Impact Investing as a Hybrid Financing Model Industry Characteristics Measurement Challenges and Lessons from Two Cases

Dr. Chia Shee Tong Tom

University of Malaya, Malaysia

Abstract

Impact investing seeks to combine intentional social or environmental benefit with financial return. This article synthesizes an exploratory study of the field's early development, using literature and industry reports, a historical snapshot of Global Impact Investing Rating System (GIIRS) data, and illustrative cases of Acumen and the Nigerian crowdfunding platform 234Give. The analysis focuses on the boundaries between impact investing, philanthropy, and conventional investment; investor return and impact objectives; social enterprise financing; impact measurement; market development; and the institutional practices illustrated by the cases. The synthesis indicates that impact investing is best understood as a heterogeneous investment approach rather than a single asset class with uniform return expectations. Its credibility depends on intentionality, investee business models that embed an impact objective, and measurement that informs decisions rather than serving only as external reporting. The historical GIIRS-based market estimate in the source study is highly sensitive to assumptions about the representativeness of rated firms and should not be read as a current or statistically validated market size. More recent Global Impact Investing Network estimates document substantial market growth, but differences in coverage and methods limit direct comparison. The cases illustrate two distinct routes for mobilizing capital: patient debt or equity for enterprises serving low-income communities, and digital crowdfunding that broadens access to charitable finance. The article concludes that impact integrity requires transparent impact

objectives, proportionate measurement, credible governance, and explicit disclosure of financial and social trade-offs.

Keywords: impact investing; social enterprise; impact measurement; patient capital; crowdfunding; blended value

1. Introduction

Financial capital has traditionally been allocated through institutions that prioritize risk-adjusted financial return, while charitable giving and public programmes have been used to address social and environmental needs. Impact investing developed around the proposition that investment capital can be intentionally directed toward enterprises and funds that seek both a financial return and measurable social or environmental benefit. The approach therefore occupies an institutional space between philanthropy and conventional investment, while retaining features of both (Freireich & Fulton, 2009; O'Donohoe et al., 2010).

The concept gained traction as investors, social entrepreneurs, foundations, and development practitioners began to recognize the limits of relying on donations and public funding alone to address persistent challenges. Market-based organizations can potentially extend the reach of services such as affordable housing, health care, education, clean water, energy, and financial inclusion. Yet market provision does not automatically produce public benefit. The impact objective must be intentional, incorporated into investment and operating decisions, and assessed against outcomes that matter to affected people (Global Impact Investing Network [GIIN], 2019).

This article develops a journal-style synthesis from the impact-investing portion of the supplied thesis. It addresses two questions: (1) What distinguishes impact investing from philanthropy, socially responsible investing, and conventional investment? and (2) How do the structure of the field, its measurement challenges, and selected organizational cases illustrate the possibilities and limits of this approach? The study is exploratory and document-based. It

brings together the thesis's literature review, its reported analysis of early GIIRS data, and the Acumen and 234Give case descriptions. It does not claim to be a systematic review or an independently collected empirical study.

The article makes three contributions. First, it clarifies impact investing as an approach defined by intent and practice rather than by a single legal form, sector, or return profile. Second, it shows why measurement is constitutive of the model: impact claims need to guide investment decisions and be accountable to stakeholders. Third, it revisits the early market-sizing exercise in the thesis and explains why its assumptions limit what can be inferred. This historical framing matters because the thesis's GIIRS observations date from 2012, while current estimates use broader datasets and different methodologies.

2. Conceptual foundations

2.1 Impact investing between philanthropy and conventional investment

The defining proposition of impact investing is that the pursuit of social or environmental outcomes and the pursuit of financial return can be combined within an investment. The GIIN defines impact investments as investments made with the intention to generate positive, measurable social and environmental impact alongside a financial return (GIIN, 2019). This definition contains three linked elements: an explicit intention to contribute to impact, an expectation of financial return, and an effort to measure outcomes. The components distinguish impact investing from an investment that happens to produce a beneficial side effect and from a donation that does not expect repayment or financial return.

The boundaries are not absolute. Philanthropic capital may accept a high risk of loss or no financial return, while conventional investment may incorporate environmental, social, and governance information to assess financial materiality. Impact investing spans a range of return objectives, from below-market, impact-first capital to market-rate, finance-first strategies. The term therefore does not imply that every investment has the same risk, return, liquidity, or

impact profile. It describes an intention and a management approach applied across different instruments, including debt, equity, guarantees, and blended-finance structures (Freireich & Fulton, 2009; O'Donohoe et al., 2010).

A useful distinction is between screening out harmful activities and actively seeking to contribute to a specified outcome. Negative screening may be part of an investor's values-based approach, but it does not by itself establish that the investment is designed to generate measurable impact. The GIIN's later articulation of core characteristics emphasizes intentionality, the use of evidence and impact data in investment design, management of impact performance, and contribution to the development of the field (GIIN, 2019). These characteristics help separate impact investing from broad sustainability language that makes no clear claim about the investor's contribution.

2.2 Impact investors and social enterprises

Impact investors differ in institutional form and in how they balance impact and return. Foundations, development finance institutions, banks, family offices, fund managers, and individual investors may all participate. Their objectives can range from addressing a defined social problem to earning a market-rate return while improving environmental or social performance. This diversity makes a single profile of the "impact investor" misleading. It also explains variation in funding structures, time horizons, tolerance for risk, and expectations for investee support.

Social enterprises are common recipients of impact capital because they use commercial activity to address a social need. However, social enterprise is itself a broad category. Organizations differ in their legal form, revenue model, governance, and dependence on grants. Social entrepreneurship research highlights the combination of social purpose and entrepreneurial action, while also recognizing that hybrid organizations face tensions between mission and commercial viability (Mair & Martí, 2006). Those tensions are not resolved simply

by labeling a business an impact enterprise; they require governance and operating choices that protect the mission as the organization grows.

Patient capital is one response to the financing constraints faced by enterprises serving low-income or underserved markets. Such businesses may need time to test distribution models, establish trust, build local infrastructure, or reach a scale at which earned revenue can cover costs. Debt or equity with longer horizons can give investees room to develop, while investors may contribute networks, management expertise, and operating support. These features distinguish some impact investors from lenders or investors focused on rapid exits, but they do not remove the need for due diligence, viable economics, or transparent expectations.

2.3 Measurement, accountability, and blended value

Measurement is central to impact investing because the intended social outcome is part of the investment thesis. It is also difficult. Social and environmental change is shaped by multiple actors and contextual conditions; outcomes may emerge over long periods, and the counterfactual—what would have happened without the investment—is rarely observable with certainty. A count of people reached, jobs supported, or products delivered can describe outputs but does not alone demonstrate lasting change or attribute that change to a particular investor.

Ebrahim and Rangan (2014) argue that the scale and scope of an organization's social performance should inform what it measures. An organization delivering services directly may be able to track outputs and outcomes, while a policy-oriented or ecosystem-building organization may need other forms of evidence. For impact investors, this implies that measurement should be proportionate to the intervention, the intended change, and the decision the evidence is meant to support. A common metric can improve comparability, but uniformity can obscure differences among populations, contexts, and pathways to change.

Accountability has both internal and external dimensions. Internally, data can help managers adjust products, delivery, and investment support. Externally, reporting can inform

investors, beneficiaries, regulators, and the public. A system that measures only what is easy to count risks rewarding activity rather than meaningful outcomes. Conversely, highly burdensome measurement can divert resources from delivery, especially in small enterprises. Credible practice therefore combines relevant quantitative indicators with qualitative evidence and stakeholder feedback, states limitations, and avoids treating a rating or framework as proof of impact.

The idea of blended value captures the fact that social, environmental, and financial value may be jointly created, but not always easily reduced to one score (Nicholls, 2009). A firm can be financially sustainable and still deliver weak or uneven social outcomes; a highly beneficial service can remain financially fragile. Investors should disclose how they balance these objectives, what constitutes acceptable performance on each dimension, and what corrective action follows when impact goals are missed.

3. Method and source material

This article uses an exploratory document-based design. The source material comprises (a) the impact-investing literature discussed in the thesis; (b) the thesis's account of GIIRS Quarterly Analytics data from 2012; (c) the thesis's market-sizing calculation based on reported annual revenues of GIIRS-rated companies; and (d) two illustrative organizational cases, Acumen and 234Give. The cases were selected in the thesis to demonstrate different ways of organizing capital around a social purpose: patient investment in enterprises and online crowdfunding for charitable projects.

The analysis is a structured synthesis rather than a systematic review. The thesis does not report a reproducible search protocol, complete dataset, coding framework, or sampling procedure for the documents and cases. The GIIRS figures are therefore treated as a historical snapshot as reported in the thesis, not as a representative estimate of the whole industry. The

Acumen and 234Give descriptions are also treated as source-period case illustrations; figures without a clearly stated reference date are not presented as current facts.

To make the quantitative inference transparent, the thesis's market-sizing logic is restated as a sensitivity range. It reports approximately US$3.1 billion in aggregate annual revenue for 418 GIIRS-rated companies and assumes that these rated firms represent 5% to 15% of total industry volume. Dividing the reported revenue by these assumed shares implies a range of approximately US$20.7 billion to US$62 billion. The thesis's approximate US$40 billion midpoint is consequently an assumption-dependent extrapolation, not a direct observation of assets under management or invested capital. Revenue, investment volume, and assets under management are distinct quantities and should not be conflated.

4. Findings

4.1 A heterogeneous field with multiple return and impact objectives

The literature reviewed in the thesis portrays impact investing as a broad and still-forming field in which participants differ by geography, sector, financing instrument, and impact objective. Some investors focus on emerging markets and underserved populations; others seek to address unmet needs in their own communities. Local expertise matters because regulatory environments, infrastructure, customer needs, and the practical meaning of impact vary by context (O'Donohoe et al., 2010).

This heterogeneity is an important feature, not merely a temporary inconvenience. A single expected return benchmark would not capture the difference between an investor prioritizing social outcomes in a difficult market and a finance-first investor targeting competitive returns. Likewise, a single social metric cannot meaningfully compare investments in clean water, affordable housing, education, and financial inclusion without accounting for the outcomes each intervention is intended to produce. Market infrastructure can support shared definitions and reporting while allowing the investment thesis to remain context-specific.

4.2 Early GIIRS data and the limits of market estimation

The thesis reports that the GIIRS-rated fund universe had grown to 36 rated funds, with a further 24 funds in the rating process, and that the company analysis covered 418 rated companies. These figures indicate that a ratings and analytics infrastructure was emerging in the early 2010s. They should be interpreted as platform coverage at that time, rather than as a census of impact investors or investees. B Lab's GIIRS analytics work was designed to provide standardized social and environmental performance information for participating companies and funds (B Lab, 2012).

Item	Historical figure reported in thesis	Interpretation
GIIRS funds	36 rated; 24 in rating process	Early platform coverage, not the whole market
GIIRS-rated companies	418	Rated firms represented a selected subset
Aggregate annual revenue	About US$3.1 billion	Revenue base used in the thesis extrapolation
Assumed rated-firm share	5%–15%	Unverified scaling assumption
Implied market-size range	About US$20.7–62 billion	Revenue-based sensitivity calculation; not AUM

Note. Historical figures are taken from the supplied thesis's account of GIIRS data; the sensitivity range is recalculated from the thesis's stated revenue and assumed coverage share. Values should not be treated as a contemporary market estimate.

The thesis compares this calculation with two earlier estimates. Freireich and Fulton (2009) argued that impact investing could potentially reach a substantial share of professionally managed assets, while O'Donohoe et al. (2010) estimated a potential investment opportunity of US$400 billion to nearly US$1 trillion over a decade across selected sectors in emerging markets. These figures were scenario-based projections with different scopes and assumptions. They are not directly comparable to a revenue-based extrapolation from a subset of rated companies.

Later estimates demonstrate how much the field and its measurement infrastructure have changed. The GIIN estimated that more than 3,900 organizations managed approximately

US$1.571 trillion in impact-investing assets under management in 2024 (Hand et al., 2024). This newer estimate is useful context, but it cannot be read as a simple growth multiple over the 2012 thesis calculation because the measures, coverage, and methodology differ. The contrast instead supports a methodological lesson: market-size claims should identify the unit being measured, the population covered, the inclusion criteria, and the assumptions used to extrapolate.

4.3 Acumen: patient capital, enterprise viability, and impact intent

The thesis presents Acumen as an example of a nonprofit global venture fund that directs philanthropic contributions into debt and equity investments in early- to mid-stage enterprises serving low-income communities. Its investment areas include agriculture, education, energy, health, housing, and water. The model links social intent to a business proposition: investees must address a critical need, offer a service or product with a plausible advantage over existing alternatives, and demonstrate a path toward financial sustainability and scale.

The case illustrates how patient capital can bridge the gap between grant funding and conventional venture finance. A longer investment horizon allows an enterprise to build markets and delivery capacity. The investor's role can extend beyond providing funds to due diligence, management support, and long-term relationships. The thesis also emphasizes Acumen's attention to leadership and ethical conduct, alongside financial and operational expertise. These practices suggest that impact performance depends not only on selecting a sector associated with social need but also on the investee's business model, governance, and ability to serve intended beneficiaries.

The case also reveals a measurement challenge. Acumen combines quantitative indicators with qualitative accounts because changes in living standards and dignity cannot always be captured through a single numerical measure. This approach is consistent with the

view that impact data should guide learning and decision-making while remaining attentive to what affected communities value. The thesis-reported portfolio figures are not date-stamped consistently, so they are not repeated here as current outcomes.

4.4 234Give: crowdfunding and the infrastructure of trust

234Give is described in the thesis as an online crowdfunding platform founded in Nigeria to connect charities, individual fundraisers, and donors. Its model addresses barriers that can constrain charitable giving: limited visibility of nonprofit projects, difficult fundraising processes, and donor uncertainty about how contributions are used. Online presentation and payment tools can reduce transaction friction and widen access to potential donors.

The case helps distinguish crowdfunding from impact investing in the narrower investment sense. A donation through a crowdfunding platform may have a social purpose but does not ordinarily provide a financial return to the donor. It is therefore better understood as a digital philanthropic mechanism, unless a platform structures repayable or return-bearing finance. The case remains relevant because it shows how digital infrastructure can support transparency, participation, and resource mobilization around social projects. Its credibility depends on verification, secure transactions, clear use-of-funds information, and follow-up reporting on results.

Together, Acumen and 234Give illustrate complementary but distinct channels. Acumen deploys patient investment capital into enterprises expected to generate both financial and social returns. 234Give aggregates donations for charitable activities and may help broaden the donor base. Their common emphasis on social purpose should not obscure their different capital structures, return expectations, or accountability requirements.

5. Discussion

The synthesis reinforces that impact investing is not adequately defined by the label attached to a fund or business. It is a practice in which impact intent is explicit and connected

to decisions about capital allocation, investee selection, engagement, and performance management. The GIIN's core characteristics provide a useful test of that practice: Is the intended contribution clear? Is evidence used in investment design? Is impact performance managed over time? Does the approach support credible market development? (GIIN, 2019).

The first implication concerns the relationship between impact and financial return. The field accommodates different return expectations, and that flexibility can mobilize capital from investors with different mandates. But flexibility also creates room for ambiguity. Funds should disclose whether they target market-rate, below-market, or capital-preservation returns; how they define success; and what trade-offs they are prepared to accept. Such disclosure enables investors and investees to judge whether a proposed financing arrangement is coherent with the enterprise's mission and operating realities.

The second implication concerns impact measurement. Measurement should function as a management system, not as a communications layer added after investment. An investment thesis should identify the problem, target population, mechanism of contribution, relevant outcomes, and plausible risks of harm. Monitoring can then combine common indicators with context-sensitive measures and beneficiary feedback. Where attribution is uncertain, investors should report contribution rather than claim sole causation. Where results are not achieved, the organization should explain how it will adapt.

The third implication concerns market sizing. Early extrapolations based on a small, rated subset may help frame a developing field, but they are highly sensitive to assumptions. The thesis's US$40 billion estimate follows from treating rated-company revenue as a proxy for a portion of total market activity. That proxy may be useful as an illustration, but it does not measure investment assets directly. Contemporary estimates using wider investor coverage are more suitable for describing present market scale. Researchers should avoid presenting

estimates across different years and methods as if they were a continuous, directly comparable series.

The cases also demonstrate the importance of distinguishing investment from adjacent forms of social finance. A charitable donation, a concessionary loan, and a market-rate equity investment can all support social objectives, but their accountability relationships differ. Donors usually expect stewardship and evidence of use; lenders expect repayment and may also assess impact; equity investors expect financial performance and may influence governance. A clear taxonomy helps practitioners choose instruments that fit the enterprise's revenue model and intended outcome rather than forcing every initiative into an "impact investment" category.

Finally, the cases point to a broader institutional condition: trust. Patient-capital relationships require credible information and governance, while online crowdfunding depends on platform reliability and transparency. Shared standards, third-party assurance, and accessible reporting can reduce information asymmetry, but they cannot substitute for meaningful engagement with the people affected by an investment. Accountability must be directed both upward to capital providers and outward to communities and beneficiaries.

6. Practical implications

For investors, impact objectives should be defined before capital is deployed and translated into due-diligence questions, portfolio support, and monitoring plans. Investment committees should consider both financial viability and the risks of mission drift. Investors should disclose return targets, time horizons, intended beneficiaries, material assumptions, and the limits of impact attribution.

For social enterprises, financing terms should reflect the time and resources required to reach underserved groups. Management teams should be able to explain how revenue generation supports, or could conflict with, the mission. Governance arrangements can protect

the mission through board oversight, investor covenants, stakeholder consultation, and transparent reporting.

For platforms and intermediaries, verification of fundraisers or investees, secure payment systems, and timely reporting are essential. Digital tools may lower access barriers, but they also make it easier for misleading claims to travel quickly. Intermediaries should make clear whether a contribution is a donation, loan, or investment and what financial or impact information contributors can expect.

For policymakers and standard-setting bodies, a proportionate approach is needed. Shared definitions and indicators can improve comparability, while excessive reporting burdens can disadvantage smaller organizations. Public policy can support the quality of the market by strengthening disclosure, investor protection, impact-management capabilities, and access to technical assistance.

7. Limitations and future research

This synthesis inherits important limitations from its source material. The thesis does not document a systematic literature search, a reproducible case-selection procedure, or a complete database of the GIIRS observations. The reported company revenue total and the assumed 5%–15% coverage share cannot be independently re-estimated from the information presented. The case descriptions are illustrative and are not comparative evaluations of organizational effectiveness. Consequently, the article supports conceptual and methodological conclusions but not causal claims about the effect of impact investing on social outcomes or financial performance.

The GIIRS evidence is historical. Its value lies in showing how early market participants attempted to construct shared ratings and analytics, not in describing the present industry. Future work could examine how impact measurement systems have evolved, compare investor-reported outcomes with independent or beneficiary-reported evidence, and assess

whether impact objectives remain embedded as enterprises scale. Comparative studies could also investigate how patient capital affects organizational survival, service affordability, and outcomes across sectors and geographies.

Further research should distinguish capital committed, capital deployed, investee revenue, and assets under management. Market estimates should disclose the population covered, inclusion criteria, data sources, treatment of double counting, and uncertainty ranges. At the organizational level, longitudinal research could explore how different financing structures influence mission integrity and the distribution of benefits among investors, enterprises, workers, and service users.

8. Conclusion

Impact investing offers a way to mobilize investment capital toward social and environmental objectives while retaining an expectation of financial return. The field's diversity of investors, instruments, sectors, and return profiles is a source of flexibility, but it also demands clear disclosure and credible impact management. Intentionality, evidence-informed investment design, continuing performance management, and accountability to affected stakeholders distinguish impact investing from a broad aspiration to "do good."

The historical GIIRS analysis and the Acumen and 234Give cases illustrate the early infrastructure and institutional experimentation that shaped the field. They also show why market statistics and organizational claims require careful interpretation. The thesis's approximately US$40 billion market estimate is assumption-dependent and should be treated as a historical illustration, while current estimates use different and broader methods. Acumen demonstrates patient investment in social enterprises; 234Give demonstrates digital donation-based fundraising. Both show how finance and technology can support social goals, but they operate through different financial relationships.

Ultimately, the strength of impact investing depends less on the label than on the alignment between capital, mission, governance, and evidence. Investors and intermediaries can strengthen that alignment by stating objectives clearly, measuring what is relevant, reporting uncertainty honestly, and adapting when outcomes fall short.

References

B Lab. (2012). GIIRS quarterly analytics report: Q3 2012. GIIRS Ratings & Analytics. https://www.truevaluemetrics.org/DBpdfs/Metrics/GIIRS/giirs-analytics-benchmarking-q3-2012.pdf

Ebrahim, A., & Rangan, V. K. (2014). What impact? A framework for measuring the scale and scope of social performance. California Management Review, 56(3), 118–141. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2014.56.3.118

Freireich, J., & Fulton, K. (2009). Investing for social and environmental impact: A design for catalyzing an emerging industry. Monitor Institute. https://thegiin.org/publication/research/investing-for-social-and-environmental-impact/

Global Impact Investing Network. (2019). Core characteristics of impact investing. https://thegiin.org/publication/post/core-characteristics-of-impact-investing/

Hand, D., Ulanow, M., Pan, H., & Xiao, K. (2024). Sizing the impact investing market 2024. Global Impact Investing Network. https://thegiin.org/publication/research/sizing-the-impact-investing-market-2024/

Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. Journal of World Business, 41(1), 36–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002

Nicholls, A. (2009). "We do good things, don't we?": "Blended value accounting" in social entrepreneurship. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 34(6–7), 755–769. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2009.04.008

O'Donohoe, N., Leijonhufvud, C., Saltuk, Y., Bugg-Levine, A., & Brandenburg, M. (2010). Impact investments: An emerging asset class. J.P. Morgan Global Research, Rockefeller Foundation, and Global Impact Investing Network.