

Decoding the ‘Social DNA’: A Qualitative Exploration of Consumer Intentions in Support of Social Enterprises

Lidia-Amelia Frunză¹, Amalia Georgescu², Adriana Manolica³ and George-Cristian Nistor³

¹⁾³⁾⁴⁾ Al. Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Iași, Romania.

²⁾ Gheorghe Asachi Technical University of Iași, Iași, Romania.

E-mail: amelia.vatamaniuc@gmail.com; E-mail: amalia.georgescu@academic.tuiasi.ro;

E-mail: manolica@uaic.ro; E-mail: george.nistor@uaic.ro;

Please cite this paper as:

Frunza, L. A., Georgescu, A., Manolica, A. & Nistor, G.C. (2026). Decoding the ‘Social Dna’: A Qualitative Exploration of Consumer Intentions in Support of Social Enterprises. In C. Vasiliu, D.-C. Dabija, A. Tziner, D. Pleșea, & V. Dinu (Eds.), *Proceedings of BASIQ International Conference on New Trends in Sustainable Business and Consumption, 12th Edition* (pp. 495-503). Editura ASE. DOI 10.24818/BASIQ/2026/12/074

Abstract

This paper explores the factors which influence the intention of the consumers in supporting social enterprises in an emergent market resulted from a qualitative methodology based on semi structured interviews with experts from social economy in Romania. The result of this study reveals the existence of a specific persona of the consumer with a social DNA and high emotional intelligence, high degree of empathy and developed human skills which is characterized by a certain level of academic studied and strong prosocial values. This research identifies dual motivations: the B2C segment is led massively by solidarity and belongingness to community and the B2B segment is motivated by financial pragmatism and legal concerns. The major identified barriers of the SE (social enterprise) consumer include the conceptual confusion arising from associating the social dimension of the enterprises to social work, price sensitivity and the stigma of low quality. The articles conclude that investing in communication of the brand, the story and the activities of the social business by offering radical transparency in it can be a new key to success in transforming the occasional support of SE in recurrent consumption behaviour.

Keywords

Social economy; consumer behaviour; social economy segment; social DNA; social enterprise consumer

DOI: 10.24818/BASIQ/2026/12/074

Introduction

In the evolving stage of the social economy sector, we identify a specific type of buyer defined by what experts call the 'Social DNA'. This is not a mere preference for eco-friendly labels, but it is a profound internal mapping of values that prioritizes community health, businesses friendly with the human being as well as sustainable impact (Achiței, 2021) over the traditional metrics of price and status. For this consumer, a purchase is a strategic act of energy transfer: they believe that where they spend their money, they feed the growth of that ecosystem, generating both market and social value (Emerson, 2003). This reflects how businesses involved in the community as social enterprises gain more attention and grow as a real part of the business ecosystem.

The social enterprise consumer represents more than just a new entity, but a fundamental shift from traditional charity or business to social business support. While charity is often a reactive, like the one-time gesture of a donation, social business support is a proactive investment in a sustainable model that impacts the community and vulnerable groups. The social economy sector seeks to move away from the aggressive, profit-only view of businesses found within classical capitalism, a phenomenon clothed in the Romanian context as the corporate pressure. Hence, a shift came into view: consumers preferred to support enterprises that solve problems through commerce instead of focusing on generating a higher revenue.

Social enterprises originally appeared in Europe in the 1990s when it was observed that neither non-profit organizations like NGOs nor private firms were able to cover the diverse social needs of their communities. However, in Romania the social economy law was published in 2015. These social enterprises are defined as organizations that implement a revenue-generating business model which helps them generate income while supporting social causes, such as promoting environmental protection, creating jobs for people in vulnerable categories (Crutchfield & Peterson, 2016), or even reinvesting generated profits to solve long-term social problems. Experts from our research even suggest that supporting these types of enterprises creates a “virtuous circle” or “the circle of social trust” since solving social issues diminishes pressure on the public budget, allowing those funds to be redirected toward infrastructure or other communal advantage.

In the “virtuous circle” the SE consumer plays a big role, but unfortunately with less emphasis than expected in academic studies. Gupta et al. found in his complex research that most of the scientific articles published on the social economy concerns have focused heavily on solving social problems from an operational and managerial perspective. However, the subject of consumers in the social economy sector remains less addressed in the specialized literature, becoming a harder topic to comprehend or explain nowadays (Tsai et al., 2020).

In contrast, consumers face various challenges in understanding the concept of social enterprise. Most studies affirm that such enterprises are perceived as organizations with an exclusively social mission (Tsai et al., 2020), although they naturally have an economic mission and generate income. Therefore, since consumers are unable to gain an appreciation for what social enterprises represent as well as their functions within the community, they don't support SE through their funds.

Accordingly, this is the reason why our qualitative study has focused on SE consumer and its characteristics, while trying to decode their ‘Social DNA’ and their intention to support social businesses.

1. Literature review

One of the first theories that we have encountered in literature which analyses the intention of the consumer is the Planned Behaviour Theory (PBT) defined by Ajzen & Fishbein in 1975 and updated later, in 2011. Starting from social norms, attitude and perceived behavioural control we managed to trace a direction in this research in terms of a schematic model. The background factors identified in their model also turned out to be a guiding map in the interview we conducted by helping in structuring the questions addressed to the sample.

Moreover, we found additional theories, models and scales regarding the socially responsible consumers which were of great value in building this research by guiding our representation of the characteristics and potential variables of the consumer with ‘Social DNA’ and by validating the data gathered through the interviews. One of the most relevant scales for us was the Socially Responsible Consumer Behaviour (SRCB) scale, which is a model developed by James A. Roberts back in 1995. It analyses consumer behaviour in relation to the social and environmental challenges displayed in society. The developed scale served as a guide for analysing to what extent and how consumers consider these various issues, especially, in our case, when wishing to buy from social enterprises. The first issue refers to purchases from different companies based on their “social responsibility performance,” which evaluates consumer preferences for brands that prove to be humane and demonstrate socially responsible behaviour. The second issue is focusing on consumers recycling habits, through which it is “measured” how often they engage in such activities and to what extent are they part of their consumption behaviour (Roberts, 1995). A third key issue discussed in this scale, highlights the compromise that consumers may reach to engage in socially responsible purchases at the expense of traditional ones. Thus, the model outlines various variables that help balance conventional purchasing factors (such as price and quality) with those related to the ethical component. Another pillar of Roberts’ model focuses on identifying the extent to which consumers avoid purchasing products that are harmful to society and the environment, namely products that have a negative impact upon it. This scale offered direction when drafting the interview guide as to have a proper foundation for our qualitative study.

There were many other models studied which helped us in mapping the “Social DNA” concept and research, thus some variables from it were key takeaways in creating a baseline for our interviews. For example, prosocial values (like altruism, empathy and solidarity) became important key takeaways as they were mentioned in important & relevant studies written by Quazi et al. (2015) in the Consumer Social Responsibility Model (CnSR), by Webb et al. (2008) thought the Socially Responsible Purchase and Disposal Model (SRDP) or by other relevant researchers like Duenas-Ocampo (2014) etc.

Therefore, the reference to a “Social DNA” among consumers reflect the idea the they posses deeply embedded social and moral values or other connected traits that impacts their behaviour, as understood from the models mentioned. In this context, our concept can be seen as a combination of empathy, community belonging, ethical awareness, collective responsibility and so on that influences or shapes consumers decisions on top of functional or economic factors. Although the term “Social DNA” may not be explicitly referenced in scholarly literature, the framework and associated research provide a valuable foundation for further analysis.

Even though the literature gave us a proper context for conducting research targeting the consumer of social enterprises or the consumer who tends to have a socially responsible behaviour, the complexity of “decoding the social DNA” of the consumer is not an easy task and still has its gaps. As Bray et al. (2011) mentioned that even “The definition of socially responsible consumer behaviour is not easy, because “evaluations” and differences tend to be subjective and complicated by circumstances”.

To have a better understanding of the social economy sector, we need to point out the challenges and barriers that may occur in its evolving phase. Besides the one mentioned briefly in previous paragraphs, the top 3 of the most mentioned challenges this sector in literature. The most outstanding challenge is by far the finical stability one. In one recent article it is stated that “among all challenges, funding for SE remains one of the top ones” (Ning et al., 2020). It is not a surprise that it’s a difficult task for social entrepreneurs to find a prosperous economic business model while struggling to solve a real social problem of the community they are part of, by addressing the needs of vulnerable groups. The second challenge of the SE is the “communication” chapter, as most of them fail to have a good and transparent marketing strategy as social entrepreneurs tend to focus more on the social or financial pillars, instead of creating a cohesive communication framework that later will generate more revenue, thus helping them maintain stability and maintain the jobs they create. The last challenge we are going to mention refers to the “social paradox” which will also be mentioned by the experts in the qualitative research. This is a metric which indicates that this field is novel and largely misunderstood (Tsai et al., 2020) in the market and this is pointed out by the lack of strong legislative model (Achiței, 2021) at international level (every country has its own definition and practices) which underpromotes social entrepreneurship and its awareness & growth.

2. Methodology

The methodology for this research involved a qualitative study by conducting eight semi-structured interviews with high-level experts in the field of social economy, each possessing a minimum of five years of professional experience. A significant number of these specialists were instrumental as promoters and architects of the Romanian Social Economy Law published in 2015, having been active in the sector since its early development in the 1990s and through the pivotal years of 2012–2013 (Achiței, 2021). The participants were rigorously selected based on their experience (minimum 3 year), profound knowledge of the domain and their dual perspective as both professionals and active consumers of social enterprises, frequently purchasing social products such as specialty coffee, artisanal goods etc. This qualitative phase represented one of the first stages of larger complex research on the topic of SE consumers, designed to validate and adapt theoretical variables from international literature to the specific to the socio-economic context of the study in the Romanian context. Initially, there was a number of 15 experts targeted to be part of this explorative study by following the Delphi framework, but only a part of them qualified in terms of either avalability for interview or years of experience and expertise in the social economy sector.

The interview guide used in this research was carefully constructed based on established theoretical frameworks from literature, specifically drawing on models used to analyse the socially responsible consumer as they are closer to the type of consumer we are circling around. By utilizing a robust foundation such as the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen), the guide seeks to analyse the variables that predict a consumer's intention to support social enterprises. It differentiates between general ethical consumption and the specific support for social businesses by incorporating unique metrics such as prosocial values (empathy, solidarity, and community belonging), level of awareness regarding social issues, and knowledge of the social economy. This structured approach serves as the qualitative precursor to a larger Delphi method study, allowing experts to validate and refine these theoretical variables to ensure they accurately reflect the specific socio-economic context and the unique “Social DNA” of the Romanian market.

The interviews were conducted online through digital platforms like Zoom and each interview was individually adapted to the participant's specific background, with sessions often exceeding one hour as to thoroughly explore the complexities of the interview guide. The experts were selected intentionally to

provide a multi-faceted perspective on the social economy, with each offering unique insights based on their specific area of mastery. The participants held diverse and influential positions, including: project managers involved in long-term social enterprise development, social enterprise managers who oversee large-scale production and B2B or B2C operations, academic lecturers specializing in business and sustainable value creation, founders and pioneers who acted as the original promoters of the Social Economy Law in Romania, supervisors of the implementation phase of SE startups and others. This diversity ensured that the analysis benefited from a holistic view of the sector, ranging from academic theory and legislative history to practical management and market competitiveness.

When it comes to the interview analysis and coding process, it is worth mentioning that they were transcribed to identify the common opinions and recurring themes among the experts regarding the social economy consumers. For valid results, the methodology entailed evaluating variables identified in existing literature against expert opinions to determine their relevance within our current context. In addition to these established concepts, the procedure also considered emergent themes and ideas from discussions that extended beyond theoretical frameworks. Additionally, to ensure validity, the results were analysed by 2 different researchers and the most frequently met themes which were identified after a content analysis were the following: the consumer behaviour of SE, its traits and segments, previous experiences or motivators impacting the intent to support SE, barriers of SE, key solutions to implement for a successful social enterprise and so on.

3. Results and discussion

One of the most important insights illustrates that social economy in Romania is undergoing a critical shift from charitable activities to professionalized business models. At the heart of this transformation lays a specific type of supporter: the “Social DNA” consumer. This consumer is not merely a buyer but a value-driven individual whose purchasing decisions are dictated by a blend of emotional intelligence and civic responsibility.

The Portrait of the “Social DNA” consumer was painted in our interviews by experts in a very meticulous way. Professionals across the sector define the typical persona of a supporter through consistent socio-demographic and psychographic data. This consumer is generally highly educated; most experts mention a minimum of a university degree and typically resides in urban environments. The age range is concentrated between 30 and 35 years old, a demographic often described as “open-minded” and attached to local community values. The table below presents a structured summary of the demographic data gathered on the SE consumer segment, derived from the data obtained, Table no. 1.

Table no. 1. Demographic data on the consumer with 'Social DNA' segment

Trait	Data Point from Experts
Age	Typically, 25–50 years old (Core: 30–45)
Education	Higher Education (University degree)
Gender	Predominantly Female
Economic Status	Stable Income (Medium to above average)
Market Sector	B2C (Individual) & B2B (Corporate)
Location	Urban areas

Beyond demographics, the “Social DNA” refers to a set of internal traits like high emotional intelligence which one of the experts defined as supporters having a cognitive and emotional intelligence above average, allowing them to perceive the impact of their consumption on others. Another internal trait resulted from the analysis of the interviews refers to prosocial values; therefore, the consumers of SE products or services are characterized by empathy, solidarity, and a sense of belonging to the community. Last, but not the least, sense-seeking consumption refers in our study to corporate professionals who seek meaning in their consumption as a response to the ultra-corporate lifestyle which is seen as a pressure that blindsides people by focusing just on economic results, numbers and productivity.

To effectively target and engage this audience, social entrepreneurs must understand that SE consumer persona is defined by stability and the cognitive capacity to grasp complex value chains, more than just looking at demographic data. This set of information gathered and presented is relevant because it allows us, as experts or practitioners, to have a better understating upon who is the socially minded consumer.

Moreover, in social entrepreneurship education, experts interviewed emphasize one important concept: that higher education is a functional requirement for this consumer with *Social DNA*. The reason behind this is

that such business model is intellectually demanding and harder to understand than other typical ones. Firstly, it requires the consumer to reject the charity paradox, which is the mistaken belief that if an enterprise has a “social” seal, its products should be free or very cheap. Secondly, it requires the consumers to possess the cognitive tools and skills to understand how a slightly higher price point today prevents a higher tax burden tomorrow by keeping vulnerable groups employed and involved in the community, as many SE recruit in their team intentionally these types of categories to help in covering their needs.

In the research conducted there were notices that there is an internal engine of the consumer with Social DNA, composed of *four primary psychological pillars*. The first one already briefly mentioned in this article refers to skills like solidarity or empathy. Experts agree that social consumers must be empathetic toward others. The most experienced expert mentioned more than 10 times that this consumer possesses a high *Emotional IQ* and needs it to understand the way social businesses help the community and the environment they are part of. In consequence, this is why the consumption from local businesses is strongly rooted in the habits of social DNA consumer.

Moreover, their sense of duty extends beyond local borders to include Fair Trade and ethical supply chains. They are concerned with whether a product involves exploited labour, and this is why the second pillar talks about Solidarity & Social Responsibility at broader levels.

Another pillar of the “Social DNA” is composed of sense of community belonging. Consumer exhibiting this mindset strive to join a *Circle of Social Trust*, as this is a space where transactions are transparent, and the buyer feels part of a community that generates impact, where helping the community ultimately protects the self.

Last pillar resulted from the analysis of the interviews points once again the rejection of *profit exclusively models*. Consumer looking for social products or services are many times exhausted by the corporate-driven pressure of traditional capitalist marketing that treats them as a mere source of revenue generation. They seek a slower, more intentional transaction. This is one of the reasons why the *slow living* trends has been rising recently, which is explained as “response to globalization and accelerated modern life, linking pleasure, ethics and everyday practices” (Parkins & Craig, 2006).

After a thorough analysis of the data gathered, we can see that intention to support social enterprises is driven by three main distinct sets of factors, depending on the type of the consumer. If we would focus on the B2C consumer, we can mention two sets of factors: *subjective motivations* and *objective & rational motivations*. The first set that resulted from the interviews refer to the internal need to help and get the feeling of a real personal contribution to solving a problem of the community they are part of. The experts that mentioned this type of subjective motivations also pointed out that often these can be triggered by personal previous experience such as having a family member which is part of a vulnerable group, for example having a relative with a form of disability. Some other experts mentioned frequently that previous experience in volunteering or getting involved in community initiatives can impact positively the intention of the consumers to support social enterprises.

The second set of motivations mentioned refers to objectives and rational ones. Experts say day educated consumers understand that social enterprises create a “virtuous circle”, as one of the respondents defines it. She described that this term refers to a macroeconomic and social mechanism where the success of a social enterprise creates a self-sustaining loop of benefits for both the individual and the state by solving social problems and diminishing the financial pressure on the government. By integrating vulnerable groups into the economy system, social enterprises help in saving the money they would spend on social assistance or other social services. Therefore, these funds can be redirected towards infrastructure, education or any other community benefits.

The third sets of SE consumer motivations talk about the Business-to-Business (B2B) shift toward fiscal facilities (e.g. Law 448/2006 in Romania regarding protected units) and operational safety. For business or corporate clients, the social mission of a SE is considered to be a bonus or a legal requirement when the company has more than 50 employees (as in the Romanian context there is a disability tax which requires companies to either buy goods or services from the social economy sector, or have 1 employee with disabilities).

By analysing the data, we have noticed that despite the positive profile of the SE consumer resulted from the interviews, several systemic barriers are considered hinder the growth of social consumption and the intention to support SE. One of the most major hurdles is the confusion between the social economy and social assistance. The term “social” is often associated exclusively with social work of NGOs poverty, charity, or giving it away for free, rather than creative competitive business model. As other scholar previously mentioned, concepts of social entrepreneurship have been narrowly understood (Petrescu & Lambur, 2020), in consequence, the confusion is still ongoing.

The second most mentioned barrier that exists between the SE consumer and its intention to support social businesses is represented by the price. Usually, the selling prices of social products or services is higher than the ones from classical businesses as the labour force is more costly. On top of that, in many circumstances, the materials used are more expensive as social enterprises look for suitable solutions on long terms which may lead to more mission-driven expenses being involved in the manufacturing process. One of the respondents who is managing a social enterprise claimed the following statements: *“I think that's the most important barrier, and for some the only one: the price. Usually, social enterprises have higher costs and obviously that's reflected in a higher price.”* Other experts mentioned that the Romanian consumers exhibit a “Balkan sensitivity” to the price, especially for consumers goods, which he defined as the reluctance to buy from a SE is that the price point is significantly higher than other alternatives on the market. What needs to be heightened about this barrier is that all the experts mentioned that the price sensitivity is higher for the consumers with limited budgets due to middle to low income. “Even when people support the idea of SE and would like to purchase their products or services, the affordability can be a limiting factor”, one expert mentioned.

Another limitation in terms of supporting social business would be one regarding the quality perception gap and the information gap. Not only there is a lingering prejudice that social products are the result of a vocational therapy and thus lower quality, but there is also a reluctance in terms of the trust people offer to social initiatives. All the participants of this study mentioned the trust gap at least twice in every interview, which underlines its importance in reports, communication and decision-making processes. The trust factor is validated by scholarly literature in social economy and indicates the degree to which an organization conveys its social mission, as well as its effectiveness influences consumer trust and purchasing behaviour (Chew & Osborne, 2009), in consequence the correction mentioned in Table no 2 is a strong solution to the trust gap.

In terms of the visibility of social enterprises, there is an obvious gap, and this is why its concept was not yet understood correctly by consumers, experts say. Moreover, the limited visibility of SE and the low communication capacity create a boundary between the market and the social economy sector. Many times, social entrepreneurs tend to focus all their efforts on generating social and economic value but fail to present themselves to other stakeholders and raise brand awareness. Many of them focus their energy on social mission, as this is frequently perceived more important and of greater impact. Another stop sign is placed on the funnel by weak storytelling as a low percentage of social entrepreneurs allocate budgets on creating marketing strategies and a good, practical solution to it will be presented in Table no 2.

While trying to decode not only the Social DNA Consumer, but the barriers in the sector, we can notice an important question that needs to be raised: Why Social Consumers Hesitate to support SE? There are certain roadblocks that occur and this is why social entrepreneurs need to address and correct them: especially their marketing teams must address these systematically. As illustrated in the table below, there are few proposed solutions given, which may be perceived as a practical implication of the findings.

Table no 2. Consumer Barriers vs. Strategic Corrections

Barrier Type	The Reality / Necessary Correction
The Charity Paradox	The misconception that “Social = Charity” Correction: Position the enterprise as a professional business. Use marketing to show that “Charity is a gift, but Social Business is a contract of quality”.
Price Sensitivity	While educated, these consumers still live in a “Balkan context” where price sensitivity is high. Correction: Shift the focus from “cost” to “social dividend”. Explain exactly why the product costs more (e.g., Fair Trade sourcing, ethical wages).
The Information or Trust Gap	Suspicion toward new businesses. Correction: Provide “Proof of Impact”. Consumers need to see physical infrastructure (professional offices, machines, production lines) to trust that the business is real and not a charity scam.
Visibility Gap	Social enterprises often fail to be “vocal”. Correction: Use digital marketing to build a “Circle of Trust” via transparency, traceability, and high-quality storytelling.

3.5. Solutions to implement the Strategic Corrections

Another practical implication when targeting the ‘Social DNA’ consumer can be going through the following checklist which we will call key requirements for targeting the social DNA audience checklist. This tool proposed to be a help for researchers and social entrepreneurs. For the people looking to apply these insights, we put forward the following 5-point strategic stages.

Key requirements for targeting the social DNA audience checklist:

- Communicate the Story (The 'Why'): Focus on the specific social problem you are solving. Use emotional IQ to connect with the consumer's empathy.
- Ensure Professionalism (The 'What'): Prove you are not an “apartment firm”. Show your machines, your offices, and your professional standards. Quality must be the baseline, not a social story.
- Build Transparency (The 'How'): Close the “Trust Gap” with real data. Provide traceability for how every cent contributes to the “Circle of Social Trust”.
- Target Urban/ Educated Hubs (The 'Where'): Tailor your message to those with the educational background to understand the impact of SE model.
- Foster the Circle (The 'Who'): Invite the consumer into a community. Make them feel they are part of a movement that rejects “profit only” view in favour of solidarity.

Setting up a developing stage for the social economy sector depends on the public sector and on entrepreneurs, but also on the power of the Social DNA consumer: the socially minded buyer who understands that every purchase and transaction is a vote and leaves a footprint on the kind of world they would like to inhabit, thus impacting the community they are part of.

To close the result and discussion section the proper way, it is important to mention that recent studies do not contradict the outcomes of our findings but validate the result by stating that social enterprises have a higher degree of success by blending social mission with innovative strategies (Nagy, 2024). In our case the key requirements and the corrections offered by the experts in the table no 2 foster collaboration and focus on consumers engagement, as Nagy suggested. However, even if some topics are clear in terms of the social economy sector what Saebi, Foss & Linder (2019) affirmed years ago is still true: *the social entrepreneurship subject remains inconclusive* and the institutional support or legislative support is still limited (Nagy, 2024 & Achiței, 2021) and this affects greatly the consumer behaviour.

4. Limitations and future research directions

The primary limitation of this explorative study, regarding the social economy consumer, is represented by the small sample size, although it was intentionally selective due to the Delphi methodology. Therefore, by including more experts in the research it could benefit in terms of validating the current data or enriching the perspectives.

While coding and validation procedures were implemented to ensure reliability, the extraction and interpretation of themes such as “Social DNA” or “Circle of Social Trust” could be considered context-dependent and influenced by the interpretation of the team of researchers. Moreover, another limitation would concern the contextual specificity of the findings as the study focused itself on a Romanian setting. Consequently, some results are bound to the Romanian social enterprise ecosystem.

Additionally, the research concentrated on experts' opinion rather than consumer data and a quantitative consumer-based study would be a good further step in the future, as to capture all the necessary data to have more substantial results. The next step for future research directions could also be cross-cultural research to examine what model, variables or determinants are transferrable to other national environments. Obtaining more extensive and vigorous data could benefit not only the academics, but also social entrepreneurs or experts who are engaged in lobby and advocacy efforts to set a more proper legislative framework of the sector.

This data could be a starting point to encourage the development of the social economy sector by pressuring the government to adapt laws that benefit more the social enterprises in the country. As the current results point out that the consumers are not familiar with the SE products or services, strategic actions like implementing social economy curricula in schools and universities or running national awareness campaigns could benefit the growth of the sector but also encourage the Romanian market to have a more sustainable consumption.

Even at this exploratory stage, the research highlights the need for institutional support structures capable of fostering the long-term sustainability of social enterprises. Implementing a legal framework at national level with more numerous support measures, such as tax deduction or incentives for both consumers or social enterprises could benefit the sector and reflect a higher level of policy maturity and enhance visibility, sustainability and impact of social entity, according to the report on *Social Economy in Europe* (2025) by OECD.

Conclusions

The research into the social economy consumer reveals that the ‘Social DNA’ consumer is not merely a demographic segment but a representative of a burgeoning shift toward value-based consumption. On the other side, social enterprises should adapt their outcomes and activities to the market to be competitive and relevant despite the low awareness level of the field.

An important insight to remember is that the social mission and its story does not sell on its own and long-term support intentions are only secured when the social mission is backed by competitive quality, transparency, and a professional business approach going beyond the conceptual confusion.

A critical takeaway from the study is the “Virtuous Circle” or “Circle of Social Trust” which could be further developed. Trust is the currency of the social economy, and it is built through the synergy of authentic communication, verified impact, and the powerful influence of trusted personal networks.

In conclusion, the growth of the social economy in Romania depends on a dual effort: national-level education to redefine the social label for the public, and the professionalization of social entrepreneurs who must act as credible business leaders, not as philanthropists. By aligning with the values of the “Social DNA” consumer, these SE can create a self-sustaining cycle that not only resolves immediate social needs but also reduces pressure on the public budget.

Acknowledgement

Many thanks to Angela Achiței for providing valuable insights on social economy consumer and contributing to a part of the title of this article.

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) usage statement:

ChatGPT (version 5.0) was responsibly used for language improvement and restructuring information. After this process, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the present article.

References

- Achiței, A. (2021). Dimensiuni ale antreprenoriatului social în România și Republica Moldova. *Revista Economia Socială*, (1), 4–13. <https://aapir.usm.md/s/iap/item/88>.
- Bray, J. P., Johns, N., & Kilburn, D. (2011). An exploratory study into the factors impeding ethical consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(4), 597–608. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0640-9>.
- Chew, C., & Osborne, S. P. (2009). Exploring strategic positioning in the UK charitable sector: Emerging evidence from charitable organizations that provide public services. *British Journal of Management*, 20(1), 90–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00554.x>
- Crutchfield, L. R., & Peterson, J. (2016). *Social enterprise: A new model for social change*. In L. R. Crutchfield, J. Kania, & M. Kramer (Eds.), *Forces for good: The six practices of high-impact nonprofits* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Duenas-Ocampo, S., Perdomo-Ortiz, J., & Villa Castaño, L. E. (2014). The concept of socially responsible consumption and its measurement: A literature review. *Estudios Gerenciales*, 30(132), 287–300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.estger.2014.01.022>.
- Emerson, J. (2003). The blended value proposition: Integrating social and financial returns. *California Management Review*, 45(4), 35–51. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166187>.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2011) *Predicting and Changing Behavior: The Reasoned Action Approach*. New York: Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203838020>.
- Gupta, P., Chauhan, S., Paul, J. & Jaiswal, M.P. (2020) ‘Social entrepreneurship research: A review and future research agenda’, *Journal of Business Research*, 113, pp. 209–229.
- Lecompte, G., & Roberts, J. A. (2006). The role of personal values in socially responsible consumption: A study of the French market. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30(3), 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2006.00492.x>.
- Ning, L., Zailani, S., & Rahman, M. (2020). Determinants of customer intention to purchase social enterprise products: A structural model analysis. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2020.1718742>.

- Nagy, S. (2024). Consumer behavior in relation to social enterprises and organizations implementing social innovation. *Bulletin of the National Technical University Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute (Economic Sciences)*, 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.20998/2519-4461.2024.3.93>
- OECD/European Union. (2025). Social economy in Europe: Contributing to competitiveness and prosperity. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/3432de93-en>
- Petrescu, C., & Lambru, M. (2020). Exploring the role of social enterprises within the Romanian welfare system. *Calitatea Vieții*, 31(1), 24–45. <https://doi.org/10.46841/RCV.2020.01.03>
- Quazi, A., Amran, A., & Nejati, M. (2015). Conceptualizing and measuring consumer social responsibility: A neglected aspect of consumer research. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 39(2), 185–191.
- Roberts, James. (1995). Profiling Levels of Socially Responsible Consumer Behavior: A Cluster Analytic Approach and Its Implications for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*. 3. 97-117. 10.1080/10696679.1995.11501709.
- Saebi, T., Foss, N. J. & Linder, S. (2019). Social entrepreneurship research: past achievements and future promises. *Journal of Management*, 45(1). 70-95.
- Tsai, J.-M., Hung, S.-W., & Yang, T.-T. (2020). In pursuit of goodwill? The cross-level effects of social enterprise consumer behaviours. *Journal of Business Research*, 109, 350–361. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.051>.
- Webb, D. J., Mohr, L. A., & Harris, K. E. (2008). A re-examination of socially responsible consumption and its measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(2), 91–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.06.002>.
- Parkins, W., & Craig, G. (2006). *Slow living* (1 ed.). Oxford International Publishers Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350044890>.
- Petrescu, C., & Lambru, M. (2020). Introduction: Social and Solidarity Economy – Challenges and Perspective for Sustainable Development. *Calitatea Vieții*, 31(1), 3–4. <https://doi.org/10.46841/RCV.2020.01.01>.