
**SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY OF
NGOS IN UYO, AKWA IBOM STATE, NIGERIA.**

Emmanuel Bassey Umoh, Christabel Brownson (Ph.D) and Prof. Don BaridamDepartment of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Akwa Ibom State
University, Nigeria.***Article Received: 4 May 2026, Article Revised: 24 May 2026, Published on: 14 June 2026*****Corresponding Author: Emmanuel Bassey Umoh**

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Akwa Ibom State University, Nigeria.

Doi: <https://doi-org/101555/ijarp.4159>**ABSTRACT**

The topic of this research work is: social entrepreneurship and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria'. The general aim of the study was to explore the relationship between social entrepreneurship and organizational sustainability of NGO's in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State. Three sub-objectives and hypotheses were formulated for the study to provide guidance. In this research, the dimensions of social entrepreneurship adopted are social value creation, capacity building and innovation and organizational sustainability is not considered. The study used a theoretical framework of dynamic capabilities theory. The survey research design was used in this study. There were 142 management staffs who made up the population for the study while 105 respondents who formed the sample size were obtained through the application of Taro Yamene's formula. The study adopted simple random sampling in order to sample all the staff members of the selected NGOs in Uyo such that each staff member in the selected NGOs has equal and independent probability of being selected in the sample. Moreover, primary data was collected by using structured questionnaire, which used the 5-pointlikert scale rating. One hundred and five (105) copies of questionnaires were issued to the respondents but only one hundred (100) were retrieved and made the bases for analysis. The results of the study revealed that there is a significant relationship between the social value creation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, significant relationship exists between capacity building and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State and significant relationship exist between innovation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom

State. The paper found that there is a positive correlation between social entrepreneurship and the sustainability of the NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.

KEYWORDS: Social Entrepreneurship, Organizational Sustainability, Social Value Creation, Innovation, Capacity Building, Dynamic Capabilities.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of social entrepreneurship has become more widely recognized over the years, with it being regarded as a key force in innovation, especially when it comes to solving issues that are not usually considered by profit-oriented businesses or government. The work of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Nigeria has been instrumental in this regard, combining innovative approaches with social goals to address critical challenges like environmental, health, education and poverty alleviation (Arejiogbe et al., 2023). Social entrepreneurship is a field of enterprise that aims to achieve social or community value, rather than profit, and employs business principles to develop and operate a venture. The dynamic nature of the socio-economic environment in Nigeria, which involves limited access to resources, high rate of poverty and inefficient institutions, makes this approach more and more important for NGOs (Chris, 2021).

There are various definitions of social entrepreneurship but overall, it is considered as the use of entrepreneurship to address social issues. The term social entrepreneurship has been defined by Dees (2021) as a combination of social mission and a businesslike approach to discipline, innovation and determination. Social entrepreneurs focus mainly on benefiting society, as opposed to making a profit, according to Dees. Social entrepreneurship has several key elements including Innovation (developing new solutions or adapting existing solutions to address social problems); Sustainability (financial viability, generating income and achieving social value); and Social Value Creation (involves creating positive outcomes for society rather than prioritizing profit maximization) and Risk Management (balancing the social value with the financial risks associated with entrepreneurship) (Tomori, 2019). These elements form the basis for responding to the needs of society.

Social entrepreneurship has a number of aspects that sets it apart from mere philanthropy and conventional entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurs are creative thinkers who strive to find innovative solutions to social problems. Bornstein (2018) concludes that innovation plays a pivotal role in social entrepreneurship, as they can create new approaches, products or services that directly benefit society. The innovation can be a technological, procedural or

organizational innovation. Moreover, social entrepreneurship is about 'generating social value', which is defined as positive measurable change in the field of education, health, poverty alleviation, environmental sustainability, etc. Social entrepreneurship helps to support environmental sustainability. I'm sure there are loads of social enterprises out there that have environmentally friendly products or services that are geared towards a conservational effort, renewable energy, and/or waste reduction.

Organizational sustainability is a capability of the organization to operate and sustain value over the long term (Xerxes, 2020). It means that this organization has the ability to sustain its mission in the long-term and to make a balance between financial, social and environmental requirements. Doherty et al. (2021) define organizational sustainability within NGOs as having multiple dimensions, including financial sustainability (i.e., the ability of the organization to generate sustainable revenue); operational efficiency (i.e., the ability of the organization to be efficient by making the most of its resources); social mission alignment (i.e., ensuring that all activities are aligned with the organization's core mission); and adaptability (i.e., the capacity of the organization to adapt to the changes in the external environment without compromising its long-term goals).

In Nigeria, this connection between social entrepreneurship and NGO sustainability is reinforced by the latest research studies. The study of social entrepreneurship and SME sustainability in Lagos State (Danlyan et al., 2024) shows that social innovative organizations have higher chances of being more sustainable and operating over time. Policy support, strategic partnerships, technology adoption, and community engagement are also cited as key elements in ensuring long-term success of social entrepreneurship, both in terms of local case studies and frameworks for its scaling (Otokiti et al., 2024).

Thus, social entrepreneurship has become a critical approach in increasing the organizational sustainability of NGOs in Nigeria. Incorporating the tenets of entrepreneurship along with the social impact mission, NGOs can create innovative, sustainable models that minimize the reliance on outside sources for funding and enhance their financial stability. Innovation, risk management, and social value creation are all related to sustainable aspects such as financial stability, operational efficiency, and adaptability. This is illustrated by the empirical and theoretical work of Arejiogbe et al. (2023), Nwankwo et al. (2024) and Otokiti et al. (2024), which shows that social entrepreneurship is a stronger strategy for NGOs in the struggle to stay afloat and achieve their missions in the long term. This study hence examines further how the social entrepreneurship practices can be optimally used by the NGOs in Nigeria for enhancing the long-term viability.

Statement of the problem

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Akwa Ibom State have a significant function to perform in the solution of different social problems such as poverty, education, health and environmental problems. But, many of these organizations have great challenges in sustaining them in the long run. One of the significant problems for NGOs is that they are highly dependent on outside resources such as donations and government funding, which are often undependable and inadequate to sustain their operations from one year to the next. Financial fragility jeopardizes the mission and sustainability of NGOs.

Technological changes are very rampant now rendering technological equipment of NGO's obsolete at a very fast rate. The ability to create innovative ideas is also a challenge for many NGO's, as innovation is essential for sustainability, providing NGOs with new ways to approach problems, new technologies to use, and new ways to do things. However, while these are potential solutions, many NGOs in Akwa Ibom State are unable to effectively implement the solutions, primarily because of their limited knowledge, lack of resources and weak strategic frameworks that can accommodate social goals and business-oriented activities.

This study thus attempted to fill these gaps by analyzing the role of social value creation, capacity development and innovation in the organizational sustainability of NGO in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State. The research offers lessons learned for how these can serve as resources for NGOs to make their operations more resilient and sustainable, which, in turn, will help NGOs to have more long-term social impact.

Objectives of the Study

This study was undertaken to examine relationship between social entrepreneurship and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State. However, the specific objectives were:

- i. To examine the relationship between social value creation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.
- ii. To examine the relationship between capacity building and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.
- iii. To examine the relationship between innovation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.

Test of Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between social value creation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State;

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between capacity building and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between innovation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Concept of social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship is an emerging domain that exists within the space of social change and business. It means using entrepreneurial thinking and actions to tackle social issues and provide innovative and sustainable solutions to problems that governments, non-profits, and philanthropists have historically been responsible for addressing. The idea has taken off worldwide, especially in developing nations like Nigeria, where social issues like poverty, unemployment, and environmental pollution remain.

Social entrepreneurship is a broad concept that can be understood as the generation of social value by entrepreneurship activities. Likewise, Zahra et al. (2019) regard social entrepreneurship as the discovery of opportunities to bring social value to bear to solve social problems while at the same time establishing the mechanisms required for sustainable financial operations. Revenue generation is often secondary as the main focus is to accomplish social mission. Social entrepreneurs have to also be problem-solvers, who discern and address unmet social needs, which create value for the people; their work must be designed to be profitable or at least financially feasible. This combination of two aspects is what sets social entrepreneurship apart from charity or non-profit activities, which can rely on outside funding and grants. Social entrepreneurs too have to deal with the issue of constraint on resources, which compels them to make the best of limited resources, go out for partnerships and community grants to fulfil their objectives.

Social entrepreneurship can play an important role in the development of the society if it fills up the gap that cannot or unwilling be filled by the government or traditional businesses. Santos (2022) notes that social entrepreneurs tend to be attuned to places where market failures occur, like in healthcare, education or environmental protection. Social entrepreneurs provide solutions to these challenges which are innovative, thus not only helping society but also advancing economic development. For example, social entrepreneurship is beginning to

be acknowledged as a tool for poverty alleviation. Social enterprises' attention on underserved populations and marginalized groups makes them an important part of the solution to inequalities, argue Seelos and Mair (2021). Their findings indicate that social ventures tend to target employment generation, skills building and access to key services, all of which have a positive impact on the reduction of poverty in the long-term.

Dimensions of social entrepreneurship

The three aspects of social entrepreneurship explored in this study are social value creation, Innovation and capacity building.

a) Social Value Creation

The primary mission of social entrepreneurship is to create social value. It's about positive, measurable changes that can be achieved in society by innovation solutions that meet unmet social needs. Social entrepreneurs work to solve social problems like poverty, inequality, education, health care, the environment and more. The key difference between social entrepreneurship and traditional entrepreneurship is in this dimension – social entrepreneurs focus on social outcomes rather than personal or organizational profit (Dafe, 2019).

Social value creation has certain aspects of contributions to social entrepreneurship. First, it is about social needs, recognizing the gaps that governments, companies or legacy nonprofits do not see. These can be problems identified within the community that lack the necessary clean water, health care, or education. There is an intention to create social value, provide services or products that have a direct impact on society (Ben, 2021). Secondly social value creation is innovative approach to problem solving, sometimes using new technologies or business models. Thirdly, social value creation is typically assessed through measurable results that it produces for the community. Creating high output in terms of quantity as well as quality is very essential (Johnson, Okebaram&Emerole, 2024). This has tangible effects that can be measured by changes in social or environmental indicators (e.g., the number of people affected, the changes in their quality of life, or health or environmental outcomes). Social enterprises focus on social returns on investment (SROI) whereas traditional businesses are more concerned with monetary returns on investment.

b) Capacity Building

Capacity building is an intrinsic aspect of social entrepreneurship and involves the development of skills, knowledge, infrastructure and effectiveness of social enterprises and their stakeholders. It entails building up the capacities of individuals and organizations to become more efficient, innovative, and sustainable in the long term. Capacity building is

especially important in the case of social enterprises in a low resource setting, allowing them to operate as effectively as possible and deliver maximum social impact (Eade, 2018).

Helping social entrepreneurs, employees and beneficiaries to acquire skills and knowledge to make impactful change is one of the most important elements of a capacity building program. This is done via training programmes, workshops, mentorship and knowledge sharing activities. Some social enterprises provide training for entrepreneurship to the marginalized people, focusing on financial management, leadership and business planning (Dees et al., 2019). This covers areas such as governance, operational efficiency, financial management and strategic planning. Social enterprises with the right resources in place are more at ease with issues, can expand their reach, and are better suited to respond to shifts in the landscape. For instance, Ashoka runs leadership development initiatives to make social entrepreneurs more effective across the globe (Bornstein & Davis 2017). Capacity building extends beyond organizations to involve social entrepreneurship, which helps build the capacity of communities. Social enterprises can empower local communities through participation in decision making and providing them skills which are relevant to their needs, leading to self-reliance and sustainability. For instance, vocational training and microfinance given to the disadvantaged groups allow them to become self-employed entrepreneurs and thus lessen their reliance on external funding (Hailey & James, 2020).

c) Innovation

At its core, social entrepreneurship is about innovation, the ability to come up with unique, effective and scalable ideas and solutions to address complex social needs. In addition to making money, a key difference between traditional entrepreneurship and innovation in social entrepreneurship is that it seeks to create a positive difference in society and the environment. This can be through the creation of new products and services, business models, or operational strategies that will increase the impact and sustainability (Mulgan et al., 2019). Innovation is an essential part of social entrepreneurship. Many social enterprises leverage on technology to address social challenges more effectively. For any organization to be successful, it is necessary to implement innovative strategy which is unique to such organization (Uwa & Johnson, 2017). Digital platforms have been used to improve access to education, healthcare, and agricultural support in underserved areas. For example, mobile banking services like MPesa in Kenya have revolutionized financial inclusion by providing banking services to unbanked populations through mobile phones (Jack & Suri, 2019). Similarly, Social enterprises often develop unique business models that integrate profitability with social impact. Hybrid business models, for instance, combine commercial revenue

streams with grant funding to ensure financial sustainability while advancing social missions. Examples include fair-trade businesses that empower local artisans by providing them with market access and fair wages (Yunus *et al.*, 2015). Innovation in social entrepreneurship is not just about creating new solutions but also ensuring they are scalable and replicable. Successful social enterprises design models that can be expanded across regions and adapted to different contexts. For instance, the One Acre Fund has scaled its innovative agricultural support model to multiple African countries, helping smallholder farmers increase their productivity and incomes (Koh *et al.*, 2016).

Concept of organizational sustainability

Organizational sustainability is the capacity of an organization to be successful over time and to take into account economic, social and environmental factors (Walter, 2023). Sustainability is an integral part of long-term success in this fast-changing world, with an increasing number of groups being influenced by a range of stakeholders including customers, employees, governments and society as a whole. The idea goes beyond mere numbers, and considers not just profit and loss, but a comprehensive business practice that incorporates ethical, social, and ecological obligations.

Sustainability of an organization can generally be defined as the ability to survive and flourish over time through the efficient management of its economic, social and environmental footprint. Bansal and DesJardine (2024) define organizational sustainability as "the ability of firms to adjust their actions to fit evolving societal expectations and new business opportunities, and to remain financially viable. This definition emphasizes the holistic approach to sustainability that considers both internal (economic) and external (social and environmental) aspects. Sustainable organizations are organizations that have goals that are in harmony with the goals of society as a whole and do not use too much of natural resources or negatively impact society. This involves a strategic business process, where organizations anticipate their use of resources, minimize waste and promote positive interactions with stakeholders (Walter, 2023).

For a number of reasons organizational sustainability is critical. It helps organizations stay competitive in today's global economy, in which consumers, investors and regulators are increasingly calling for responsible business behaviour. Second, sustainable organizations have the ability to better handle risks and adjust to new economic, social and environmental situations. Third, the organizations that focus on sustainability have better financial results, because they can save money, increase efficiency and draw in customers who appreciate

ethical and sustainable practices (Elan, 2020). Moreover, sustainability is becoming a key driver of innovation. There are lots of new products, services and business models being created to tackle challenges like climate change, scarcity of resources and inequality on a global scale. For instance, Unilever's Sustainable Living Plan has enabled the company to cut down its environmental effects while boosting profits by providing environmentally friendly and affordable products (Polman, 2022).

Organizational sustainability is also very closely related to long-term success since it allows the organization to be resilient, manage risks and take advantage of opportunities. With the escalating environmental, social and economic issues that are increasingly prevalent in our world, organizations who are not practicing sustainability can be damaged to their reputation, possibly be penalized by regulations, and also suffer monetary losses. However, businesses that adopt sustainability are more likely to succeed in the future (Jeffrey, 2021). The positive correlation between sustainability and organizational performance is supported by empirical studies. Eccles, et al. (2024) identified that companies that are highly engaged in sustainability issues perform better in the stock market and have higher profitability than other companies. The study also indicated that the companies that are sustainable experience lower volatility and risk, which implies that the implementation of sustainability plays a role in organizational stability and long-term success.

The dimensions of the organizational sustainability

Organizational sustainability is a multi-faceted concept, including economic, social and environmental dimensions of an organization's long-term viability. It is the capacity of the organization to function efficiently, adjust to changes in environment and sustain its mission in a way that is responsible for resource management and stakeholder engagement (Walter, 2023). In today's corporate landscape, sustainability is not just a choice but a must for businesses aiming to achieve a balance between profit and social and environmental well-being. This concept is frequently discussed in five areas: economic sustainability; social sustainability; environmental sustainability; governance and ethical sustainability; and adaptive capacity. All these dimensions make a difference in determining organizations' overall resilience and success in the long run.

a) **Economic Sustainability:** Economic sustainability is the ability of an organization to create and use financial resources in an efficient way for achieving its long-term goals. It does this by making businesses, non-profits, and governmental organizations financially

viable and value to stakeholders. The dimension focuses on financial sustainability, investment approach, cost management, and revenue generation.

b) Social Sustainability: Social sustainability is centered on the social impact of an organisation on people, communities and the wider society. This includes ethical business practices, employee wellbeing, stakeholder engagement and corporate social responsibility (CSR). Corporations that focus on social sustainability promote social equity, workforce empowerment and help benefit local and global communities.

c) Environmental sustainability: environmental sustainability is about an organization's duty to reduce its adverse effects on the environment. It includes eco-friendly business operations, carbon footprint reduction, resource conservation, and supply chain and product life cycle sustainability.

d) Governance and ethical sustainability: Governance and ethical sustainability are defined by structures, policy and principles that shape decisions made by organizations. As they conduct their businesses, organizational must ensure that they comply with the policy, procedures and safety measures that are associated with their operation (Uwa, Akpaetor& Johnson, 2018). Ethical governance promotes accountability, transparency, compliance and integrity, ensuring that organizations do what is best for all of their stakeholders.

Businesses that serve social purposes causes and are they are created to provide long-term value. Social entrepreneurship and organizational sustainability have been on the agenda for a long time, especially as organizations and societies face urgent global problems, including inequality and environmental degradation, as well as economic instability. Social entrepreneurship, as a combination of principles of entrepreneurship and a social mission, is very important for the development of sustainable organizational practices that are not only profit-oriented but also aim to improve the social and environmental situation (Kevin, 2021). Social entrepreneurship is clearly and directly related to organizational sustainability. Social entrepreneurs, as such, are committed to building enterprises that produce social benefits, while simultaneously ensuring the sustainability and sustainability of their undertakings. Thus, this dual mission reflects organizational sustainability principles, which focus on the need to consider economic, social and environmental dimensions to ensure long-term success (Wry, 2019). There are various dimensions in which social entrepreneurship is a part of sustainability.

Nowadays one of the key features of social entrepreneurship is its attention to the generation of social value, which is closely related to the social aspect of organizational sustainability. Social entrepreneurs tackle pressing social problems like poverty, healthcare access,

education inequality and environmental issues in a creative and sustainable way with a business model. This emphasis on social impact helps foster resilient organizations that are attuned to communities and stakeholders. Practices with a commitment to social value creation have been found to lead to greater employee engagement, customer loyalty, and public trust through empirical studies (Haugh, 2021). In emerging markets, for example, Haigh, Walker, Bacq, and Kickul (2019) identified social enterprises that were more sustainable for tackling local community needs as an example of social innovation and developing inclusive business models.

Strategic partnerships are the lifeblood of social entrepreneurship, enabling them to make a greater difference and sustain their endeavors. Social enterprises can access resources, knowledge and expertise from governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), corporations and local communities, which can help them to be more successful in the future. Strategic partnerships are vital to organizational sustainability as they allow for risk sharing, innovation and sharing of resources. Miles, Verreyne and Luke (2020) identified strategic partnerships as being key in helping social enterprises to scale and expand their social impact whilst ensuring financial sustainability. The partnerships provided social enterprises with increased visibility, flexibility in funding sources, and access to technology, tailor-made networks, and other vital resources.

A second important aspect that connects social entrepreneurship with the sustainability of the business is revenue diversification. Social entrepreneurs tend to have a hybrid business model that integrates a mix of philanthropic contributions, government funding, and profits from social enterprise market-based activities. This not only helps to mitigate reliance on any single source of income but also helps enhance the resiliency of the organization by generating several sources of income. Battilana and Lee (2014) report that revenue diversification is crucial to support the long-term sustainability of social enterprises. Their research revealed that social enterprises that diversified their revenue models were more likely to overcome financial difficulties, to maintain their social value over time and to continue to operate. Moreover, revenue diversification enables the social enterprises to allocate the profits towards their mission-based works, enhancing their sustainability efforts.

Theoretical framework

Dynamic capabilities theory by Teece, Pisano and Shuen (1997)

Dynamic Capabilities Theory, introduced by David Teece, Gary Pisano and Amy Shuen in 1997, is a strategic management theory that focuses on an organization's ability to adapt and

evolve in response to rapidly changing environments. Both the classical theory based on static resources and competitive advantage is discarded and replaced by a more recent one that focuses on dynamic resources.

The strength of this theory is the emphasis on an organization's ability to integrate, develop, and reconfigure its resources and capabilities to address new challenges and opportunities. Organizations operating in a dynamic environment (Johnson, Emerole and Okebaram, 2024). Dynamic capabilities are the ability of the organization to detect opportunities and threats, exploit opportunities and keep the organization competitive through ongoing adjustments to the resource base. This notion goes beyond simply having resources and involves processes and routines that help organizations renew and modify their resource capacities to adapt to the environment (Smith, 2023). Seizing capabilities are used to launch new programmes, to expand into new markets or to create strategic alliances in order to increase social impact (Mair & Marti, 2019). This includes making strategic decisions and investing in new capabilities, developing new solutions and mobilizing resources to act and seize identified opportunities.

Dynamic Capabilities theory offers a lens through which to examine social enterprises and understand how they can be successful and continue to be effective in the field of social entrepreneurship. Social enterprises are faced with uncertainty and quick change, and dynamic capabilities are vital to their success. Therefore, all the employees in such organizations must be resilient and flexible to the changes in their jobs (Ekutu et. al., 2018). Social enterprises are occasionally subject to changing social needs, shifts in funding landscapes and changes in regulation. Dynamic capabilities enable them to remain relevant by adjusting their strategies and operations. Dynamic capabilities enable social enterprises to create new solutions and approaches, thereby driving innovation. This is essential to tackle social challenges and to bring about sustainable results. A successful enterprise that can allow them to effectively use their dynamic capabilities can be able to create innovative social programs or new business models which can improve the impact and financial sustainability of the enterprise (Teece, 2014). Additionally, firms that can be flexible with resources and adjust to the environment are more resilient. Social enterprises that are more dynamic have the ability to better deal with the risks, challenges and survive adverse situations (Smith, 2023). For example, social enterprises that can adapt their funding mechanisms or activities are more likely to endure and carry on with their mission during economic downturns.

METHODOLOGY

The survey research design was used in this study. This was conducted to describe the concept of social entrepreneurship and sustainability of NGOs in Akwa Ibom state. The population for this study was the management staff of the selected non-governmental organization (NGOs) in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. The choice was based on the NGOs which have been functioning in operation for the past ten years and they are popular and working in the state. The list of these NGOs was from Nigerian Network of NGOs (NNGO) database. Twenty-three (23) NGOs were identified and the total management staff of the identified NGOs was one hundred and forty-two (142) persons. The study sample includes these management staff who are the target population of these staff.

Using Taro Yamane sampling size determination formula, the sample size for this study was made up of 105 respondents. The simple random sampling technique was used, which would ensure that all the employees of the selected NGOs in Uyo had an equal and independent probability of being sampled. The study was entirely based on primary data. The data obtained were primary data and these were collected using structured questionnaire administered to the sampled respondents. Close-ended Questions were asked in the staffs of selected NGOs in Akwa Ibom state using the questionnaire. In the structure of the questionnaire, it was divided into two sections, namely: section 'A' and section 'B'. Section 'A' of the questionnaire was used to obtain demographic data of the respondents and section 'B' of the questionnaire generated data used by the researcher to test the research hypotheses formulated in chapter one of this study. A Likert's Scale of five points (disagreed (1 point), strongly disagreed (2 points), neutral (3 points), agreed (4 points) and strongly agreed (5 points)) were adapted to rate the responses. The Pearson product moment correlation analysis technique was used to test the hypotheses in this study.

Data Presentation

Table 1 Distribution of questionnaire/response rate.

Categories	Frequency	Percentage %
Copies of questionnaire administered	105	100
Copies of questionnaire filled and returned	100	95
Copies of questionnaire not returned	5	5

From Table 1 above, it was observed that out of one hundred and five (105) copies of questionnaires which were issued to respondents, only one hundred (100) copies which were

retrieved were properly filled and used as the bases for analysis. Five (5) copies of the questionnaire fell among the copies that were either not properly filled or not returned.

Test of Hypotheses

This section of the study test and interpret the null hypotheses that were formulated in this study using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) analysis. Thus, the test of hypotheses was done as shown hereunder:

Hypothesis one

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between social value creation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State;

Table 2: Correlation analysis.

Variables	Method	SVC	OS
SVC	Pearson correlation	1	0.902
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000
	N	100	100
OS	Pearson correlation	0.902	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	
	N	100	100

From Table 2, it was observed that the relationship between social value creation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State was 90.2%. The p-value computed showed that the relationship between the two variables was significant. The null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between social value creation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State was rejected and the alternative hypothesis which states that there is significant relationship between social value creation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State was accepted as p-value computed was less than 5% level of significance.

Hypothesis two

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between capacity building and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.

Table 3: Correlation analysis.

Variables	Method	CD	OS
CD	Pearson correlation	1	0.911
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000

	N	100	100
OS	Pearson correlation	0.911	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	
	N	100	100

From Table 3, it was observed that the relationship between capacity building and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State was 91.1%. The p-value computed showed that the relationship between the two variables was significant. The null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between capacity building and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State was rejected and the alternative hypothesis which states that there is significant relationship between capacity building and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State was accepted as p-value computed was less than 5% level of significance.

Hypothesis three

H03: There is no significant relationship between innovation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.

Table 4: Correlation analysis.

Variables	Method	IN	OS
IN	Pearson correlation	1	0.920
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000
	N	100	100
OS	Pearson correlation	0.920	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	
	N	100	100

From Table 4, it was observed that the relationship between innovation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State was 92%. The p-value computed showed that the relationship between the two variables was significant. The null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between innovation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State was rejected and the alternative hypothesis which states that there is significant relationship between innovation and organizational sustainability of NGOs in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State was accepted as p-value computed was less than 5% level of significance.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Some significant results were obtained following the test of hypotheses. The findings are discussed in this section of the study as shown below:

The results obtained in Table 2 showed a strong positive correlation between social value creation and organizational sustainability with a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (PPMC) coefficient of 0.902, which is statistically significant. This finding implies that NGOs with social value creation becoming embedded in their mission and operations have a greater likelihood of becoming viable. This is confirmed by Rey-Martí et al. (2016) who stated that the social enterprises that are oriented towards achieving social results rather than just profit are more sustainable in the long term. In the Kenyan context, Mwangi and Ngugi (2014) found that the trust and commitment social enterprises showed in local communities, due to their co-created value contributes to organizational growth and continuity. In contrast, Chukwuma (2017) conducted a study on informal NGOs in Nigeria, and found that lack of clarity or measurement of social value led to community disinterest and "donor fatigue. Similarly, Mulwafu (2015) found in Malawi that programmes that were not responsive to the real needs of the community reduced the credibility of the NGOs and made it difficult for them to be successful in the long term. The findings highlight the need to make value creation a sustainable process with a social impact and participatory approach through evidence for NGOs in Akwa Ibom State.

Table 3 revealed that there was a strong positive relationship ($r = 0.911$) between capacity building and organizational sustainability of selected NGOs in Akwa Ibom state. The results show that the NGOs that invest in developing their internal capacity (training staff, developing leaders, engaging stakeholders, and improving operations) are more likely to be sustainable in the long term. The results are consistent with the research of Light (2017) which underscores the need for capacity building leading to organizations that are more adaptive and strategically aligned and able to carry them out in the long-term. In contrast, Gonzalez (2023) found that in rural Mexico the connection between capacity building and sustainability was less important, which is the inverse of what was found in this study. Gonzalez noted that there were few NGOs that could build capacity effectively, either due to insufficient institutional structures or capacity, or due to a lack of funds, and none showed significant improvements in sustainability results. The gap could relate to contextual or institutional issues like lack of technical skills or monitoring and evaluation tools, or cultural inertia in the face of organizational change. If not, capacity building can be misguided and have little impact in these environments.

Table 4 shows that in the context of organizational sustainability, there is a very strong positive correlation between innovation and organizational sustainability, where the PPMC coefficient is $r = 0.920$. These findings indicate that NGOs with an innovative approach in their processes, services, and problem-solving mechanisms are more likely to be effective at adapting to complex social problems and sustain their existence in the long-term. Innovation can be through technology, flexible operating structure or new financing arrangements. This aligns with the innovation as a critical element of resilience in nonprofit organizations noted by Mulgan et al., (2019). Adepoju and Oyeyemi (2017) reported that in Ghana, the use of mobile technology by NGOs in program monitoring and engaging beneficiaries led to increased efficiency and accountability. During economic downturns, Jameson (2024) noted that Nigeria saw a rise in adaptability and program reach among NGOs that adopted innovative outreach strategies like mobile-based services and digital fundraising.

In a study of civil society organisations in Uganda, however, Makoba (2002) warned that many of the traditional NGOs had become stagnant and lost the confidence of donors due to a failure to innovate. This was also seen in Lagos by Effiong (2015) who found that NGOs that did not want to change their organizational structure were not able to adjust to the changing expectations of the communities they served, or to compete for funding from donors for new technologies. In the context of NGOs in Akwa Ibom State, innovation is not just a feature, but an imperative to ensure sustainability and relevance.

CONCLUSION

This research has examined the social entrepreneurship-organizational sustainability link, focusing on important aspects like social value creation, building capacity and innovation. The results further indicate that social entrepreneurship is important for the sustainability of organizations, especially NGOs, in the long run due to its ability to generate innovative solutions and build strategic partnerships. Also, the study revealed that capacity development in the employees' skills and knowledge is important and innovation is essential to adapt in a changing environment. All these elements together help to build resilience and development in organizations and keep them going to achieve their social mandate effectively.

For NGOs, this will help them build even more sustainable operations and thus increase their overall impact. The social entrepreneurship initiatives need to be supported by enacting facilitating policies, providing funding options and fostering collaboration amongst the stakeholders in order to establish an enabling environment for the NGOs. Further studies are needed to develop sector-specific applications for social entrepreneurship and to examine the

long-term implications of these aspects on the growth of organizations and the development of society.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are proposed for this work:

NGOs and other social enterprises need to focus on projects that can directly create social value. This can be possible through innovative solutions and improve service delivery targeted at meeting the needs of the community.

Investment in capacity-building should be considered as a way to improve performance and sustainability, especially for organizations like non-governmental organizations (NGOs). These efforts should include ongoing training and development initiatives designed to build the skills and knowledge of the organization's employees, volunteers, and stakeholders to contribute to company success.

NGOs and social enterprises must embrace new technologies, refine the models for providing services and consider a digital transformation strategy to enable a culture of innovation. Fostering research and development (R&D) activities can support organizations to stay competitive, flexible and resilient in a changing socio-economic environment.

REFERENCES

1. Arejiogbe, O. A., Olujobi, O. J., Ajayi, A. A., & Omoyajowo, B. A. (2023). Bolstering the impact of social entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation for sustainable development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 50(8), 1162–1179.
2. Bansal, P., & DesJardine, M. R. (2024). Business sustainability: It is about time. *Strategic Organization*, 12(1), 70-78.
3. Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2019). *Social entrepreneurship: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.
4. Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2019). *Social entrepreneurship: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.
5. Chris, U. (2021). Social entrepreneurship and sustainable development in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Management Studies*, 12(2), 45–59.
6. Danlyan, A. F., Aigbebemen, M. G., Oseremen, A. F., & Anthonia, I. U. (2024). Social entrepreneurship and SME sustainability in Lagos State. *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 14(2), 173–190.

7. Dees, J. G. (2021). The meaning of social entrepreneurship. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 19(2), 34–42.
8. Dees, J. G., Emerson, J., & Economy, P. (2019). *Enterprising nonprofits: A toolkit for social entrepreneurs*. John Wiley & Sons.
9. Doherty, B., Haugh, H., & Lyon, F. (2021). Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23(4), 507–528. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12228>
10. Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2024). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science*, 60(11), 2835-2857.
11. Ekutu, C.A., Edeh, F. O., Alamina, U. P., Fern, Y. S., Kumari, P. and Johnson, E. E. (2020). Effects of organizational structure on employee resilience. *Journal of Business School*, 3(2), 75-85
12. Emerson, J., Wachowicz, J., & Chun, S. (2020). Social return on investment (SROI): Exploring aspects of value creation in the nonprofit sector. *The Roberts Foundation*.
13. Hailey, J., & James, R. (2020). NGO capacity building: The challenge of impact assessment. INTRAC
14. Jack, W., & Suri, T. (2019). The long-run poverty and gender impacts of mobile money. *Science*, 354(6317), 1288-1292.
15. Johnson, E. E., Emerole, G. A. and Okebaram, S. M. (2024). Assessment of organizational justice practices and employees' commitment of Civil Service Commission in South-South, Nigeria. *Iiard International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 10(11), 1 - 15.
16. Johnson, E. E., Okebaram, S. M. and Emerole, G. A. (2024). Effect of interactional justice on employees' engagement of Civil Service Commission in South-South, Nigeria. *Iiard International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research*, 10(11), 1-16
17. Koh, H., Hegde, N., Karamchandani, A., & Katz, R. (2016). Beyond the Pioneer: Getting inclusive industries to scale. Monitor Deloitte
18. Light, P. C. (2017). *The search for social entrepreneurship*. Brookings Institution Press.
19. Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2016). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36–44.
20. Mulgan, G., Tucker, S., Ali, R., & Sanders, B. (2019). *Social innovation: What it is, why it matters, and how it can be accelerated*. Skoll Centre for Social

21. Nwankwo, S. I., Eze, J. U., Okoli, F. O., & Chukwu, C. U. (2024). Achieving survival of social enterprise through entrepreneurial marketing: Empirical evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of African Business*, 25(1), 1–20.
22. Otokiti, S. O., Igwe, P. A., Ewim, O., Ibeh, K., & Sikhakhane-Nwokediegwu, I. (2024). Scaling social entrepreneurship: A framework for sustainable social impact in sub-Saharan Africa. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 20(2), 189–210.
23. Santos, F. (2022). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 335-351.
24. Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M. A., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy. *California Management Review*, 58(4), 13–35.
25. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G. and Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509 – 533.
26. Tomori, A. (2019). Key components of social entrepreneurship and their role in social value creation. *African Journal of Business and Economic Research*, 14(3), 78–95.
27. Uwa, K. L. and Johnson, E. E. (2017). Strategy implementation and organizational competitiveness in Nigeria: A study of Akwa Ibom State Transport Company (AKTC), Uyo. *AKSU Journal of Management Sciences*, 2(2), 102 - 116.
28. Uwa, K. L., Akpaetor, U. A. and Johnson, E. E. (2018). Ethical compliance and organizational profitability of Telecommunication Companies in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and innovation Research*, 6(2), 8 - 17
29. Xerxes, P. (2020). Organizational sustainability: Concepts, frameworks, and measurement. *Journal of Sustainable Organizations*, 8(1), 1–15.
30. Yunus, M., Moingeon, B., & Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2015). Building social business models: Lessons from the Grameen experience. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 308-325.
31. Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2019). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes, and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519–532.