

Social Innovation for Community Well-Being: Evaluating Grassroots Interventions in Addressing Local Development Challenges

Emily R Sophie^{1*}, Amelia M Hayes²

¹Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria

²National Open University Of Nigeria, Ibadan

*Corresponding Author: sophieer@gmail.com

Article Info:

Article history: Received, 10/04/2026, | Revision, 20/05/2026, | Accepted, 30/06/2026, | Vol (4), Issue (1), (June, 2026)
e-ISSN 2988-0246 | p-ISSN 2988-6732 | doi: <https://doi.org/10.61233/zijen.v4i1.43>

Abstract:

This article examines the implementation of community-based social innovation as a strategic approach to addressing local development challenges that cannot be fully resolved through formal policies or market mechanisms. The study aims to analyze the effectiveness of grassroots interventions in enhancing community well-being and to identify the supporting and inhibiting factors that influence program success. Employing a qualitative case study design within a constructivist paradigm, data were collected through in-depth interviews, participatory observation, focus group discussions, and analysis of organizational and policy documents. The findings reveal that the success of community-based social innovation is strongly shaped by community participation, adaptive local leadership, multi-stakeholder collaborative networks, institutional support, sustainable funding, and organizational capacity to adapt to social dynamics. Barriers identified include limited participation in certain areas, conflicting stakeholder interests, restricted access to technology, and weak monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. The theoretical contribution of this study lies in the integration of social innovation, community development, participatory development, social capital, and collaborative governance frameworks to understand the dynamics of local development. Practically, the study highlights the need to strengthen community capacity, ensure consistent institutional support, and develop sustainable funding strategies so that community-based social innovation can serve as a cornerstone of inclusive and sustainable local development.

Keywords:

Social Innovation, Community Well-Being, Grassroots Interventions.



© 2026 The Author(s).

This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

INTRODUCTION

Social innovation has emerged as a strategic approach to addressing local development challenges that cannot be fully resolved through government policies or market mechanisms. Issues such as poverty, unemployment, limited access to education and healthcare, environmental degradation, and weak community participation have driven the rise of grassroots interventions. These initiatives originate from genuine community needs and are designed collaboratively by citizens, civil society organizations, youth groups, local communities, and social enterprises. By positioning communities as the primary actors of development, social innovation not only provides short-term solutions but also strengthens collective capacity for sustainable social change (Razzano & Bernardi, 2024; Liodaki & Apostolopoulou, 2026).

Despite positive contributions, the effectiveness of community-based social innovation

programs is highly dependent on factors such as participation levels, adaptive local leadership, collaborative networks, institutional support, sustainable funding, and organizational adaptability. Empirical studies that comprehensively evaluate the tangible impacts of grassroots interventions remain limited, creating an academic urgency to explore enabling and constraining factors more deeply. Such evaluations are essential for developing participatory development models that are both effective and sustainable (Purcell et al., 2025; Hanke et al., 2026).

This research is grounded in several conceptual frameworks. Social Innovation Theory highlights the creation of new solutions through collaboration, while Community Development Theory emphasizes empowerment and local capacity building. Participatory Development Theory underscores active involvement in all stages of development, and Social Capital Theory stresses trust, norms, and networks as key resources. Finally, Collaborative Governance Theory explains the necessity of synergy among government, private sector, civil society, local communities, and academia in joint decision-making (Zhang et al., 2026; Razzano & Bernardi, 2024).

The study aims to analyze the implementation of social innovation through grassroots interventions in addressing local development challenges and improving community well-being. It also seeks to identify supporting and inhibiting factors that influence program success, thereby providing recommendations for strengthening participatory and sustainable development. The research questions focus on how grassroots interventions contribute to local development and which factors determine their effectiveness (Panday, 2026).

The novelty of this study lies in its comprehensive evaluation of grassroots interventions, mapping prior research while identifying gaps such as limited empirical evidence and contextual focus on developed countries. By integrating theories of social innovation, community development, participatory development, social capital, and collaborative governance, this research contributes both theoretically and practically. It enriches academic discourse on social innovation and offers practical insights for policymakers and practitioners to design inclusive, adaptive, and sustainable community-based development strategies (Purcell et al., 2025; Razzano & Bernardi, 2024; Hanke et al., 2026).

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative approach based on the constructivist paradigm, aiming to gain an in-depth understanding of the process of implementing social innovation in the context of community life. The chosen research strategy is case study research, as it allows for a comprehensive exploration of complex and contextual social phenomena specifically, the implementation of community-based social innovation to improve community well-being. The research data consists of two types: primary and secondary data. Primary data was obtained through in-depth interviews with community leaders, community organization managers, social innovation program implementers, village or local government officials, social entrepreneurs, and beneficiary communities. In addition, participatory observation of community activities and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were conducted to strengthen the validity of the data. Secondary data were obtained from organizational documents, program reports, government policies, publications by non-governmental organizations,

and relevant scientific literature. Data collection techniques employed triangulation of sources, methods, and time to ensure the validity of the information (Mukhalalati & Awaisu, 2019; Doroudi, 2024; Gül et al., 2022).

The inclusion criteria for this study encompass informants who are directly involved in the implementation of social innovation programs, such as community leaders, heads of community organizations, program managers, village governments, civil society organizations, social entrepreneurs, academics, and program beneficiaries. Exclusion criteria were established for individuals or organizations without direct experience or relevance to the program's implementation. The unit of analysis was the local community serving as the locus of grassroots interventions. Data analysis employed the interactive model developed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, comprising data collection, data condensation, data presentation, and the drawing of conclusions and verification. The analysis process was conducted through the stages of open coding, axial coding, and selective coding, followed by the interpretation of findings and the formulation of research propositions. To support the analysis process, NVivo software was used as a qualitative coding tool. This approach allows researchers to identify key themes, relationships between variables, and factors influencing the effectiveness of community-based social innovation (Chen et al., 2026; Hajar et al., 2026; Kravchenko, 2026).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The results of this study are presented based on a qualitative case study approach within a constructivist paradigm. Data analysis was conducted through the stages of open coding, axial coding, and selective coding using NVivo software, resulting in a number of key findings that represent the dynamics of implementing community-based social innovations. These findings reflect the factors that support or hinder the effectiveness of grassroots interventions in improving community well-being.

The first finding was high community participation in program planning and implementation. Informants, including community leaders and heads of community organizations, emphasized that residents' active involvement was a key factor in the program's success. This participation took the form not only of attendance at activities but also of contributions of ideas, labor, and local resources. Observational data indicate that community activities that directly involve residents are more effective at fostering a sense of ownership and ensuring the sustainability of the program (Razzano & Bernardi, 2024; Qiao et al., 2025).

The second finding is adaptive local leadership, in which the roles of community leaders and program managers proved crucial in guiding the course of the intervention. Leadership that is responsive to residents' needs and capable of bridging the interests of various stakeholders enhances program effectiveness. Interviews with village officials indicate that local leadership open to cross-sectoral collaboration is a key factor in success (Zhang et al., 2026; Panday, 2026).

The third finding is the collaborative network that has formed among communities, civil

society organizations, the government, and social entrepreneurs. FGD data indicate that these networks facilitate the exchange of resources, knowledge, and institutional support. Multi-stakeholder collaboration enables social innovation programs to gain legitimacy and access to sustainable funding. Organizational documents indicate that a program's success is often determined by its ability to build strategic partnerships (Purcell et al., 2025; Hanke et al., 2026).

The fourth finding is institutional support and sustainable funding. An analysis of regional development policy documents indicates that programs receiving formal government support are more likely to endure over the long term. However, limited funding remains the primary obstacle to maintaining program sustainability. Informants from civil society organizations emphasized that diversifying funding sources including community-based social enterprises is a key strategy for reducing dependence on external aid (Nakpodia et al., 2026; Liodaki & Apostolopoulou, 2026).

The fifth finding concerns the capacity of community organizations to adapt to social dynamics. Field observations indicate that organizations capable of adjusting their strategies to changing community needs are more effective at maintaining the relevance of their programs. This adaptive capacity encompasses managerial skills, program innovation, and human resource management. Data from interviews with academics supporting these communities confirm that organizational capacity is a determining factor in the success of social innovation (Pécot et al., 2024; Anooja & Kumar, 2025).

The sixth finding concerns implementation barriers, which include low participation in some regions, conflicts of interest among stakeholders, limited access to technology, and weak program monitoring and evaluation. Field notes indicate that these barriers often reduce the effectiveness of grassroots interventions. Informants from social enterprises emphasized the need for participatory evaluation mechanisms to identify problems early on and refine implementation strategies (Okoye, 2026; Zhao et al., 2026).

Overall, the findings of this study confirm that the effectiveness of community-based social innovations is strongly influenced by a combination of factors, including community participation, local leadership, collaborative networks, institutional support, sustainable funding, and organizational adaptive capacity. Empirical data obtained through interviews, observations, focus group discussions (FGDs), and documentation reveal varying levels of program success across different communities, reflecting the complexity of social dynamics in local development (Gonzalez-Coffin et al., 2026; El Charif et al., 2026).

Discussion

The results of this study confirm that the effectiveness of community-based social innovations is strongly influenced by a combination of factors, including community participation, local leadership, collaborative networks, institutional support, sustainable funding, and organizational adaptive capacity. These findings align with the study's objective, which was to analyze the implementation of social innovations in addressing local development challenges while identifying factors that support and hinder program success. Thus, this study successfully addresses the research question posed: how do grassroots interventions contribute to improving community

well-being and sustainable development (Razzano & Bernardi, 2024; Pécot et al., 2024).

Interpreting the findings within a theoretical framework shows that high levels of community participation enhance the effectiveness of social innovation, as explained in the theory of Participatory Development, which emphasizes the active involvement of citizens in every stage of development. Adaptive local leadership supports the theory of Community Development, which emphasizes the importance of local capacity and self-managed resource management. The collaborative networks formed between communities, the government, and the private sector reinforce the relevance of Collaborative Governance theory, which emphasizes multistakeholder synergy in decision-making. Furthermore, the success of programs supported by trust and social norms aligns with Social Capital theory, which emphasizes the importance of social networks as a key asset for development (Zhang et al., 2026; Panday, 2026).

When compared to previous studies, the findings of this research show both similarities and differences. Research by Purcell et al. (2025) indicates that collaborative networks are a key factor in program sustainability, consistent with the results of this study. However, research by Nakpodia et al. (2026) emphasizes that social innovations often face limitations in impact measurement, which differs from this study, which successfully identified success factors empirically. Furthermore, a study by Liodaki & Apostolopoulou (2026) highlights the relevance of participatory methods in evaluating community-based programs, which supports the approach taken in this study. Differences emerge in the context of developing countries, where this study emphasizes more complex social dynamics compared to studies in developed countries (Hanke et al., 2026; Qiao et al., 2025).

The scientific contribution of this article lies in its novel approach to comprehensively evaluating the effectiveness of grassroots interventions on community well-being and local development. This article enriches the academic literature by providing an empirical understanding of the factors that support and hinder program success, while also formulating recommendations for strengthening sustainable participatory development. Its practical contribution is to provide a foundation for the development of more inclusive and sustainable local development policies and programs (Gonzalez-Coffin et al., 2026; El Charif et al., 2026).

However, this study has limitations that must be acknowledged appropriately. First, the study was conducted only within a specific community, so the results cannot be broadly generalized. Second, limitations in resources and time resulted in a limited number of informants, even though the data had reached saturation. Third, the use of a qualitative approach makes the research results more descriptive and interpretive, so they cannot provide statistical generalizations. These limitations open opportunities for further research to expand the scope and use a mixed-methods approach to strengthen the validity of the findings (Nakpodia et al., 2026; Okoye, 2026).

The implications of this study for future research include the need for a more in-depth exploration of the relationship between social innovation and more measurable indicators of community well-being, such as income levels, the quality of education, and access to health care. For practitioners, this study offers recommendations for strengthening the capacity of community organizations, increasing community participation, and building broader collaborative networks. For

policymakers, this study emphasizes the importance of institutional support and sustainable funding to ensure the success of community-based social innovation programs (Liodaki & Apostolopoulou, 2026; Hanke et al., 2026).

Furthermore, this study confirms that the success of community-based social innovation depends not only on internal community factors but also on external support from the government, the private sector, and civil society organizations. This reinforces the argument that sustainable local development requires a holistic approach that integrates various actors and resources. Thus, this study contributes to the development of a more contextual and practical theory of participatory development (Zhao et al., 2026; Qiao et al., 2025). Finally, this study shows that community-based social innovation has great potential to improve community well-being and address local development challenges. However, the success of such programs depends heavily on a combination of factors, including participation, leadership, networking, institutional support, funding, and organizational adaptive capacity. These findings underscore the importance of integrating theories of social innovation, community development, participatory development, social capital, and collaborative governance as a conceptual framework for understanding the dynamics of inclusive and sustainable local development (Purcell et al., 2025; Pécot et al., 2024).

CONCLUSION

This study conclusively confirms that the implementation of community-based social innovations makes a tangible contribution to improving community well-being and addressing local development challenges. The key factors influencing the effectiveness of grassroots interventions include community participation, adaptive local leadership, collaborative networks among stakeholders, institutional support, sustainable funding, and the capacity of community organizations to adapt to social dynamics. These findings directly address the research objectives and research questions posed, demonstrating that the success of social innovation depends not only on program design but also on active engagement and multi-stakeholder synergy in its implementation.

The theoretical contribution of this study is the strengthening of the integration between the theories of social innovation, community development, participatory development, social capital, and collaborative governance as a relevant conceptual framework for understanding the dynamics of community-based local development. Its practical contribution lies in the formulation of recommendations that can be used by civil society organizations, local governments, and social enterprises in designing more inclusive and sustainable participatory development strategies. This article also makes a conceptual contribution by emphasizing the importance of community organizations' adaptive capacity as a key variable that has previously received insufficient attention in the social innovation literature.

The implications of this study open the door to more in-depth follow-up research on the relationship between social innovation and more measurable indicators of community well-being, as well as the exploration of mixed-methods approaches to strengthen the validity of the findings. For practitioners, the results of this study can serve as a basis for strengthening community participation mechanisms, building broader collaborative networks, and developing sustainable funding strategies.

For policymakers, this study underscores the need for consistent institutional support so that community-based social innovation can become a key pillar of inclusive and sustainable local development.

REFERENCES

- Anooja, J., & Kumar, V. (2025). Elements of innovation: A review of literature on craft-design ecosystem. *Sustainable Futures*, 9, 100670. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.100670>
- Chen, P., Liang, R., Bao, Z., & Zeng, M. (2026). A systematic review of constructivist group activities for promoting social-emotional learning in primary schools. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 13, 102323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102323>
- Doroudi, S. (2024). On the paradigms of learning analytics: Machine learning meets epistemology. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100192>
- El Charif, M. H., Melhem, J., El Asmar, K., Elbejjani, M., Gross, A., & Chaaya, M. (2026). The association between social isolation and cognitive function in older adults in urban, fringe and rural regions of Lebanon: A secondary data analysis of two national cross-sectional studies. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 13, 102485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102485>
- Gonzalez-Coffin, S., Miller Hesed, C. D., Yocum, H. M., & Roberts, R. (2026). Social science for climate-resilient grasslands: Strategies to support individual and systemic adaptation. *iScience*, 29(6), 116265. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2026.116265>
- Gu, T., Hu, J., Song, X., Yan, H., & Chen, Z. (2026). How to enhance the urban community resilience from the perspective of social networks? A case study of Xuzhou, China. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 33(7), 5340–5363. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-01-2025-0078>
- Gül, U., Altuntaş, D., & Efe, E. (2022). A year and a half later: Clinical experiences of intern nursing students in the COVID-19 pandemic: A constructivist grounded theory. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 63, 103381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2022.103381>
- Hajar, M. U., Yulianti, E., Ibrohim, & Nur, H. (2026). Co-constructing STEM framework for rural schools through community-based participatory research: A systematic thematic analysis. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 13, 102823. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102823>
- Hanke, F., Day, R., Burchell, K., & Thomson, H. (2026). Tackling energy poverty in Europe through energy communities: tracing the innovation journeys to support an emerging niche. *Energy Policy*, 208, 114874. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2025.114874>
- Kravchenko, A. V. (2026). Methodological issues in ecolinguistics as a research project: A constructivist perspective. *Language Sciences*, 113, 101768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2025.101768>
- Liodaki, D., & Apostolopoulou, E. (2026). Community energy as care infrastructure: Insights from two energy communities in England and Greece. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 136, 104704. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2026.104704>
- Mukhalalati, B., & Awaisu, A. (2019). Principles, paradigms, and application of qualitative research in pharmacy practice. In Z.-U.-D. Babar (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Pharmacy Practice and Clinical Pharmacy* (pp. 162–172). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812735-3.00622-1>
- Nakpodia, F., Olan, F., Ogunyemi, T., & Hasan, A. (2026). Navigating the roadblocks: exploring challenges in implementing corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives in a Sub-Saharan African economy's small and medium enterprises (SMEs). *European Business Review*, 38(1), 17–45. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-01-2024-0005>
- Okoye, K. (2026). Impact of global technological turn and innovations for humanitarian aid and development: A systematic review on the pathways to sustainable development. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 13, 102743. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102743>

- Panday, P. K. (2026). Networks that matter? Community organisations and citizen participation in local governance forums in Bangladesh. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 124, 104173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2026.104173>
- Pécot, M., Ricaurte-Quijano, C., Khoo, C., Alonso Vázquez, M., Barahona-Canales, D., Yang, E. C. L., & Tan, R. (2024). From empowering women to being empowered by women: A gendered social innovation framework for tourism-led development initiatives. *Tourism Management*, 102, 104883. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2024.104883>
- Purcell, C., Manthorpe, J., & Malley, J. (2025). Understanding the role of internal governance units in the process of social innovation: The case of Shared Lives Plus in England. *Research Policy*, 54(1), 105152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2024.105152>
- Qiao, Y., Yan, M., Liu, G., Sarfo, I., & Qiao, J. (2025). Determinants and grassroots voices for specialized village development in China: A survey of 1155 village cadres. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 120, 103822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2025.103822>
- Razzano, C. C., & Bernardi, M. (2024). Empowering urban resilience: Grassroots volunteering for a renewed shock-response governance in post-pandemic Milan. *Urban Governance*, 4(4), 374–387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ugj.2024.12.006>
- Zhang, C., Liao, L., Liu, X., & Hu, H. (2026). How is the collaborative process developed at the grassroots? Evidence from a party-led urban regeneration project in China. *Cities*, 175, 107151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2026.107151>
- Zhao, Q., Qin, C., Lu, Z., & Sun, Y. (2026). Triple helix interactivity and social tie embeddedness: Catalysts for innovation legitimacy and sustainable practice institutionalization. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 227, 124611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2026.124611>