 200 social entrepreneurs across various sectors. The survey includes questions on financing preferences, perceived barriers, and the effectiveness of different financing models. Data are analyzed using statistical methods, including descriptive statistics and regression analysis, to determine the factors influencing financing choices and success rates.

IV. RESULTS

Based on this, social entrepreneurship can be defined as a business system where the core components are social enterprises. These enterprises aim to generate profit while addressing social problems. In 2002, the Department of



Commerce and Industry of the Government formally defined social entrepreneurship as business activities conducted primarily to achieve social goals rather than to generate profit for owners and shareholders. The income generated is mainly reinvested into business development or public affairs (Bataeva, 2015, pp. 221–223). The Finnish Ministry of Labor offered another perspective, emphasizing that a social enterprise is like any other business in its aim to make a profit by providing goods and services to the market [14]. However, a distinguishing feature is that at least 30% of the employees must be people with disabilities. Such companies help to create a more balanced and humane society by providing employment opportunities to the disabled and long-term unemployed (Bataeva, 2015, pp. 221–223).

To accurately characterize the essence of social enterprises, several criteria are essential:

- a) **Social Impact:** The focus is on solving or mitigating a specific social problem. The social effect should be result-oriented and explicitly stated in the enterprise's founding documents, distinguishing it from corporate social responsibility.
- b) **Innovativeness:** Social enterprises apply new approaches to solving both old and new social problems.
- c) **Profitability and Financial Sustainability:** These enterprises aim to be profitable and financially independent from external funding. Their primary goal is to earn and spend independently, without relying on sponsors, and profit is not distributed for private purposes.
- d) **Democratic Management:** Social enterprises often involve all stakeholders in the decision-making process, ensuring openness and transparency. This management style is common in enterprises formed by public organizations or cooperatives, where each shareholder has an equal vote.
- e) **Income Reinvestment:** Profits are reinvested into the business or for social purposes. Three approaches to profit reinvestment are highlighted:
 - **Full Reinvestment:** All profits are reinvested into expanding the enterprise. This approach is common in enterprises created by and for people with special needs or socially vulnerable groups.
 - **Partial Reinvestment:** A portion of the profit is reinvested while another part is used for social goals, typically seen in enterprises created by public organizations or charitable foundations.
 - **Full Allocation to Social Effect:** All profits are directed towards achieving the social effect, often used by partnerships between public organizations and private enterprises where the public organization leases production means to the private enterprise and all profits return to the public organization. This approach is less common.

These criteria highlight the unique characteristics and operational principles that define social enterprises, differentiating them from traditional businesses and enhancing their capacity to create significant social impact. The distinctions between social enterprises, charitable organizations, and traditional businesses

Table 1 Distinctions between various organizations

Distinctions	Social Enterprises	Charitable Organizations	Traditional Businesses
Primary Objective	Aim to generate profit while addressing social issues.	Focus primarily on social, cultural, or environmental missions.	Aim to maximize profit for owners and shareholders.
Revenue Model	Earn revenue through the sale of goods or services, with profits reinvested into their social mission.	Rely on donations, grants, and fundraising activities.	Generate income through commercial activities, focusing on increasing shareholder value and distributing profits to owners.
Profit Distribution	Profits are reinvested into the business or used for social purposes, rather than being distributed to private owners.	Surplus funds are used to further the organization's mission and are not distributed as profit.	Profits are distributed to owners or shareholders as dividends.
Management and Governance	Often incorporate democratic management	Governed by a board of directors or trustees, with	Managed by executives and governed by a board



	practices and stakeholder involvement to ensure transparency and accountability.	a strong focus on ethical governance and compliance with non-profit regulations.	of directors, with primary accountability to shareholders.
Impact Measurement	Measure success through both financial performance and social impact metrics.	Measure success through the achievement of their mission and the positive outcomes of their programs	Measure success primarily through financial performance indicators such as profit margins, revenue growth, and return on investment

In contrast to existing approaches for classifying social enterprises, the proposed criterion of financial soundness allows for a justified selection of funding sources, which in turn influences the harmonization of social and business goals. Numerous successful examples from international practice demonstrate the creation and operation of social enterprises that achieve significant financial results, generate substantial social synergies, and foster collaboration with local governments and communities. Based on the conducted research, social entrepreneurship can be defined as an activity aimed at solving or mitigating problems faced by socially vulnerable segments of the population, under conditions of self-support, innovation, and financial independence [15]. It represents a fundamentally new form of entrepreneurship that successfully combines social goals with commercial practices. Social entrepreneurship is a blend of charitable and business approaches to solving social problems, taking social orientation from charity and an entrepreneurial approach from business. The operations of social enterprises are grounded in the principles of socially responsible business, reflecting the socio-economic interests of their personnel, society, and the areas in which they operate. The successful development and functioning of social entrepreneurship heavily rely on the financial and resource support of large business corporations. In nearly all countries, social enterprises receive some form of government assistance, with laws and policies established at various levels to create favourable financial and legislative conditions for their development. However, in European countries, unlike in the United States, this support is more extensive and exists at all levels of government.

V. CONCLUSION

This study explores into the pivotal role of innovative financing models in advancing social entrepreneurship, where the dual goals of achieving social impact and financial sustainability are paramount. Traditional funding sources often prove inadequate for addressing the complex challenges faced by social enterprises, necessitating the exploration and adoption of alternative approaches. Impact investing emerges as a prominent model, attracting investors keen on generating measurable social and financial returns. Similarly, Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) align incentives across stakeholders, demonstrating effectiveness in tackling societal issues through outcome-based financing. Crowdfunding platforms democratize access to capital, leveraging community support to fund socially driven initiatives. Venture philanthropy and hybrid financing models blend philanthropic principles with strategic guidance, enhancing organizational resilience and scalability. Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) play a critical role in providing inclusive financial services, while microfinance remains instrumental in empowering underserved populations. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives bridge the gap between business goals and social impact, showcasing the potential of private sector engagement in driving sustainable change. The challenges persist in balancing social and financial objectives, measuring impact effectively, and ensuring long-term financial viability. Technological advancements and data analytics offer promising solutions to enhance transparency and accountability within the sector.

REFERENCES

1. Dees, J.G. (1998) The Meaning of “Social Entrepreneurship”. The Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership. Kansas City, MO and Palo Alto, CA.
2. Eric Emerson is Professor of Disability and Health Research, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK and Visiting Professor, Australian Family and Disability Studies Research Collaboration, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

3. Ormiston, Jarrod & Charlton, Kylie & Donald, Scott & Seymour, Richard. (2015). Overcoming the Challenges of Impact Investing: Insights from Leading Investors. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. 6. 1-27. 10.1080/19420676.2015.1049285.
4. Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Routledge Academic.
5. L.C. Stringer, E.D.G. Fraser, D. Harris, C. Lyon, L. Pereira, C.F.M. Ward, E. Simelton, Adaptation and development pathways for different types of farmers, *Environmental Science & Policy*, Volume 104, 2020, Pages 174-189.
6. Paul Belleflamme, Thomas Lambert, Armin Schwienbacher, Crowdfunding: Tapping the right crowd, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Volume 29, Issue 5, 2014, Pages 585-609,
7. Mollick, Ethan. (2014). The Dynamics of Crowdfunding: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 29. 1–16. 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2013.06.005.
8. Bateman, Milford. (2014). The Rise and Fall of Muhammad Yunus and the Microcredit Model. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 10.2139/ssrn.2385190.
9. Roszkowska-Menkes, Maria. (2021). Porter and Kramer’s (2006) “Shared Value”. 10.1007/978-3-030-02006-4_393-1.
10. Mcwilliams, Abigail. (2001). Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theory of the Firm Perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*. 26. 117-127. 10.5465/AMR.2001.4011987.
11. Agrawal, A.; Hockerts, K. Impact Investing Strategy: Managing Conflicts between Impact Investor and Investee Social Enterprise. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 4117
12. Roundy, Philip. (2017). Social Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurial Ecosystems: Complementary or Disjointed Phenomena. *International Journal of Social Economics*. 10.2139/ssrn.2893165.
13. Bataeva, B.S., 2015. The approaches to social entrepreneurship in Russia and abroad. In: *Proceedings of the III International Scientific Congress “Entrepreneurship and Business in the Conditions of Economic Instability”*, Conference Proceedings Language: Russian, pp. 221–223.
14. Bedford, D.A., Carayannis, E.G. (Eds.), 2018. *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Innovation and Entrepreneurship ICIE 2018*, 5–6 March 2018. Washington DC, USA, p. 530.
15. Blank, S., 2018. *Why the Lean Start-Up Changes Everything//On Entrepreneurship and Startups*. Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation, USA, pp. 30–32. Mode of access. <https://hbr.org/2013/05/why-the-lean-start-up-changes-everything>.



INNO SPACE
SJIF Scientific Journal Impact Factor
Impact Factor: 8.423



ISSN INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

 **9940 572 462**  **6381 907 438**  **ijirset@gmail.com**



www.ijirset.com

Scan to save the contact details