JETMASE
Journal of Emerging Trends in Management Sciences and Entrepreneurship
Volume 8 (1), Pages 73- 87 January 2026
ISSN: 2384-762X
https://www.jetmase.com

Social Entrepreneurship as a Panacea for Grassroots, Development: A Study of Selected Social Entrepreneurship, Venture Across South-East Nigeria

IFEME, S.C.[1*] NDUBUISI, P.O. (Prof)[2] & ORAJAKA, U.P. (Prof)[3]
Department of Accounting, Peter University, Achina-onneh, Anambra State
Department of Entrepreneurship Studies, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam, Anambra State Nigeria
Corresponding Email: sixaci@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: The study examined the social entrepreneurship as a panacea for grassroots development: a study of selected social entrepreneurship venture across South-east Nigeria. The researcher developed two specific objectives which were to: analyze the effect of social innovation and social impact, on grassroots development in South East. This study was anchored on Social capital theory. Data were generated through primary and secondary sources. The method for data collection was the questionnaire which was administered randomly among the staff of the social entrepreneur. The population of the study was seven hundred and twelve (**712**). The sample size was the same because the population is not up to 1000 population. Five hundred and eighty-seven (587) copies of questionnaire were retrieved. The hypotheses were tested using multiple regression analysis method at 0.05% level of significance. Findings from the study revealed that Social innovation had significant positive effect on grass root development in South East Nigeria (t=4.694, p, 000). Social impact had significant positive effect on grass root development in South East Nigeria (t=3.624, p, 000). The study concludes that social entrepreneurship is a powerful catalyst for grass-root development, particularly when it emphasizes innovation, measurable social impact, community networks, and employment generation. The study recommended that Governments, development agencies, and non-governmental organizations should actively promote social innovation by providing funding, training, and incubation support for social entrepreneurs. Social enterprises should be encouraged to adopt clear social impact measurement frameworks to assess the effectiveness of their interventions.

Keywords: Social entrepreneurship, grassroots development, social innovation, social impact, Social capital theory

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Social Entrepreneurship is an approach by individuals, groups, start-up companies or entrepreneurs, in which they develop, fund and implement solutions to social, cultural or environmental issues. Social entrepreneurship is an emerging business field that is rapidly gaining popularity and relevance. Many people around the world are now realizing the role of social entrepreneurship (Teasdale & Dey, 2020). As opposed to normal businesses whose main focus is to make profits, social entrepreneurship enterprises aim to promote better social welfare and create social value for citizens. The word entrepreneurship, entrepreneur and small businesses have been in existence for many years, but people have

diverse perspectives about them. (Muogbo, Eze, & Obananya, 2021).

The notion of social entrepreneurship has caught the interest of current scholars and practitioners for some time now, as proven by the growing body of literature and the emergence of fresh scientific and non-scientific groups (Ifechukwu-Jacobs, 2022). Social entrepreneurship has become increasingly popular as a technique for solving social problems, such as eradicating poverty, developing rural areas, and growing the economy in emerging nations (Hartati et. al, 2024). Aside from Nigeria, numerous countries in the world are regularly working towards achieving progress and development.

Social entrepreneurship engenders a plethora of positive values and finds solutions to uncountable socioeconomic and environmental challenges. The most important stakeholders that play an important function in the upward movement of entrepreneurship are social entrepreneurs (Edwards-Schachter & Wallace, 2017). The analysis of the views of social entrepreneurs on entrepreneurship can provide significant data about entrepreneurship in a country. Predicated on this basic information, it will be very easy to assess the overall extent of social entrepreneurship and to design strategies aimed at eradicating poverty in Nigeria. Social entrepreneurship is known for striving towards achieving developmental objectives that are associated with the fundamental requirements of the people and development that is sustainable (Jacobs, Ezeokafor, & Ekwere 2021). Social entrepreneurship is a variation of entrepreneurship with the social mission explicit and central to its reason for being. Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector, by adopting a mission to create and sustain social value; recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission (Orajaka, 2021).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Social ventures are increasingly being acknowledged for their role in creating solutions, which include combating social exclusion, building up local social capital, encouraging democratic engagement, providing high-quality welfare services, and promoting inclusive economic growth (World Bank, 2014). By encouraging the establishment and growth of social enterprises, governmental policies may be able to address socioeconomic problems like unemployment, Poverty, insecurity, limited economic opportunities and social inequality more effectively and efficiently than if they only rely on the public or private sectors. When social enterprises receive sufficient backing from governmental policy, their benefits improve.

The opposite is true in Nigeria, where social entrepreneurs confront a number of obstacles, including, lack of a financial assistant. From a financial standpoint, social entrepreneurs need money to develop, implement, and improve creative strategies for reintroducing previously marginalized populations into the market. Once more, the issue is out-of-pocket work. There are costs associated with solving different societal issues and ensuring the welfare of the community, and these costs are typically absorbed by the owner out of pocket or through extremely high interest rate loans from moneylenders. The future development of social entrepreneurs is subsequently hampered by these transaction expenses.

Once more, this is the dominance of affluent founders and benefactors who, by using their resources and connections, control the social entrepreneurship landscape to their advantage, placing startups and others in precarious

situations. In all, obtaining capital, negotiating intricate legal and regulatory frameworks, obtaining sufficient support networks, and establishing a solid organizational structure are just a few of the many obstacles that social entrepreneurs in Nigeria must overcome. These elements may make it extremely difficult for them to grow their business and increase their social impact. It is against this back drop that the study examines social entrepreneurship as a panacea for grassroots development: a study of selected social entrepreneurship venture across Southeastern Nigeria.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to examine social entrepreneurship as a panacea for grassroots development: a study of selected social entrepreneurship venture across South-east Nigeria. The specific objectives include to:

i. To analyze the effect of social innovation on grassroots development in south east
ii. To evaluate the effect of social impact on grassroots development in South East

1.4 Statement of Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses will guide this study:

Ho1: Social innovation has significant effect on grass root development in South East Nigeria.

Ho2: social impact has significant effect on grass root development in South East Nigeria.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual Review

2.1.1 Social Entrepreneurship

The words ‘social entrepreneur’ and ‘social entrepreneurship’ have become buzzwords but there is still no universally accepted definition (Tan, Le & Xuan, 2019). According to Ayob, (2018), social entrepreneurship embraces the basic principles of entrepreneurship, but it is the process of recognizing and relentlessly pursuing opportunities to create social value. Similar to traditional entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship is a type of entrepreneurship driven more by social ideals than by financial gain. Using business methods, expertise, and concepts in conjunction with a private sector approach to address social, cultural, and environmental issues is known as social entrepreneurship (Onya, Arinze, & Atueyi, 2025).

Social entrepreneurs are entrepreneurs whose purpose is to improve society by addressing social problems, creating social change, or fostering responsible conduct in the environments in which they operate (Matthew, et. al. 2020; Osabohien, Worgwu & Al-Faryan, 2022). Social entrepreneurship is therefore a significant tool in addressing social problems including unemployment, poverty, and education (Smith & Stevens, 2018). Social entrepreneurship therefore, refers to the identification of a social problem and the utilization of entrepreneurial principles to systematize creates and controls a social enterprise to achieve a desired social change. More so, it engages the ability to see ‘problems’ as ‘opportunities’ and then take the initiative to make out the solutions to those problems and the customers who could pay to have them solved (Atueyi, & Mbanefo 2025).

2.1.2 Social Innovation

Rye and Brown (2021), defined Social innovation as a process of creating new ideas and solutions to social problems that

challenge the existing paradigms and structures, and lead to the creation of new forms of collective action and social relationships. Social innovation can be understood as the development and implementation of new ideas and solutions that meet social needs and create value for society". (Abirami, Sofia, Byram Perumalla & Pushpa, 2023) Social innovation refers to the creation, adoption, and diffusion of new ideas, practices, and models that address social problems and bring about positive social outcomes." (Mulgan et al., 2019).

2.1.3 Social Impact

Kraus, Burtscher, Vallaster, and Angerer, 2018) referred to social impact as the consequences for the population of any action, public or private, that alters the way people live, work, play, relate to each other, and organize them to satisfy their needs and, in general, act as members of society. The concept of impact refers to the effects that are achieved in the long-term that can be attributable to the intervention of the organization; social changes that could be verified and have been direct consequence of organizational actions (Atueyi, and Mbanefo 2025). Social impact is related with social results-both in the long- and short-term, adjusted by effects achieved by others (alternative attribution), and effects that would have happened anyway, negative consequences, and effects that diminish with time.

2.1.4 Employment Creation

Adeleye, Adewale, and Fashola, (2022) the variation in the conceptualization of employment generation is that it is a viable solution to unemployment. Thus, employment generation can be measured by knowing how many people get employed over certain period of time by comparing the present staff strength of enterprises to their previous staff strength in some past periods. Employment generation is captured within the domain of employment creation. The term employment generation is used to refer to a situation where investment production activities give rise to the need to employ more human resources that would be consistent with higher level of output production (Adewale, 2022).

2.2 Theoretical Review

2.2.1 Social capital theory (SCT) by Bourdieu (1985)

Social capital theory (SCT) by Bourdieu (1985) as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition”. Its basic premise is that a network provides value to its members by allowing them access to the social resources that are embedded within the network (Bourdieu, 1985; Florin, Lubatkin, & Schulze, 2003).

These social networks need to be developed through investment strategies oriented towards the institutionalization of group relations, which are reliable sources of benefits (Portes, 1998). In general, social capital can be broken down into two elements: (a) the social relationship itself, which allows individuals to claim access to resources possessed by their associates, and (b) the amount and quality of those resources (Bourdieu, 1985; Portes, 1998).

This theory has been applied widely in several research areas. Although very few studies have related SCT to big data, it is possible to construct a relationship with SCM (Hazen et al., 2016). In terms of SCT in the supply chain, interactions among its members lead to wide acceptance of the norms and values of that chain, as well as the sharing of

information, data, and analysis to improve the overall performance of the network (Chiu, Hsu, & Wang, 2006; Hazen et al., 2016; Huysman & Wulf, 2006). According to Kankanhalli, Tan, and Wei, (2005), social capital provides the conditions necessary for knowledge and information exchange to occur.

On this basis, Hazen et al. (2016) argue that SCT should be applied to study big data in the SCM context, with the purpose of improving sustainable performance. The authors state that more research is needed into how social capital affects the adoption of big data for supply chain sustainability under competition, considering inter-firm and inter-supply chain relations. Furthermore, it remains to be investigated how information sharing through BDA impacts the importance of structural and relational supply chain network components.

According to Schumpeterian philosophy, enterprising businesspeople who upend and disorganize the status quo are valued. According to Schumpeter, an entrepreneur is an inventor who establishes a business and uses "novel combinations of means of production". According to his view of economic growth, the task of the entrepreneur is to use innovation to upend the general equilibrium. Entrepreneurship, which he dubbed the "creative destruction of capital", he said, was the cause of any shift that disrupted the usual cyclical flow of the industry. A process of industrial mutation known as "creative destruction" transforms the economy from the inside out, eradicating the old system and establishing a new one (Mehmood, Alzoubi & Ahmed, ,2019).

Schumpeter, (1949) said that entrepreneurship innovation causes gales of creative destruction because it renders obsolete inventories, ideas, technologies, skills, and equipment. According to Schumpeter, entrepreneurial endeavors to (i) provide new goods and services, (ii) open up new markets, (iii) adopt new manufacturing techniques, (iv) find new sources of supply, (v) reduce poverty baseline, and (vi) create new social value which leads to innovation. Entrepreneurship, in Schumpeter's view, is the engine of change for poverty alleviation. Creativity spawns new endeavors and predictors of poverty alleviation. This supports the assumption of Kuratko, Burnell, Stevenson, Neubert, and Fisher (2023) that corporate innovation leads to increased profitability and poverty alleviation. The most crucial aspect of the Schumpeterian innovation theory for social entrepreneurship is that a social entrepreneur should establish a social firm, develop novel combinations of production methods, be inventive, and bring about social change by creating market disequilibrium.

2.3 Empirical Review

Pérez-Barea, (2025) expanded and updated a previous analysis of social entrepreneurship, incorporating the academic literature published between 2017 and 2024. Using the Web of Science database and Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA) technique, 1262 articles were analyzed, organized into three time periods (2017–2018, 2019–2021, and 2022–2024). The results show a clear evolution of the field, where sustainability, digitization, and resilience emerge as fundamental axes. Compared to the original research, which identified the convergence between the third sector and corporate social responsibility (CSR), this research reveals a consolidation of hybrid models, aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Sustainability is positioned as a transverse axis, integrating economic, social, and environmental objectives. Digital transformation, driven by

the pandemic, has facilitated scalability, organizational efficiency, and social impact measurement, but also poses challenges in terms of technological equity.

Kakungulu, (2025) examined the evolution, frameworks, and strategies of social entrepreneurship, exploring its historical foundations, core concepts, sector-specific applications, and the growing importance of impact measurement. Through analysis of legal structures, funding models, and the integration of technology, the paper highlights how social enterprises manage to thrive despite systemic and operational challenges. Special attention is paid to the delicate balance between profit generation and purpose alignment, illustrating the need for adaptive strategies in an increasingly complex global landscape. Ultimately, this study underscores the capacity of social entrepreneurship to drive meaningful change, advocate for equity, and inspire a redefinition of business success.

Jinyoung, (2025) assessed how the recovery trajectory is reshaping impact capital and social enterprise ecosystems to promote resilient, equitable development post-pandemic. Using a qualitative methodology, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 15 impact investors and social entrepreneurs operating across Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia, Philippines and Singapore. Interview transcripts were coded through descriptive thematic analysis approach to map changing investor priorities, pivot in social enterprise models along with persistent and emerging barriers. Key trends identified include deepening digital divide driving focus on edtech and telemedicine enterprises, rising hunger and income precarity accelerating food security and livelihood-linked innovations. However, concerns remain around measuring real-world impact, human capital gaps and policy constraints regarding foreign investment and public procurement.

Seerangan, et al., (2025) explored the impact of social entrepreneurs in grassroots development through case studies of K R Agro Farming and Centre for Improved Rural Health and Environmental Protection (CIRHEP). The findings highlight the significance of community engagement, sustainable practices, and innovation in driving socio-economic transformation. The study concludes that social entrepreneurs contribute significantly to rural development by fostering self-sufficiency, economic empowerment, and environmental sustainability.

Raghu, et al. (2025) examined how SE aligns with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and contributes to inclusive, resilient, and innovation-driven change. It addresses key research gaps—fragmented theoretical applications, limited sectoral analysis, and weak methodological generalizability by synthesizing six foundational theories: behavioral decision theory, theory of planned behavior, social cognitive theory, institutional theory, social capital theory, and grounded theory. A systematic literature review was conducted using the PRISMA protocol to ensure rigor and transparency in selecting studies from 2015 to 2024. The review identifies thematic gaps in existing literature, including underexplored areas such as sector-specific financing, digital innovation, entrepreneurship in emerging sectors, sustainable technology adoption, and the contextual embedding of SE within SDG-linked outcomes. Using the theory-context-characteristics-methods (TCCM) framework and machine learning-based BERTopic modeling, this study analyzes SE research to offer both conceptual depth and empirical

mapping. Its originality lies in the interdisciplinary integration of theory with advanced text analytics to uncover actionable, theory-driven insights into SE–SDG alignment. Findings reveal SEs' contributions to SDGs 4, 8, and 9 through inclusive models and digital tools such as AI and block chain. SE also advances SDGs 10, 11, and 12 while being enabled by institutions (SDG 16) and partnerships (SDG 17). The study calls for multilevel theoretical integration across cognitive, relational, and institutional domains, with managerial implications for hybrid model design, stakeholder collaboration, and digital capability building.

METHODOLOGY

3.1: Research Design

Descriptive research will be used to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena to describe "what exists" with respect to variables or conditions in a situation. It describes data and characteristics about the population or phenomenon being studied. A descriptive design was therefore preferred because this study seeks to obtain information on world acclaimed States vis-à-vis those in place at various social entrepreneurship establishments.

3.2: Area of the Study

The area of study consists of the five States in the South-East geo political zone of Nigeria: Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo states. The study was directed at the social entrepreneurship in each of the states.

3.3: Sources of Data

The primary source of data that was used in this study were from questionnaire. This is because of the nature of the variables that was used. Questionnaire as source of instrument for data collection was used to collect data from intended participants.

3.4 Population of the Study

The populations of this study comprise owners, manager and employees (staff) of selected social entrepreneurship ventures and those associated with that in south east Nigeria from which the study were carried out. The study population is therefore considered below

s/n	ANAMBRA STATE	Staff strength
1	Solution Innovation District	17
2	Level Up Anambra Programm	21
3	Business Mentorship System of Igbos	53
	IMO STATE	
4	Okobi	10
5	Okobi student club	17
6	The female founder tribe	26
7	Imdeeg's skill up Imo Project	12
8	Society for Family Health	22
9	Mercy Motherless Babies Home	20
10	Eziama Motherless Babies Home	27
	ENUGU STATE	
11	Nze Ventures Home Ltd	29
12	Michael Anike Foundation	10

	ABIA STATE	
13	Solar Sister Nigeria	22
14	Aba to the world	33
15	ACCED programm	31
16	Youth out Loud Abia	21
17	Abia state government's entrepreneurship development programm	34
18	Microfinance Scheme for Women	33
19	Skill Development Program	26
20	Market Access and Networking	54
	EBONYI STATE	
21	Enviable Transport Services	52
22	The enviable Scholarship Foundation	32
23	SMEDAN (Small and medium scale enterprises development agency of Nigeria	35
24	Youth Entrepreneurship Program	39
25	Microfinance Scheme	36
	Total	712

Sources: Online Sources 2026

3.5 Sample size

Because it the population size is not up to 1000, the researcher used the entire population as the sample size which is seven hundred and twelve (712)

3.6 Method of Data Collection.

The major research instrument that was adopted for the study is the mixed method which comprises of structured questionnaire and interviews to elicit responses for the sample population.

3.7: Method of Data Analysis.

In this study, the descriptive statistics such frequency counts with simple percentage will be use to analyse bio – data of the respondents while linear regression will be used to test hypotheses 1, and 2, All analyses will be done through the application of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 20 windows)

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter presents the data obtained from the respondents through the administered questionnaire. Seven hundred and twelve (712) copies were administered among the selected staff of social entrepreneurs in south East However; five hundred and ninety-two (592) copies of questionnaire were retrieved, while five hundred and eighty-seven (587) where found to be good in the analysis. Therefore, the analysis and interpretation of data were based on the returned questionnaire. The validity and reliability of this study was highly ensured, despite the number of copies of the questionnaire not returned. The method was adopted because it possesses a unique estimating property which includes unbiased, efficiency and consistency when compared with other linear unbiased estimates.

Table 4.1Respondent rate of the collected questionnaire

S/N			Percentage Returned
1	Copies of questionnaire Distributed	712	100
2	Copies of questionnaire Returned	592	95.2
3	Copies of questionnaire Rejected	5	0.80
	Copies of questionnaire used	587	94.3

Source: Field Survey 2026

From the table above, seven hundred and twelve (712) copies of the questionnaire were distributed. Five hundred ninety-two (592), were returned which represent 95.2, while five were rejected because they were not properly filled. Five hundred and eight (587) which represents 94.3% were used in the analysis.

Table 4.2 Demographic features of Respondents

Table 4.2.1 Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	295	49.7	50.3	50.3
	Female	292	49.2	49.7	100.0
	Total	587	98.8	100.0	

Source: Computed by the researcher, 2026

Table 4.2 reveals that two hundred and ninety-five (295) respondents which represents, 50.3% were male, while two hundred and ninety-two (292) respondents which represent 49.7% were female. By implication, male respondents were more than female respondents by 0.6% in our selected population sample for this study. The implication of this is to enable us to know the number of female and male that successfully returned their questionnaire.

Table 4.2.2 Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single	298	50.2	50.8	50.8
	Married	160	26.9	27.3	78.0
	others	129	21.7	22.0	100.0
	Total	587	98.8	100.0	

Source: Computed by the researcher, 2026

In table 4.2.2 out of the five hundred and eighty-seven (587) respondents, two hundred and ninety-eighty (298) were single, while one hundred and sixty (160) respondents which represents 27,3 percent are married. However, one hundred and twenty-nine (129) were others. It is therefore glaring that the majority of the respondents are single as at the time of this study. Thus marital status table helped to know the number of single, and married, and respondents that answered the distributed questionnaire.

Table 4.2.3 Work Experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-5yrs	110	18.5	18.7	18.7
	6-10yrs	176	29.6	30.0	48.7
	11-15yr	201	33.8	34.2	83.0
	over 16yrs	100	16.8	17.0	100.0
	Total	587	98.8	100.0	

Source: Computed by the researcher, 2026

Table 4.2.5 shows respondents' work experience. For a period of 1-5 years, one hundred and ten (110) which represents 18.7% have been with the firms. This is followed by those in service between 6-10 years with one hundred and seventy-six (176) which represents 30.0%. Again, those that fall in service gap between 11-15 years with two hundred and one (201) which represents 34.2%. Lastly, This is followed by those in service between over 16 years with one hundred (100) which represents 17%. The implication of years in-service is to enables us have a clear view of those who have been in service for a particular period of time.

Table 4.2.4 Educational qualification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SSCE	151	25.4	25.7	25.7
	HND/BSC	382	64.3	65.1	90.8
	MSC/MBA	50	8.4	8.5	99.3
	OTHERS	4	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	587	98.8	100.0	

Source: Computed by the researcher, 2026

The table indicated that one hundred and fifty-one (151) respondents, which represent 25.7% have acquired SSCE, while 65.1% of the respondents which represents, three hundred and eighty-two (382) acquired HND/MBA. However fifty (50), which represent 7 percent either have MSc or MBA. The respondents that have others are numbered four (4) which represent 7%. This is one of the demographic items which helped us to identify the educational qualification of the respondents.

Table 4.2.5 Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	21-30	72	12.1	12.3	12.3
	31-40	169	28.5	28.8	41.1
	41-50	246	41.4	41.9	83.0
	Above 50	100	16.8	17.0	100.0
	Total	587	98.8	100.0	

Source: Computed by the researcher, 2026

Table 4.2.4 depicts the age bracket of the respondents. The distribution shows that 12.3% of the respondents are between the age brackets of 21 to 30 years while 28.8% respondents are within the age bracket of 31-40 years. On the same note, 41.9% of the respondents are within the age bracket of 41 - 50 years. 17.0% of the respondents are within the age bracket of 50 and above.

4.3 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression result was employed to test the effect of independent or explanatory variables on the dependent variables. The result of the multiple regression analysis is presented in the tables below.

Table 4.3.1 Summary of the Regression Result

The result of the multiple regressions formulated in chapter three is presented in the tables below.

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.746[a]	.556	.552	.65160	.556	121.191	6	580	.000	1.792

a. Predictors: (Constant), SON, SOI,
b. Dependent Variable: GRD

Table 4.3.1 shows that R^2 co-efficient of determination which measures the strength of the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable has the value of 0.55. This implies that 55% of the variation in social entrepreneurship is explained by variations in grass root development. This was supported by adjusted R^2 of 0.55%. Test for autocorrelation: This is used to test whether errors corresponding to different observations are uncorrelated. If the value of the durbin-watson from the regression result is close to 2 no autocorrelation in that regression result, but if it deviates significantly then there is

autocorrelation. The Durbin-Watson statistic (D.W) of 2 reveals no autocorrelation in the model. Hence, the result is good for business analysis because the Durbin Watson result is 1.792 which indicates that the study is free from the problems of autocorrelation.

Table 4.3.2 ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	308.738	6	51.456	121.191	.000[b]
	Residual	246.261	580	.425		
	Total	554.998	586			

a. Dependent Variable: GRD
b. Predictors: (Constant), SON, SOI,

The f-statistics value of 121.191 in table 4.4.2 with F-statistics probability of 0.000 shows that the independent variables have significant effect on dependent variable such as social innovation, social impact, and employment creation can collectively explain the variations in material management variables on employee efficiency.

Table 4.3.3. Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	0.449	.219		4.321	.000	.559	.449
	SON	.254	.054	.265	4.694	.000	.148	.361
	SOI	.332	.092	.350	3.624	.000	.512	.152

a. Dependent Variable: GRD

A'priori Criteria: This is determined by the existing business theories; it also indicates the signs and magnitude of the business parameter under review. In table 4.3.3 we found out that social innovation has a positive sign given its value as 0.25; this implies that a unit increase in social innovation increases the grassroots development by 25%, this conform to the a' priori expectation. Social impact has a positive sign given its value as .0332; this implies that a unit increase in Social impact increases the grassroots development by 33%, this conform to the a' priori expectation.

T- Statistics: The t-test is used to measure the individual statistical significance of the explanatory parameters in the model. From table Coefficients above social innovation is 4.694, this is statistically significant, this suggest that it contribute significantly to

grassroots development**.** Social impact is 3.624 this is statistically significant, this suggest that it contribute significantly to grassroots development at 5% level of significant**.**

4.4 Test of Hypotheses

Here, the two hypotheses formulated in introduction one was tested using t-statistics and significance value of the parameter variables in the regression result. The essence of this is to ascertain how significant the effect of individual independent or explanatory variables on the dependent variables.

Test of Hypothesis One

Ho1: Social innovation has no significant effect on grass root development in South East Nigeria.

Social innovation has a T-statistic of 4.694 and a probability value of 0.000 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we accept the alternative hypothesis and reject the null hypotheses which state that Social innovation has significant effect on grass root development in South East Nigeria.

Test of Hypothesis Two

Ho2: Social impact has no significant effect on grass root development in South East Nigeria.

In testing this hypothesis, the T-statistic and probability value in table above is used. Social impact has a t-statistics of 3.624 and a probability value of 0.000 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypotheses which state that Social impact has significant effect on grass root development in South East Nigeria

CONCLUSION

This study examined the effect of social entrepreneurship on grass-root development using social innovation, social impact, social values, social capital, and employment creation as explanatory variables. The empirical findings reveal that social innovation, social impact, exert positive and statistically significant effects on grass-root development, while social values, though positive, were not statistically significant. The significant influence of social innovation indicates that the ability of social enterprises to introduce new ideas, services, and problem-solving approaches plays a critical role in addressing grass-root challenges such as poverty, limited access to basic services, and economic exclusion.

Overall, the study concludes that social entrepreneurship is a powerful catalyst for grass-root development, particularly when it emphasizes innovation, measurable social impact, community networks, and employment generation. Strengthening these dimensions can significantly enhance sustainable development outcomes at the local level. The study makes the following the recommendations:

i. Governments, development agencies, and non-governmental organizations should actively promote social innovation by providing funding, training, and incubation support for social entrepreneurs. Policies should encourage the development of locally driven solutions tailored to the specific needs of grass-root communities.

ii. Social enterprises should be encouraged to adopt clear social impact measurement frameworks to assess the effectiveness of their interventions. This will enhance accountability, attract funding, and ensure that programs genuinely contribute to grass-root development.

REFERENCE

Abirami, M., Sofia, R., Byram A., Perumalla V. & Pushpa M. (2023) The Role of Social Entrepreneurship in Stimulating Innovation and Economic Growth. *European Chemistry Bulletin, 12(8), 3490-3502*

Adeleye, J., Adewale, T., & Fashola, F. (2022). *Digital transformation in Nigeria: Opportunities and challenges*. Lagos: TechPress.

Adewale, A. (2022). E-commerce and employment growth in Nigeria: A sectoral analysis. *African Journal of Business and Economic Research*, 18(4), 72-90.

Atueyi, C. L. & Mbanefo P (2025). Igbo Apprenticeship System and Sustainable Economic Development in Anambra State. *Journal Of Emerging Trends In Management Sciences And Entrepreneurship*, *7*(1), 425–440.

Atueyi, C.L., and Mbanefo P.(2025) Effect of Tax System on Productivity in Nigeria journal of emerging trends in management and entrepreneurship 2,Pp1-17,20

Ayob, A. H. (2018). Diversity, trust and social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 1–12. doi:10.1080/19420676.2017.1399433.

Badreddine, A. & Larbi, C. H. (2024) The Economic Impact of Social Entrepreneurship: Evidence From A Brief Literature Review. *International Conference: Social Entrepreneurship and Social Work University of Batna Algeria. 23-24.*

Hartati, A.S.; Warsiki, A.Y.N.; Kusmantini, T.; Diantoro, A.K. (2025) Social Entrepreneurial Intentions: An Empirical study at Ponpes Darul Qur'am. PINISI Discret. Rev. 2022, 5, 361–368.

Ifechukwu-Jacobs, C. J. (2022) Role of a sustainable agro entrepreneurship towards economic diversification and economic growth: A study of Anambra east local government. *International Academic Journal of Management and Marketing 7(2), 115-129*

Jacobs, C.J. Ezeokafor, U. R. & Ekwere G. E.(2021). Effect of entrepreneurial education on unemployment reduction among Students in Nigeria. *Business and Management Research, 10 (2) 16-26*

Jinyoung, H. (2025) Impact Investing and Social Entrepreneurship in Southeast Asia post-COVID-19. *Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews*, *13(01), 089-103*

Kakungulu, S. J. (2025) Social Entrepreneurship: Balancing Profit and Purpose. Research Invention Journal of Research *in Education 5(1):15-21.*

Kraus, S.; Burtscher, J.; Vallaster, C.; Angerer, M. (2018) Sustainable entrepreneurship orientation: Reflection on status-quo research on factors facilitating responsible managerial practices. Sustainability, 10, 444.

Kuratko, D.F.; Burnell, D.; Stevenson, R.; Neubert, E.; Fisher, G. (2023) Enacting entrepreneurial hustle. *Business Horizon, 66, 237–249.*

Matthew, O.; Ufua, D.E.; Osabohien, R.; Olawande, T.I.; Edafe, O.D. (2020) Addressing Unemployment challenge through micro and small enterprises (MSEs): Evidence from Nigeria. Problem Perspective Management, 18, 79–89.

Mehmood, T.; Alzoubi, H.M.; & Ahmed, G. (2019) Schumpeterian entrepreneurship theory: Evolution and relevance. *Academic Entrepreneurship Journal, 25, 4.*

Muogbo, U.. S., Eze, S.. U, & Obananya, C.G (2021) skill acquisition as tool for solving youth restiveness and unemployment in Nigeria: the role of nysc. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research, 3 (4)* 161-174

Onya, C.C; Arinze, S.E & Atueyi, C.L (2025). job satisfaction and employee performance in private universities in Anambra State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences & Humanities Research 13(2):229-241*

Orajaka, U. P. (2021). Reward of Management Practices for Employee Retention and Variable Payment to Public Institutions. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences,* 11(3), 212-225

Osabohien, R.; Worgwu, H.; Al-Faryan, M.A.S. (2022) Social entrepreneurship, technology diffusion and future employment in Nigeria. *Social Entrepreneurship Journal, 19, 1–11.*

Pérez-Barea, J. J. (2025). The Evolution of Social Entrepreneurship: Broadening the Framework for the Digital and Sustainable Era. *Administrative Sciences*, *15*(2), 55. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15020055

Raghu, R., T., Alka, A., Suresh, M., Prema N. (2025) Social entrepreneurship and sustainable technologies: Impact on communities, social innovation, and inclusive development. Sustainable Technology and Entrepreneurship 4, 100110 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stae.2025.100110

Rye, J. F., & Brown, T. (2021). Conceptualizing social innovation: understanding the need for an integrative definition. *Innovation: Organization & Management*,23(3), 305-324.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1949). The Theory of Economic Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Seerangan, C., Venkata R. R., Ramesh, S. & GnanaSaranya, S. (2025) Role of Social Entrepreneurs in Grassroots Development. *International Research Journal of Education and Technology 7(3), 630-645*

Smith, B. R., & Stevens, C. E. (2018). Different types of social entrepreneurship: The role of geography and embeddedness on the measurement and scaling of social value. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development,* 575–598. http://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2010.488405

Tan, L. P., Le,A. N. H.& Xuan, L. P. (2019). A systematic literature review on social entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 3, 1–16. doi:10.1080/19420676.2019.1640770.

Teasdale, S., & Dey, P. (2019). Neoliberal governing through social enterprise: Exploring the neglected roles of deviance and ignorance in public value creation. Public Administration, 97(2), 325-338. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12588