POLAC ECONOMIC REVIEW (PER)
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
NIGERIA POLICE ACADEMY, WUDIL-KANO

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND POVERTY REDUCTION IN BORNO STATE: A THEMATIC APPROACH

Ashemi Baba Ali Department of Economics, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria

Ibrahim Mohammed Lawal Department of Economics, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria

Abstract

The existence of poverty has a long history, but its prevalence across sub-Saharan countries, particularly in Nigeria and specifically in Borno State, has been a source of concern for both governmental and non-governmental agencies. This phenomenon was further exacerbated by the emergence of insurgency, which has severely affected all aspects of the state. As a result, it has attracted various policies, initiatives, and programs internationally particularly the Sustainable Development Goals and locally, among which entrepreneurship was a central focus for reducing poverty to a minimal level. However, only marginal success was recorded because the traditional approach to entrepreneurship primarily focuses on profit, which is purely economic, giving little or no consideration to the social components essential for reducing poverty. This underscores the need for social entrepreneurship. Consequently, employing thematic analysis indicates that social entrepreneurship facilitates social inclusion, increases income, boosts economic welfare, ensures access to capital, education, healthcare, and other essential services, and supports sustainable agriculture and community development, among other benefits. However, challenges such as institutional, financial, social and cultural, environmental, security, and human capital issues persist. Despite these challenges, the study concluded that social entrepreneurship has a significant positive impact on addressing the prevalence of poverty in the state. Recommendations include capacity building, improved security, policy reforms, and infrastructural development

Keywords: Social Entrepreneurship, Poverty; Borno state, Insurgency

1. Introduction

Poverty has a long history of existence which has become an issue of concern to government and non-governmental organization across the globe. Across 112 countries (6.3 billion people) about 1.1 billion people live in acute multidimensional poverty out of which 83.7 per cent live in rural areas, 584 million are children under the age of 18, 83.2 per cent live in Sub-Saharan Africa (553 million people) and South Asia (402 million people) and nearly two thirds (749 million) of this category of persons live in middle income countries (United Nations Development Programme, 2024) particularly its prevalence in high in conflict affected area.

However, in Nigeria which is part of the countries that form the Sub-Saharan countries with a population estimated to be over 200 million, the populous in the region has about 63 per cent which is about 133 million are multi-dimensionally poor out of which 72 per cent are from the rural areas. More so, 86 million which represent 65% live in the North while about 35 per cent (47 million lives in the South (National Bureau of Statistics, 2022).

The North region has taken the lead in the rising poverty rate particularly the North East and North West region which has about 45 million and 20 million people that are multidimensionally poor (NBS, 2022). The prevalence recorded in the North East region was heightened by insecurity particularly Borno state which witnessed the Boko Haram insurgency that has lasted for over decades. This insecurity has succeeded in causing displacement, loss of lives and properties worth N1,379,706 million (USD6,898.53million) [Borno State Agency for the Coordination of Sustainable Development & Response, 2020]. According to NBS (2022), the state has Multi-dimensional Poverty Index (MPI) rating of 0.315, with about 2.25 million people living in poverty.

Additionally, the insecurity situation has increased the state unemployment rate to 43.25 per cent in 2020, financial exclusion rate and worsen the food security condition of the state. This is because farmers could not have access to their farm land and as a result output has decline thus leading to a decrease in security, thereby unable to meet the growing demand. To address these concerns, government and NGOs at all levels have launched various programmes and policies, engage in national and international collaborations, and created new agencies. Among which include the keying to SDGs initiatives, creation of SMEDAN, Borno state ministry of poverty alleviation and youth development, disbursement of micro credits or loans and vocational skills and acquisition training.

Therefore, encouraging entrepreneurship has been advocated as a measure for reducing poverty, which the relevant stakeholders across the state has been supportive. But the variant of entrepreneurship that is been practice is more of the traditional type which emphasis has been focused on how to make profit without consideration to other impacts and as such it is pure capitalist in nature since welfare is not regarded. With these current practice, marginal success to poverty reduction was achieved and as such necessitate the need to search for an alternative form of entrepreneurship that is holistic in practice, thus, the need for social entrepreneurship. By social entrepreneurship, it emphasizes creating and sustaining social value through entrepreneurial activities (Austin et al, 2006).

However, various studies have been conducted on the theme. Among which include Assaf (2024), Nikhil (2023), Arturo, Karen, Indira (2023), Sackey (2023), Arejiogbe et al (2023), Miller and Anderson (2020),Amr and Mamdouh (2019), Mathew et al (2022), Ngatse-Ipangui and Dassah (2019), Sultan et al (2018), , Muklis, Mohammad and Mohammed (2018) among others but these studies were skewed towards countries such as Malaysia, Ghana, Saudi Arabia, Egypt. Although, few studies have also been carried out in Nigeria Arejiogbe et al (2023) and Bashiru, AbdulSabur & Bukoye (2024). Therefore, it will be inappropriate to generalize the outcome of these previous studies particularly to Borno state. More so, these studies of adopted different methodology such as mixed methods, regression models, case studies but a few studies have been documented to have employed a thematic approach. It is in lieu of these gaps that created the need for this study examine social entrepreneurship and poverty reduction in Borno State using a thematic Approach

2. Literature Review

2.1. Conceptual Review

2.1.1 Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship is broadly recognized as the process of identifying and exploiting opportunities to create value through innovation and resource management. Ratten (2023) defines entrepreneurship as identifying business opportunities and utilizing resources in creative ways to generate value. Similarly, Calabrò et al. (2022) emphasize entrepreneurship's ability to drive economic change through innovation and responsiveness to market opportunities. Dhliwayo et al. (2017) highlight the role of entrepreneurs in analyzing market environments, developing innovative ideas, and managing risks to create wealth. Akin et al. (2017) add that entrepreneurship involves mobilizing resources to identify and capitalize on opportunities effectively.

Chakuzira and Shambare (2021) describe entrepreneurs as individuals who meet market demands through resource acquisition and business expansion. Islam (2020) underscores the role of entrepreneurship in GDP growth, particularly in developing economies. Priyadi and Mulyani (2024) explore entrepreneurial traits such as persistence, adaptability, and forward-thinking. Shuaibu et al. (2021) add that entrepreneurship involves generating valuable goods and services through creativity and commitment. Rosemaro (2022) defines entrepreneurship as producing something valuable while bearing associated risks. Penrose (2009) simplifies entrepreneurship as the process of transforming uncertainty into measurable risks. Collectively, these definitions highlight entrepreneurship's dynamic role in driving innovation and economic growth.

2.1.2 Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship applies entrepreneurial principles to address societal challenges, prioritizing social change over profit maximization. Glasbeek (2024) characterizes it as an "essentially contested concept," reflecting its multifaceted and evolving nature. Mair and Marti (2006) define it as the innovative use of resources to create social value or stimulate social change. Also, the term "social entrepreneurship" is used to refer to the rapidly growing number of organizations that have created models for efficiently catering to basic human needs that existing markets and institutions have failed to satisfy (Kadir & Safir, 2016). Social entrepreneurship combines the resourcefulness of traditional entrepreneurship with a mission to change society (Zaefarian, Tasavori & Ghauri, 2015).

According to Santos (2012), Social entrepreneurship, commonly defined as ‘‘entrepreneurial activity with an embedded social purpose’’. Therefore, Duke University's Fuqua School of Business, the Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship (CASE) writes, social entrepreneurship is the process of recognizing and resourcefully pursuing opportunities to create social value with the innovative method. Social entrepreneurs are innovative, resourceful, and result-oriented, who draw upon the best thinking in both the business and nonprofit worlds to develop strategies that maximize social impact. These entrepreneurial leaders operate in all kinds of organizations: large and small; new and old; religious and secular; non-profit, for-profit, and hybrid (Jiao, 2011). This definition highlights the importance of innovation, sustainability, and social value creation as core components of social entrepreneurship. Consequently, social entrepreneurs can be compared to that of the commercial entrepreneurship using the following indicators

Table 1: Comparism between Social Entrepreneurship and Commercial Entrepreneurship

SN	Indicator	Social Entrepreneurship	Commercial Entrepreneurship
1	Market failure	Judging from the condition of social organization with the birth of market failure from several social aspects.	Market pressures sometimes do not match the expectations of public needs.
2	Mission	The main target of a social entrepreneur is social value for society.	Its main target is to make a profit as a result of its business activities.
3	Resource Mobilization	The challenge is a surplus of resources, constrained to compensate, competitive. More on value than on material.	There is a material compensation to make it easier to pay accordingly.
4	Performance Measurement	Social changes are not easy to measure, resulting in impacts that are difficult to quantify.	Performance standards are clear and measurable.

Source: Austin *et al* (2003)

Additionally, successful models of social entrepreneurship include the following as captured from the works of Sauermann (2023).

i. *Social enterprises* are enterprise that aim to create social or environmental impact in addition to generating financial returns.
ii. *Cooperative*s are democratically run, member-owned businesses that put the needs and

interests of their communities and members ahead of maximizing profits.

iii. *Social franchising* is a replication model that enables social enterprises to scale their influence by replicating their business model in new locations while upholding a consistent brand, quality standards, and mission,

iv. *Community-based Organizations (CBOs)* are nonprofit, locally administered groups that strive to meet the unique needs and difficulties of their local communities.

v. *Cross-sector partnerships* involve collaboration between social entrepreneurs, businesses, governments, and civil society organizations to address complex social, environmental, and economic challenges.

vi. *Microfinance Institutions (MFIs)* offer low-income people and communities' small loans and other financial services.

vii. *Social Impact Bonds* (SIBs) are financial instruments that use private investment as leverage to finance social initiatives or program.

viii. *Social innovation incubators* are organizations that provide help to social entrepreneurs grow and expand their businesses.

2.1.3 Poverty

Poverty is a complex, multidimensional issue characterized by the lack of essential resources and opportunities necessary for a decent standard of living. The United Nations defines poverty as more than a lack of income, including social discrimination, exclusion, and limited access to basic services like education and healthcare. The World Bank (2023) emphasizes that poverty encompasses income deprivation, lack of access to essential services, and vulnerability to economic shocks. Recent discussions advocate for broader definitions of poverty that include structural and systemic factors limiting individuals' ability to improve their circumstances.

However, the concept of poverty has gone beyond monetary measures, incorporating multidimensional frameworks. Alkire and Foster (2011) introduced a multidimensional poverty index (MPI) to assess deprivation in areas such as health, education, and living standards. Chambers (2005) highlights the subjective dimensions of poverty, including exclusion, stigma, and lack of empowerment. Addressing poverty requires a multidimensional understanding, encompassing economic, social, and psychological aspects, to ensure inclusive and sustainable interventions.

2.1.4 Poverty Reduction

Poverty reduction strategies aim to improve living standards and address the root causes of poverty through integrated economic and social policies. Recent scholarship underscores the importance of multidimensional approaches that address both structural and systemic inequalities. The United Nations (2023) highlights the need for equitable wealth distribution and social inclusion as essential components of poverty reduction strategies.

Entrepreneurship has emerged as a key tool for poverty reduction. Islam (2023) emphasizes its role in creating jobs, empowering marginalized communities, and fostering economic growth. Karnani (2023) advocates combining entrepreneurship with social protection measures to achieve sustainable poverty alleviation. Sachs (2023) argues for investments in healthcare, education, and infrastructure alongside entrepreneurial initiatives. Prahalad (2023) emphasizes engaging the poor as active participants in market economies, transforming them into producers and consumers. Therefore, poverty reduction requires coordinated efforts across economic, social, and institutional dimensions to create sustainable and equitable outcomes.

2.2. Empirical Review

2.2.1. Social Entrepreneurship and Poverty Alleviation

Miller and Anderson (2020) examined how technology-driven social enterprises address poverty in sub-Saharan Africa. Using a mixed-methods approach, the study analyzed the activities of tech-based social enterprises through interviews and case studies. The findings highlighted that mobile banking solutions and other technology innovations enhanced access to essential services, improving the socio-economic conditions of underserved populations. The researchers concluded that technology-driven social entrepreneurship offers scalable solutions for poverty reduction in developing regions. Also, Muklis, Mohammad and Mohammed (2018) examined the nexus between social entrepreneurship and poverty development which was a literature review. As a result, they discovered that social entrepreneurship stimulates employment as well as realization of universal prime education and promoting gender equality in which by extension results to poverty reduction.

Arejiogbe *et al* (2023) investigated the bolstering the impact of social entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation for **s**ustainable development in Nigeria while employing qualitative method and hinging their studies on Opportunity-Based Entrepreneurship Theory, Social Network Theory, and Schumpeterian Theory of Innovation. PLS -SEM technique was employed which revealed that social innovation, social value and social impact are significant predictors to poverty and as a result they concluded his study concludes that social innovation is fundamental for empowering individuals and communities to lift themselves out of poverty and achieve long-term prosperity.

Sauermann (2023) examine social entrepreneurship as an impetus for sustainable development in low-income communities. By so doing, mixed-methods approach was employed and findings reveal that effective initiatives require strong leadership, community engagement, funding accessibility, and adaptability, as well as that social entrepreneurship has the potential to advance sustainable development through the provision of innovative solutions to complex social and environmental problems, the promotion of local economic development and the enhancement of community resilience. However, major challenges encounter by this entrepreneur includes complex regulatory environments, funding, and community trust.

Datta *et al* (2020) investigated women empowerment and social entrepreneurship with focus on Barefoot college concluded that social entrepreneurship initiatives are cogent in advancing gender equality and promoting women's empowerment in low-income communities through promoting access to education, healthcare, and economic opportunities for women which by help to reduce gender-based inequalities and promote sustainable development in the future.

In Nigeria, Bashiru, AbdulSabur and Bukoye (2024) investigated the impact of social entrepreneurship on poverty alleviation and sustainable development in zamfara state by using a survey method which was analysed by using structural equation model. As a result, findings indicate social innovation, social value and social impact are statistically significant predictors of poverty alleviation because they are all at significant. Therefore, the study concluded that social entrepreneurs give value to social entrepreneurship practices by addressing the basic needs of the disadvantage individuals in the society, particularly to be self-reliant which facilitates poverty reduction and thus promoting sustainable development.

More so, Douglas and Prentice (2019) in their study on the innovation and profit motivations for social entrepreneurship stressed that the effects of social entrepreneurship development hinges on rise in innovation, technology level, employment increase, generating technical and production knowledge and income distribution at the community level, and as such leads to increase in national wealth increase and economic growth of community. Subramanian and Mohanram (2016) assess the need for social entrepreneurship development with focus as a tool for poverty reduction discovered that innovation, family background, government support program, social entrepreneurship, women participation, entrepreneurship training and education, individual entrepreneurial characteristics, participation of micro, small & medium enterprises, youth empowerment, collaboration of government-university-industry is the key tool for entrepreneurship development which invariably stimulates employment and thus alleviates poverty.

Hall *et al* (2010) examined how entrepreneurship and innovation affect economic inclusion and social sustainability. By so doing, qualitative approach, they employed case studies and interviews to gather relevant data. Findings indicated that while some entrepreneurial initiatives effectively provided opportunities for marginalized groups, others inadvertently exacerbated existing inequalities. This outcome underscored the necessity of tailoring social enterprises to fit the specific economic and social contexts of the communities they aim to help. The study concluded that entrepreneurship can serve as a significant tool for sustainable development, its effectiveness relies on context-sensitive execution rather than simply applying generic business models.

Dzomonda (2020) investigated the impact of social entrepreneurship on promoting sustainable development in South Africa. The study sought to determine if social enterprises significantly contribute to economic, social, and environmental sustainability. A qualitative method using a survey and facilitated by convenience and snowball sampling methods. The findings revealed a strong and significant association between social entrepreneurship and economic and social sustainability, supporting the notion that social enterprises address social issues like poverty and unemployment. However, no significant correlation was observed between social entrepreneurship and environmental sustainability, highlighting that the sector's effect on environmental matters is limited. Based on these results, the study concluded that social entrepreneurship is an effective means for enhancing economic and social conditions, though its influence on environmental sustainability requires further attention.

Sackey (2023) in his work exploring Innovative roles of social entrepreneurship in poverty alleviation with focus on Ghana. As a result, qualitative research method as employed and thematic content analysis, aided by coding through NVivo software in analyzing the data. The findings indicate that social entrepreneurship in Ghana successfully tackles overlooked social challenges through community-driven and grassroots strategies through creating job opportunities, enhancing educational access, and fostering skill development, social entrepreneurs improve living standards for disadvantaged populations. Furthermore, the study emphasizes the potential for partnerships between social enterprises and government bodies to better synchronize efforts with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and rectify shortcomings in government-led poverty reduction strategies.

In Saudi Arabia, Assaf (2024) investigates the nexus between social entrepreneurship, financial inclusion, and women's empowerment, offering insights into how entrepreneurial initiatives advance gender equality and sustainable development. Findings reveal that social entrepreneurship significantly boosts women’s empowerment via financial inclusion. Tailored strategies that emphasize collaboration, creativity, diversity, and scalability play a crucial role in providing women with access to financial resources, enhancing their economic independence and bargaining power. These initiatives also correspond with the objectives of Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 by increasing the involvement of women in the workforce and overcoming traditional obstacles to financial services.

Sultan *et al* (2018) explore the role of social entrepreneurship in alleviating poverty while utilizing a mixed-methods framework. Findings indicate that social entrepreneurship promotes economic empowerment by creating jobs, introducing innovative and sustainable business models, and involving communities actively in development initiatives. Thus, concluded that while social entrepreneurship is vital in combating poverty, its success relies on favorable policies, financial support, and strategic alliances that enhance both sustainability and scalability. Similarly, Primm (2023) argued that social enterprises provide sustainable job opportunities and fair compensation, thereby decreasing reliance on exploitative labor markets. More so. It also enhances women's capabilities through training in areas such as business management and financial literacy, promoting self-sufficiency, linking women to global markets, boosting their earnings and fostering community development.

Ngatse-Ipangui and Dassah (2019) carried out a study to evaluate the influence of social entrepreneurs on community development within the Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality, specifically in the townships of Khayelitsha and Gugulethu. Employing a mixed-methods approach. The results indicated that while social entrepreneurs significantly aid community development through initiatives like skills training, job creation, education, and healthcare services, their effectiveness is frequently constrained by several challenges. These challenges include a lack of community participation in decision-making, poor program implementation, insufficient monitoring and evaluation, the absence of clearly defined development plans, and activities that lack sustainability, preventing long-term impact. Many residents recognized the advantages of social enterprises but voiced concerns that these efforts do not adequately tackle the entrenched socio-economic problems. The research concludes that although social entrepreneurs are vital in promoting community growth, their projects require more strategic design, inclusivity, and sustainability.

2.2.2. Challenges of Social Entrepreneurship in alleviating Poverty

Mathew et al (2022) investigated Social Entrepreneurship, the State and National Development with emphasis as a viable Nexus for Addressing Social Challenges in a Developing Country Context which was conducted through a qualitative approved. Findings revealed that the major challenges bedeviling social entrepreneurship bad leadership, poor governance and lack of social inclusion in public policy formulation and as such concluded that mutual networking and cooperation between social entrepreneurs and relevant stakeholders is required to achieve its set goals.

Lasma (2012) social entrepreneurship problems and solutions with focus on Latvia which was a desk review shows that the identified challenges include no legal regulation on social entrepreneurship exists, the lack of support instruments particularly for establishing and developing a social enterprise, and dependence on donations and subsidies for self-sustaining a social enterprise. Similarly, Nikhil (2023) investigated the challenges faced by social entrepreneurs which employed a qualitative technique shows that the major challenges faced by social entrepreneurs includes funding, lack of skilled human resource, poor structure, poor plan, strategy and persistent to the true mission

Amr and Mamdouh (2019) examined the challenges facing social entrepreneurship with focus on Egypt while using qualitative approach discover that the major challenges include challenges related to policy-making and other legal aspects; challenges related to institutional and operational support; and challenges related to social, educational and cultural awareness of the field and its ecosystem. In another similar studies carried out in Nepal, Jeetendra, Kee-Seon and Sunil (2022) identified the challenges of Social Enterprises in Developing Country using qualitative techniques which include absence of legal and other policies create confusions, thus poses challenges in sustaining social enterprises. Specific social enterprises promotion acts, financing policies, and business support services are some of the shortcomings for the sustainability and growth of social enterprises in Nepal.

Arturo, Karen, Indira (2023) investigated Social Entrepreneurship in a Pandemic which focus on the Challenges and Opportunities using a qualitative approached discovered that innovation, collaboration, and digitization, as well as financing and sustainability are the key opportunities whereas the challenges include lack of funding and government support, economic uncertainty, and resource constraints. Siti, Khairul and Faudah (2024) analyzed the challenges faced by social entrepreneurs in Malaysia by employing qualitative approach, through semi structured interviews with social entrepreneurs. Discovered that the challenges encountered by this category of entrepreneur include regulatory complexities due administrative bottlenecks, limited access to financial support, poor market penetration and consumer awareness, and operational inefficiencies which is linked to inadequate of business management expertise and resources.

Therefore, from these reviewed studies it will be inappropriate to generalize the outcome to Borno state context, hence, the need for state-specific studies. More so, a large dossier of these studies adopted different methodologies such as mixed methods, regression models, case studies but a few studies have been documented to have employed a thematic approach particularly to Borno state. It is in lieu of these gaps that created the need for this study examine social entrepreneurship and poverty reduction in Borno State using a thematic Approach

3. Methodology

Content review research design was employed which was hinged on secondary sources of data. This source comprises journal papers from Science Direct, Google Scholar database, Scopus, World Bank, National Bureau of Statistics and United Nations development programme databases, spanning a period from 2014 to 2024.

Qualitative analysis was used in analyzing the data obtained specifically the thematic approach which encapsulates several stages which was manually conducted. This includes selecting relevant texts, familiarization and coding. Themes were generated and identified within the coding framework which contains social inclusion, increase income, economic welfare, access to capital, mentorship opportunities, and access to education, healthcare services, and community development.

Also, the same steps were also engaged to analyze the challenges for which the theme generated includes institutional, financial, social and cultural, environmental, security, and human capital issues. Consequently, the themes identified were then interpreted in the context of the study facilitated by a deductive conceptual analysis for which findings were compared to reviewed literature for which conclusions are drawn.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Impact of Social Entrepreneurship on Poverty Reduction

Based on the analysis from the reviewed literatures, the following are the findings for discussions for the study

Social Inclusion*:* Among the spillover impact of the BokoHaram Insurgency and COVID- 19 pandemic is rise in social exclusion of youths, women which invariably serves as a recipe to an increase poverty and inequality level of the state. Therefore, the study's findings reveal that emphasizing on social entrepreneurship due to its thrust of not only creating economic impact but also social impact through innovative solutions, it would result to an increase the social inclusion rate which invariably would lead to poverty reduction in the Borno state. This finding aligns with the work of Muklis, Mohammad and Mohammed (2018), Datta et al. (2020) and Assaf (2024) which concludes that social entrepreneurship enhances social inclusion by fostering sustainable social equity and thus reduces poverty.

Increase Income: The study reveals that social entrepreneurship results to an increase in income. This is because entrepreneur or household earns income either from the services renders or product sold be it in the agriculture, manufacturing and service sector. By so doing, income will be earned by households which by implication will increase their purchasing power to bridge the demand gap for essential needs required to export out of poverty line of the state. This finding is in tandem with previous studies such as Douglas and Prentice (2019) which concluded that social entrepreneur or enterprise results to increase in household income and leads to a decline in the poverty levels.

Employment Opportunities: Findings from the study show that social entrepreneurship creates employment opportunities to households and the teaming youths. By so doing, unemployment will be reduced, other social evils such as theft, kidnaping etc will be minimized in the state and stable income is to be earned which by extension gives households or individuals the opportunities to cater for the demand of their dependents. This further implies that poverty will be reduced to a large extent at the micro and macro level in the state. Hence, this outcome aligns with the works of Sackey (2023), Muklis, Mohammad and Mohammed (2018), Sultan et al (2018), which stressed that social entrepreneurship significantly creates employment.

Mentorship Opportunities: Mentorship has been a critical missing link which is considered among the contributory factor to the poverty level of the state. Findings from the study indicates that social entrepreneurship facilitates or give opportunities for mentor ship as this will result to skills development, career opportunities, networking opportunities and personal growth for individuals particularly those below the poverty line. This would further empower them to cater for their household needs and thus resulting to poverty reduction. By, this outcome is it aligns with the works of Sackey (2023) which concluded that social enterprises created mentorship opportunities particularly through skills development to enable the youths and other vulnerable to escape poverty.

Access to Basic Services: Lack of access to basic services is considered as form of poverty. This could be in education, healthcare, better water services among others which is prevalence in the state due to the spillover impact of the insurgency. However, findings from the study reveals that social entrepreneurship have significantly facilitated access to the aforementioned services which has improved households living conditions and invariably result to a reduction in poverty levels which by extension is in line with the works of Ngatse-Ipangui and Dassah (2019), Muklis, Mohammad & Mohammed (2018) and Primm (2023).

Community Development*:* Borno state is at the phase of recovery arising from the impact of insurgency. This phase involves rebuilding affected communities, creating source livelihood particularly in the area of agriculture, agro-allied ventures for the concerned individuals. Findings from the study indicate that social entrepreneurship has significantly facilitated community development. This could be in areas of improving the quality of life, increase community participation, empowerment among others which could invariably trigger growth. Consequently, this outcome is in tandem with Douglas and Prentice (2019) and Sauermann (2023) which concluded that social entrepreneurship results to community development

Access to Capital: This is a critical aspect especially in the rebuilding phase of Borno state. However, the study's findings indicated that social entrepreneurship results increase access to capital which can be through innovative funding models (i.e., crowdfunding), partnership and collaborations (i.e., corporate, NGO and Government partnerships), capacity building and training among others. By so doing, households would benefit and increase their capacity to be self-reliance and thus exit the poverty trap. This outcome aligns with previous studies such as Datta et al. (2020) and Bashiru, AbdulSabur and Bukoye (2024) which conclude that social entrepreneurship facilitates social innovation particularly its funding model so as to ensure access to capital which invariably guarantees households economic stability.

Economic Welfare*:* Findings from the study shows that social entrepreneurship significantly results to an increase in household welfare, particularly in the area of ensuring increase in income, creating wealth, ensuring access to basic services and guaranteeing financial security which by extension on the aggregate would results to a reduction in poverty which is further in tandem with the works of Sackey (2023) which stress that social entrepreneurship results to an increase in economic welfare.

Environmental Sustainability: The study reveals that social entrepreneurship enhances environmental sustainability. In other words, it supports the process without depleting the natural resources or causing harm to the individuals which by extension supports future generations. This outcome is in tandem with the works of Dzomonda (2020) and Sauermann (2023) which argued that social entrepreneurship facilitates through the provision of innovative solutions to complex social and environmental problems which invariably spur development.

4.2 Challenges of Social Entrepreneurs in alleviating Poverty

Security Issues: Insecurity has become an issue of concern in the state. Although, the state is gradually recording relative peace owing to the various recovery initiatives or programmes instituted by the government and complemented by none—governmental organization. But despite this fit achieved, entrepreneurs are still not confident in investing or engaging in their entrepreneurship activities due to fear of attacks from the insurgents which could invariably results to economic or asset loss. This finding is in line with the

Institutional Issues: Findings from the study indicates that institutional issues particularly in the area of relevant regulatory framework, stringent administrative bureaucracy bottlenecks, tax related matters to support the smooth operations of social entrepreneurship is inadequate. This has severely hindered the growth and development of this variant of entrepreneurship. This outcome aligns with previous studies such as Lasma (2012), Amr and Mamdouh (2019), Arturo, Karen, Indira (2023) and Siti, Khairul and Faudah (2024), which they argued that lack of government support poses a serious impediment in their practice.

Financial Issues: The study reveal that most of the social entrepreneur are faced with the challenge of funding which could arise from limited access to capital, high risk perception, regulatory barriers, lack of network opportunities, limited access to mentorship, poor planning among others. These issues have scuttled their operations to meet their designed goals or objectives. Consequently, this outcome corroborates with the works of Amr and Mamdouh (2019), Nikhil (2023), Arturo, Karen, Indira (2023) and Siti, Khairul and Faudah (2024).

Social and environmental Issues: This is considered as a success factor for social entrepreneurs in alleviating poverty but the study's findings indicates that it has been a challenge. These environmental issues could be in form of climate change, resource depletion, pollution whereas the social issues comprise resistance due cultural and social norms, size of inequality levels, complex nature of human rights and social justice. This finding is in consonance with the works of Amr and Mamdouh (2019)

Human Capital Issues*:* Human capital is a critical element to the success of any entrepreneurship which social entrepreneurship is not an exception. However, findings from the study depicts that social entrepreneurship is faced with human capital issues. This capture issues of lack of access to education, management expertise skills, inadequate mentoring programs, poor networking and partnerships, training and development, requisite technology to meet up global best practice. This finding is in tandem with the works of Lasma (2012), Nikhil (2023), Siti, Khairul and Faudah (2024).

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that the social entrepreneurship will go a long way in reducing poverty in the state which invariably will result to economic growth and development. This is against the backdrop that tapping this variant of entrepreneurship will results to social inclusion, increases income, boasts economic welfare, ensures access to capital, basic services economic welfare, employment & mentoring opportunities and community development, among others. Despite these bouquets of positive impact, there exist certain challenges such as institutional, financial, social and cultural, environmental, security, and human capital issues, among others. Consequently, the following recommendations were suggested for implementation

i. There is need for intensive public awareness so as to attract prospective investors such as government, non-governmental and corporate bodies so to address the funding issues as well as minimizing the resistance due cultural and social norms which is embedded in the environmental issues.

ii. Training and re-training is needed so as to improve the skills and capability of entrepreneurs and those with the intention as this will go a long way to address human capital issues.

iii. There is need for the government particularly state of assembly to legislate laws particularly in the area of ease of doing business, modifying existing tax laws to avoid multiple taxes, ensuring tax holidays and waiver as this will go a long way to ease the operations of social entrepreneurs.

iv. There is need for the government and all relevant stakeholders to develop and intensify efforts as well as the political will in addressing the insecurity situation of the state as this will spur the growth and development of entrepreneurship in the state.

References

Akin, N., Barış B, & Evrim, M. A. (2017). Examining of immigrant entrepreneurship studies in international literature by using social network analysis. Problems and perspectives in management 15: 500-8.

Alkire, S., & Foster, J. (2011). Multidimensional Poverty Index: Assessing deprivation in health, education, and living standards. *OPHI Working Paper* No. 38.

Arejiogbe, O. E., Moses, C. L., Salau, O. P., Onayemi, O. O., Agada, S. A., Dada, A. E., & Obisesan, O. T. (2023). Bolstering the impact of social entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation for sustainable development in Nigeria. *Sustainability, 15(8)*, 6673.

Arturo, D.B., Karen, Q.A., Indira,L. G. López.(2023). Social entrepreneurship in a pandemic: Challenges and opportunities, *South Florida Journal of Development*, 4(3),1066-1076.

Assaf, A. A. (2024). Impact of social entrepreneurship on women empowerment through Financial inclusion: An analytical study from Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship, 16(1)*, 25-38.

Amr, S & Mamdouh, I (2020). Challenges facing social entrepreneurship: The implications for government policy in Egypt, *Review of Economics and Political Science*, 5(2), 162-182

Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2003). Social entrepreneurship and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Harvard Business School Research Paper*.

Bashiru M. N, Abdul Sabur H & Bukoye A. I. (2024).Impact of Social Entrepreneurship on Poverty Alleviation and Sustainable Development in Zamfara State. *International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management* (IJAEM), *6*(5), 698-707.

Calabro, A., Vecchiarini, M., Gast, J., Campopiano, G., De Massis, A., & Kraus, S. (2022). Innovation and internationalization of family firms: A systematic review of the literature. *Review of Managerial Science, 16(2)*, 365-405.

Chakuzira, W., & Shambare, R. (2021). The impact of entrepreneurship on small business growth in Southern Africa. *Journal of African Business, 22(3)*, 267-289.

Chambers, R. (2005). *The Many Dimensions of Poverty*. Paper presented at the International Conference on the Many Dimensions of Poverty.

Datta, P. B., Gailey, R., & Gagon, C. (2020). Women's empowerment and social entrepreneurship: A case study of the Barefoot College. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *11*(1), 73-97.

Dhliwayo, S., Van Vuuren, J., & Antonites, A. (2017). The influence of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial attitudes and intention. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences, 20(1)*, 1-9.

Douglas, E., & Prentice, C. (2019). Innovation and profit motivations for social entrepreneurship: A fuzzy-set analysis, *Journal of Business Research*, 99, 69-79.

Dzomonda, O. (2020). The impact of social entrepreneurship on promoting sustainable development in South Africa. *Journal of Social and Economic Studies.*

Glasbeek, B. (2024). Social entrepreneurship as an evolving and contested concept. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 15(1), 1-20.

Hall, J., Daneke, G. A., & Lenox, M. J. (2010). Sustainable development and entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future directions. *Journal of Business Venturing, 25(5)*, 439-448.

Islam, S. (2020). Entrepreneurship and economic growth in developing economies. *Journal of Developmental Economics*, *12(1)*, 45-63.

Jiao, H. (2011). A conceptual model for social entrepreneurship directed toward social impact on society. *Social Enterprise Journal, 7(2)*, 130–149.

Kadir, M. A. B. A., & Sarif, S. M. (2016). Social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneur, and social enterprise: A review of concepts, definitions, and development in Malaysia. *Journal of Emerging Economies and Islamic Research, 4(2).*1-16.

Karnani, A. (2023). Combining entrepreneurship with social protection for poverty alleviation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 178(2), 345-360.

Lasma, D. (2012). Social entrepreneurship problems and solutions: A case study of latvia. WEI International European Conference, Academic Conference Proceedings Zagreb, Croatia October 14-17, 2012, 175-190.

Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business, 41(1),* 36-44.

Matthew, E. E., Stephen, I.U., Olawale, Y., Ifeanyi, P.O, Ugbenu,O., Kasa, A. G. (2022). Social entrepreneurship, the state, and national development: A viable nexus for addressing social challenges in a developing country context. *Journal of Policy and Development Studies, 18(3),* 45-67.

Miller, J., & Anderson, P. (2020). Technology-driven social enterprises addressing poverty in sub-Saharan Africa. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development.*

Muklis, L., Mohammad, D. H., & Mohammed, S. A. (2018). Social entrepreneurship development and poverty alleviation: A literature review. *MAYFEB Journal of Business and Management, 2*, 1-11.

National Bureau of Statistics (2022). *Nigeria Multidimensional Poverty Index (2022)*. National Bureau of Statistics, FCT Abuja.

Nikhil, P. (2023). Challenges faced by social entrepreneurs: A qualitative study. *Journal of \ Social Enterprise Research, 14(2),* 78-95.

Ngatse-Ipangui, R., & Dassah, M. O. (2019). Social entrepreneurs and community development: Evidence from Cape Town. *International Journal of Social Economics, 46(12),* 1423-1439.

Prahalad, C. K. (2023). Engaging the poor as active participants in market economies. *Journal of Consumer Research, 50*(1), 1-20.

Priyadi, R., & Mulyani, S. (2024). Entrepreneurial traits: Persistence, adaptability, and forward-thinking. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 62(1), 1-20.

Penrose, E. (2009). *The theory of the growth of the firm.* Oxford University Press.

Primm, A. (2023). Social entrepreneurship: A pathway to poverty reduction among women. *Journal of Women's Empowerment Studies, 7(2),* 122-136.

Ratten, V. (2023). Entrepreneurship: Definitions, opportunities, challenges, and future directions. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence, 42(5), 79–90.*

Rosemaro, J. (2022). Entrepreneurship and risk management in modern business. *Harvard Business Review, 45(3),* 200-215.

Sackey, O. (2023). Exploring innovative roles of social entrepreneurship in poverty alleviation: A case study of Ghana. *African Journal of Business and Development Studies, 14(1),* 67-81.

Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics, 111(3),* 335–351.

Shuaibu, M., & Ahmed, S. (2021). Creativity and innovation in entrepreneurship: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies, 9(2),* 77-92.

Siti, N. N., Khairul A. A., & Fuadah, J. (2024). Challenges Faced by Social Entrepreneurs in Malaysia: Navigating Barriers to Growth and Sustainability. *Global Business and Management Research*, *16*(3), 385-395.

Subramanian, S. S., Mohanram, V. (2016). Need for social entrepreneurship development – poverty alleviation tool. *Roots International Journal of Multidisciplinary Researches A Peer Reviewed, Refereed & Quarterly Journal*, 2(4).

Sultan, S., Khan, T., & Ahmed, F. (2018). Social entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation: A mixed-methods analysis. *Journal of Development Studies, 54(7),* 987-1002.

United Nations. (2023). Equitable wealth distribution and social inclusion for poverty reduction strategies. *United Nations Development Programme Report*.

United Nations Development Programme. (2024). *Global multidimensional poverty index 2024: Global poverty amid conflict.*

Zaefarian, R., Tasavori, M., & Ghauri, P. N. (2015). Corporate social entrepreneurship approach toward market-based poverty reduction. *Symposium on Emerging Markets, International Business, Corporate Social Responsibility, 51(2).*