

## Social Entrepreneurship Education in Ghana

Ebenezer Rexford Amankwah<sup>1</sup>, Marian Cudjoe Miller<sup>2</sup>

DOI: [10.29180/978-615-6342-86-7\\_2](https://doi.org/10.29180/978-615-6342-86-7_2)

### ABSTRACT

The growing socio-economic issues that significant portions of the populace face in Ghana are not being addressed by the political, social, and economic institutions that are supposed to guarantee the fundamental rights and necessities of every member of the public. According to several studies, giving students' entrepreneurship education increases their ability to start new businesses, which has an impact on society's economy (Mars, Slaughter, & Rhoades, 2008). The study of entrepreneurship is one of the subjects in education that is expanding the quickest in the world, but many academics have noted that there is a lack of agreement and focused attention in the areas of "what" and "how" to teach in these programs. The authors contend that, despite significant advancements, social entrepreneurship (SE) is not sufficiently taught in Ghanaian schools and that, in part, this may be remedied by including SE instruction in the preservice educator curriculum. The purpose of this article is to give a review of common and best practices for tertiary-level entrepreneurship curriculum material and teaching methodologies, as well as to investigate the relationships between these practices and guidelines. We found that many of these companies have moved from the collaboration phase to the exploration phase and now have many social (and environmental) organizations involved in their policies, operations and management, and sometimes their product lines and business models. Educational and research materials from SAP and Credit Suisse, as well as E4impact and Miller Academy, provide training and support to entrepreneurs and businesses at various stages of development. The research cited here contains 'strategic' research data (from academic and policy organisations).

**Keywords:** Social Entrepreneurship, Ghana, Teaching, Higher Education

---

<sup>1</sup> Ebenezer Rexford Amankwah, Researcher, Budapest Business University, e-mail [luckytrustman@yahoo.com](mailto:luckytrustman@yahoo.com)

<sup>2</sup> Marian Cudjoe Miller, Livingstone International University of Tourism Excellence and Business Management, Public Health and Nutrition Department, e-mail: [mcmiller800@gmail.com](mailto:mcmiller800@gmail.com)

## **Introduction**

Ghana's historically underprivileged populations, and particularly the majority of their youth, have faced a plethora of socio-economic challenges, such as unequal access to education, discrimination based on culture, and rising rates of unemployment. Additionally, research indicates that teaching students about entrepreneurship enhanced their ability to start new businesses and social projects in the marketplace (Mars et al., 2008; Timmons & Spinelli, 2004). As a result, education is a major factor in entrepreneurial activity. Future educators would be better able to support the development of SE in schools if they had the knowledge and abilities necessary to function as mentors for social entrepreneurs. Furthermore, it would help the growth of society if educators could foster a feeling of social responsibility through entrepreneurial activity.

Concentrating on education science inquiries may help create successful SE programs that align with entrepreneurial learning practices (Jones, 2010) and can be tailored to the financial and schedule limitations of higher education establishments (Vincett & Farlow, 2008). This article attempts to offer a thorough roadmap of standard and optimal approaches for teaching social entrepreneurship at the tertiary level, both in terms of curricular material and instructional strategies.

The course material and entrepreneurship teaching methodology (Solomon, 2007) require a more thorough explanation to support the pursuit of identifying the top EE program practices (Jones & Matlay, 2011) instructing "for" entrepreneurship programs. The curriculum content of this topic uses skills-based methods to teach pupils about the inner workings of a corporation (Bennett, 2006). This paper examines social entrepreneurship education in general, its advantages, and potential suggestions for Ghanaian stakeholders.

### **This study will seek to answer the following research questions.**

1. Does Ghana have social entrepreneurship education in its national curriculum?
2. What is the structure and duration of the curriculum of social entrepreneurship courses?
3. How has social entrepreneurship solved unemployment in Ghana?

By answering these questions, we will seek to contribute to the limited study of social entrepreneurship in Ghana.

## **Literature review**

### **The effect of the African Sub-Saharan Environment on Social Entrepreneurship**

Researchers studying social entrepreneurship appear to have a particular interest in the sub-Saharan African area. Numerous social and economic issues arise, generating demands that may present chances for businesses with some social objectives. These endeavours can take many different forms, from profit-driven commercial business models that target niche markets to more socially conscious initiatives that address the acute needs of marginalized communities, extreme poverty, institutional gaps, and vulnerable environmental resources.

Thus, an investigation into the connection between social entrepreneurship and the unique characteristics of the sub-Saharan African setting is probably going to yield some fresh perspectives. Expanding on the topic of social entrepreneurship and environmental factors, we address expectations regarding the impact of the sub-Saharan African environment on social entrepreneurship in this section. We take into account the four contextual factors – acute poverty, informality, colonial history, and ethnic group identity – that are especially relevant to Africa while discussing significant aspects of social entrepreneurship.

According to the literature, social entrepreneurship develops when demands cannot be met by the public or commercial sectors and when doing so may have significant positive externalities (Santos, 2012).

The attitudes, abilities, and knowledge needed to create social value through economically sustainable organizations were among the Secondary Education Commission (SECs) this study examined (Sun and Cai, 2013). As the conformation of innovation, creativity, entrepreneurship, and social impact, the SEC may be viewed as a meta-competency (Brown, 1994; Le Deist and Winterton, 2005; Edwards-Schachter et al., 2015). Since the formation of social entrepreneurs is aided by adequate personal skills and beliefs, education in (social) entrepreneurship focuses on building individual traits to carry out the task successfully (Colom and Flores-Mendoza, 2001; Othman et al., 2017).

By employing a flexible curriculum and combining theory and practice to identify social problems and create multidisciplinary solution proposals, SEC mastery can be developed and increased (Bloom, 2006). Active learning strategies are the foundation of educational initiatives focused on (social) entrepreneurship. Students must connect theoretical thought to an experience in the actual world by overcoming real-world obstacles (Awaysheh and Bonfiglio, 2017; Boyatzis and Kolb, 1991; Wu and Martin, 2018). Peer discussions, case studies, project-based learning, action research, service-learning, and situated learning are among the active methodologies that are frequently added to traditional classroom methodology (Castro-Spila et al., 2018; Joos and Leaman, 2014; Mueller et al., 2015; Thomsen et al., 2019).

### **History of Colonialism (from another perspective?)**

In sub-Saharan Africa, social entrepreneurship is likely to be influenced by a nation's colonial past in the same way that other facets of the economy are. Even though colonization was a relatively recent development in African history, the effects of the former colonizing power are frequently still felt today in a variety of contexts, such as the continent's institutions, cultural norms, and economic development (Acemoglu et al., 2000; Herbst, 2000).

As previously mentioned, academics have observed that African nations that were previously colonized by the British tend to be wealthier and possess more advanced formal institutions than those that were formerly colonized by the French, Belgians, Germans, or Portuguese (Acemoglu et al., 2000), indicating a greater general emphasis on and confidence in economic institutions. This shift in focus is probably going to have an impact on social entrepreneurship in general and on how it's seen in particular. Entrepreneurs who place greater emphasis on and have greater faith in economic institutions may see their endeavours as more for-profit than

charitable, reflecting a wider belief in the ability of industry to solve issues and a more favourable experience with economic institutions.

There is no reason to believe that the belief in for-profit business should have an impact on a venture's self-perception as a social enterprise, even though it is likely to be higher in British-colonized countries (Acemoglu et al., 2000). This is because the venture's actual activities will be driven by the needs of the people it targets, as previously discussed, rather than by the belief in for-profit business.

### **Informality – poverty**

Although informality is a global phenomenon (Godfrey, 2011; ILO, 2012), as was already said, it is especially common in sub-Saharan Africa because of the region's formal governments, which are often weaker or less effective. Even while informality plays a significant role in the environment of sub-Saharan Africa, it has a complicated effect on social entrepreneurship. Businesses, whether formal or informal, can place equal emphasis on their social objectives and their solely profit-oriented missions.

While a microfinance institution has its roots in the formal financial sector, a local money lender, for example, may be integrated into the informal economy and use the poor as part of its business model while still maximizing its profits (Collins, Morduch, Rutherford, & Ruthven, 2009). Based on research on the impact of colonization on economic development in Africa, this logic pertains to the effect of British colonization in Africa and does not imply a comparable relationship for other former British colonies, such as the United States, India, or New Zealand. Thus, generally speaking, we may anticipate that an African nation's colonial past will impact the venture's self-perception as a social enterprise but not its actual operations, indicating a gap in this case between self-perception and social goal.

### **The Identity of Ethnic Groups**

Additionally, compared to other regions of the world, ethnic groupings have a comparatively greater influence on the sub-Saharan African environment (Herbst, 2000; Michalopoulos & Papaioannou, 2015). Although it conflicts with the state, ethnic group identity adds an alternative institutional framework to national institutions that may be acknowledged by the state (Posner, 2005). In sub-Saharan Africa, strong ethnic identities are likely to have an impact on social entrepreneurship in the same way that they do on other sectors of the economy. Specifically, the Ubuntu approach that is commonly adopted in sub-Saharan Africa, which is based on a worldview that prioritizes human interdependence and reciprocity over individualism (Mangaliso, 2001; West, 2014), could potentially influence social initiatives in African regions where ethnic or tribal identities are strongly held.

Because traditional sub-Saharan African worldviews are less individualistic, we can anticipate that social initiatives in these countries will be associated with a more social than for-profit approach when it comes to self-perception. Since this is more in line with the traditional Ubuntu and group-based approach to decision-making than with top-down decision structures, we can also anticipate that social ventures will adopt activities that emphasize the engagement of communities in decision-making when it comes to their social mission (Mangaliso, 2001).

Notably, informality occurs both within and outside of ethnic groups (De Soto, 2000; Godfrey, 2011), although ethnic institutions are generally informal (Herbst, 2000; Rivera-Santos et al., 2012). This explains why we anticipate a particular effect of ethnic group identity on social entrepreneurship from informality. Overall, this logic implies that the four contextual factors should impact the venture's conception of itself as a social enterprise as well as the activities it chooses to do, offering uniquely African perspectives on our comprehension of social entrepreneurship.

Overall, our exploratory findings point to a higher likelihood that the venture will perceive itself as a social enterprise and select initiatives that further its social mission when poverty levels are higher and ethnic group identities are strongly held. On the other hand, colonization by the British as opposed to other countries greatly lowers the likelihood that a business will consider itself to be a social enterprise, but it has no effect on the company's real social objective on the ground. Regarding the two definitional dimensions of social entrepreneurship, informality has no discernible impact.

### **Concept of Social Entrepreneurship**

Although the primary goal is social, businesses that create economic value can be classified as social entrepreneurs (Austin et al., 2006; Martínez-Rivera and Rodríguez-Díaz, 2013; Sassmannshausen and Volkmann, 2013). Because they combine the financial orientation of traditional businesses with philanthropic or altruistic goals that create social benefits, some authors refer to these businesses as hybrids (Alegre et al., 2017; Battilana and Lee, 2014). There are typically two schools of thinking in SE: the European and the North American. The first is marked by the application of socially innovative ventures, which began with the establishment of Ashoka and have served as a platform for the scaling and support of social entrepreneurial companies (Bacq and Janssen, 2011).

Social innovation entails developing social practices that result in social transformation as well as collaboratively solving social problems (Pol and Ville, 2009; Young, 2006; Cajaiba-Santana, 2014). Their main goal now is to change the structure of social interactions by empowering various social actors, particularly the traditionally marginalized groups, and by providing a creative answer to a social demand (Portales, 2019). Novelty and technology should not be confounded when considering social practices (Domanski et al., 2020).

According to Vizcaíno et al. (2020) and Weerawardena and Sullivan Mort (2006), the traditional definition of a social entrepreneur is a person who prioritizes meeting the needs of marginalized communities and is typically portrayed as proactive, resilient, and maintaining a distance from power. Emotional intelligence is one of the factors that contribute to the success of social entrepreneurs because they possess the conviction and ability to turn ideas into actions (Winarno et al., 2019; Zhou and Bojica, 2017). They blend their commitment to sustainability and social justice with the pursuit of financial objectives (Wry and York, 2017). Three definitions of the social entrepreneur were presented by Zahra et al. (2009): social bricoleur (Hayek), social constructionist (Kirzner), and social engineer (Schumpeter). However, Abebe and colleagues (2020) define four archetypes of the social entrepreneur based on their life

experiences and the scopes of their social engagements: (1) seasoned champions, (2) local pragmatists, (3) social activists and (4) corporate veterans.

The discourse on entrepreneurship is more focused on achieving economic sustainability because social entrepreneurship is defined as a concept that includes the processes and activities used to identify, define, and take advantage of social opportunities to increase social wealth and add social value to society (Zhara, Gedajilovic, Neubaum, & Shulman, 2009, p. 522).

Social entrepreneurship resonates well with the concepts of social justice because it focuses on directly addressing basic human needs that are not being met by existing economic or social institutions. The functioning of the main social institutions determines how valuable items like childcare, education, healthcare, personal security, housing, and leisure time are distributed.

Because the state determines how much goes to each individual through the enactment of laws, the setting of taxes, the organization of the delivery of health care and education, and other activities, its policies and practices serve to improve social justice (Miller, 2003). However, without the cooperation of other significant institutions like universities, colleges, and schools, the state would be essentially powerless. University instructors and students are inescapably involved in the multifaceted roles that cultivating social justice entails.

### **Social Entrepreneurship Education**

These days, one of the areas of education with the quickest rate of growth worldwide is entrepreneurship education (EE) (Solomon, 2007). This demonstrates the significance of entrepreneurship for any society's economy. There is a subliminal belief that there will be positive economic growth, job creation, and overall improvement in the economy if EE is provided. Numerous scholars investigated this hypothesis, and they discovered some evidence in favour of it (Dzisi, 2008; Ligthelm, 2007; Mojica, Gebremedhin & Schaeffer, 2010; Pacheco, Dean & Payne, 2010). Furthermore, whether entrepreneurship can be taught at all is a topic of discussion among academics and business professionals (Fayolle & Gailly, 2013).

The authors contend that without cooperative human change agents, universities, colleges, and schools – which can be seen as structures of change in the knowledge economy – would not be able to operate effectively. Human agency was defined by EmirBayer and Mische (1998: Page 7) as "the temporally formulated engagement by actors of different structural environments which, through the reciprocity of habit, imagination and judgment, both transforms and reconstructs those structures in an interactive response to the problems posed by changing historical situations." This statement is consistent with Bourdieu's (1977) previous concept of habitus, in which he contended that an individual's intentional and cognitive patterns of empirical behaviour are determined by the formative effect of their past.

According to some research, indirect learning from the family context, firsthand experiences, or social persuasion frequently influences how entrepreneurship education affects behaviour and attitudes (Bae et al., 2014; Bloemen-Bekx et al., 2019; Entrialgo and Iglesias, 2016; Levie and Hart, 2011; Mari et al., 2016). According to Shirokova et al. (2016), gender and the

academic setting are additional factors. The goals of social entrepreneurship might differ depending on the institutions and backgrounds involved, thus educators should encourage the development of entrepreneurial attitudes and abilities as well as promote SE at the knowledge level (Salamzadeh et al., 2013; Urban and Kujinga, 2017). Additionally, some research has emphasized how personality qualities, role models, and particular forms of support affect SE intention (Tran and Von Korflesch, 2016; Younis et al., 2020). Others include emotional intelligence, gender and the individual's culture (Elliott, 2019; Pines et al., 2012; Tiwari et al., 2020).

Concurrently, these entrepreneurs assign low marks to pre-university education, arguing that primary and secondary education falls short in fostering creativity, independence, and personal initiative, as well as entrepreneurship and the creation of new businesses.

These areas also meet criticism of colleges and universities, and the efficiency of vocational training in assisting individuals in starting and growing businesses is considered just mediocre.

This calls for universities in African countries to support entrepreneurship education programs (EEPs) to foster social and economic growth. Over the past 20 years, EEPs have expanded dramatically to promote entrepreneurial mindsets and abilities as well as to create jobs (cf. Valerio et al. 2014; Martinez et al. 2010). The underlying idea of these programs is that entrepreneurial skills are not innate personality qualities but rather can be learned opinions of other scholars regarding the study conducted by EEPs.

Most academics concur that communities and cultures that value entrepreneurship produce successful entrepreneurs rather than the other way around (Watson et al., 1998; Lee and Peterson, 2000). Among the first to show a clear correlation between education and the likelihood of starting and growing a successful business was Robinson et al. (1994).

Research shows, for example, that theoretical programs are much less successful than those that assist students in putting theory into practice by preparing them for a career in self-employment and giving them the tools to develop a business plan, launch, or grow their company (Meyer, 2011).

Universities from all around the world have recently started offering courses to develop into social entrepreneurs. In the United States, innovative and idealistic students at Babson College, which historically taught commercial entrepreneurs, are offered a full curriculum on social entrepreneurship. These students participate in 'hands-on' social innovation laboratories where they develop applications that change people's lives, develop nutritious food recipes, develop energy-saving technology, or develop commercial ideas that benefit society as a whole.

Universities with social media presences include those in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe, Singapore, Sao Paulo, Beijing, and an increasing number of universities in Africa, including the University of Ghana Business School, the University of Cape Town Graduate School of Business (UCT) and the Gordon Institute of Business Science (GIBS).

This E4impact program is designed to increase the capacity of African students and African universities through collaboration with the 6 Africa Journal of Management.

It now includes partner programs with universities in Ghana, Sierra Leone, the Ivory Coast, Senegal, Uganda, and Ethiopia in addition to the original Kenyan university.

In sub-Saharan Africa, several more Master of Business Administration (MBA) and diploma programs are jointly offered by Western and African colleges that are aimed partially or entirely toward social entrepreneurs.

These programs were compared along the following dimensions: their duration, or the length of their participants' entrepreneurial journeys;( E4impact program)

- A blended approach that offers both classroom and "outside the building" training.
- Participants must bring a "business idea" to develop and put into action.
- Business plans are used to combine creativity with practicality in operations and finances.
- Individual coaching – to put theoretical knowledge into action in real-world business;
- Mentoring – to offer great "role models" and first-hand business knowledge to investors; to increase the likelihood of success,
- Obtaining a master's degree will help you dispel the myth that entrepreneurship is a "B-rated" professional choice.

The E4impact program gives participants access to the entire spectrum of experiences most suited for growing impact entrepreneurs and allows them to obtain both a Master's degree from the local university partner and a European MBA from Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore.

### **Model and Structure of E4impact**

E4impact is a 12- to 15-month curriculum that includes 264 hours of remote learning in addition to 39 days on campus (three boot camps lasting seven days each, and six weekends lasting three days) (video-lecturers, assignments, and tutorials to enable participants to practically engage in business start-up or management while attending the program).

A business coach assists all participants and helps them integrate the course material into their business plans. Each participant is connected with a mentor who offers advice on both personal and professional matters and is an expert in his or her field. The program also hosts four business competitions where participants can pitch their ventures to sponsors, funders, and investors.



Up to now– Graduate School Business & Society (Italian: Alta Scuola Impresa e Società). (ALTIS) has collaborated with the following colleges:

**Table: 1**

Tangaza University College	Kenya
Catholic Institute Business & Technology University of Makeni	Ghana Sierra Leone
Uganda Martyrs University	Uganda
Centre de Recherche et d'Action pour la Paix Institut Supérieur de Management	Ivory Coast Senegal
Saint Mary	Ethiopia

*Source: ALTIS*

Table 1 demonstrates how almost all of these programs offer both in-person and online instruction, allowing students to develop their ideas for social enterprises and including mentoring from reputable role models. Most of them are certificate programs that provide linkages to the business community and entrepreneurship incubation.

To put it another way, the authors of this article, aware of the difficult socio-economic conditions that the vast majority of schools face, recognize the following and, using their creative judgments – that is, their justifications for actions combined with an imaginative reflection of how institutions might unfold – propose the following: Socially conscious educators must mobilize as human beings to provide an entrepreneurial response to a societal need before social entrepreneurship in educational settings may take shape. Once social entrepreneurial educators have interacted with a social context, their ability to see a need as an opportunity will determine the latter human action. According to Lushka (2008), possibilities can only arise when social entrepreneurs aim to alter their surroundings in response to their forays into social entrepreneurship education. Nonetheless, based on Bourdieu's (1977) concept of habitus, the social entrepreneur as an individual is also shaped by the circumstances surrounding her or his interactions with other professionals in the field, as they contribute their rationales, assessments, and creative ideas to these thoughtful exchanges.

The concept of an encounter is what makes the human agent significant. According to Roland Martin's theory of education as an encounter, learning only takes place when a person and a culture have an encounter in which one or more of the person's capacities and one or more cultural artefacts become yoked (or attached) together (Martin, 2013). This indicates that education happens when talents and stock come together and bind. Individuals contribute their cultural knowledge and learning capacities to interactions, which in turn help to create the specific encounter (Waghid, 2016). According to Waghid (2016), cultural understandings are somewhat related to people's increased political consciousness, intellectual development, and alertness.

The capacities and cultural stock, such as societal ideas, habits, and values, resonate with Bourdieu's (1986) understanding of embodied cultural capital of individuals and are typically geared towards the attainment of social justice in society when an educational encounter aims to develop social entrepreneurial capacities among preservice educators in the field of education (Waghid, 2016). As a change agent, the social entrepreneurial educator brings to the interaction their cultural background and learning skills, which influence the encounter in and of itself as well as the social entrepreneurial educator's perspective while interacting with students in a classroom or school setting. Stated differently, the authors claim that preservice educators could be improved by using Bourdieu's (1977) idea of habitus and Roland Martin's (2013) theory of education as an encounter. Preservice teachers can make creative decisions about how to address societal issues based on thoughtful interactions with one another and others in a specific social setting.

### **Interdisciplinary training of social entrepreneurs**

Students can find opportunities to develop their creative, innovative, and entrepreneurial capacity through opportunities provided by the university as a stakeholder in the agenda for sustainable development (Bagur-Femenías et al., 2020; Bokova, 2014; Byun et al., 2018; Cabrera-Santacana et al., 2014; Robinson, 2011; Wagner, 2012; Zamora-Polo and Sánchez-Martín, 2019). According to McAdam and Debackere (2017), Higher Education institutions (HEI) are institutions that create social value by participating in cross-sector co-creation scenarios. This leads to reflection, where formative processes integrate place-based learning and critical reflection (Rivers et al., 2015b, c). This concept aligns with John Dewey's progressive pedagogy (González-Monteagudo, 2001).

Though entrepreneurial experiences are diverse and require the development of transversal abilities, entrepreneurial teaching has historically taken place in business schools (Smith and Woodworth, 2012). Numerous curricula take a traditional capitalist business strategy while teaching entrepreneurship (Buendía-Martínez et al., 2020a). To bring about social change, it is crucial to include aspects of economics and social innovation in all fields of vocational training (Worsham, 2012). Students understand that community service should be supported by economic considerations rather than the other way around in an environment where SE practices and learning are valued (Buendía-Martínez et al., 2020b; Howorth et al., 2012; Velasco Martínez et al., 2019). For this reason, scholars such as Jensen (2014) have defended the teaching of SE in humanities professions. Even more studies emphasize the advantages of teaching transversal SE outside of the university such as in preschool (Sarıkaya and Coşkun, 2015).

The characteristics of change agents align with 21<sup>st</sup> century competencies (Rivers et al., 2015). This is because social entrepreneurs and changemakers acquire soft skills including problem-solving, adaptation, growth promotion, and creativity (Daher et al., 2018; Worsham, 2012; Zat'ková and Ambrozy, 2019). Thus, in addition to self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, and interpersonal skills, communities of practice should foster the development of social entrepreneurship, innovation, and transversal competencies (Brock and Steiner, 2009; Hockerts, 2018; Lehner and Kansikas, 2011; Nandan and London, 2013; Nandan and Scott,

2013). (Byun et al., 2018). To achieve the aims of the Sustainable Development aims (SDG), changemakers need to be produced (Zamora-Polo & Sánchez-Martín, 2019).

According to the research, quasi-experimental studies using a pre-and post-test can be used to examine how attitudes toward entrepreneurship have changed (Entrialgo and Iglesias, 2016; Thomsen et al., 2019). Similar recommendations are made for research in many places and circumstances (Joos and Leaman, 2014; Kummitha and Majumdar, 2015). It is anticipated that new research will improve social entrepreneurship education across a range of subject areas, particularly education (Peterlin, 2019; Waghid, 2017).

### **Role and Importance of Social Entrepreneurship**

In India, social entrepreneurship is the key to future growth. Social entrepreneurs will become increasingly important in advancing social changes in the coming days. The finest thing about social entrepreneurship is that its success is measured not in monetary terms but rather in the quantity of people these businesses can positively influence and reach. Social entrepreneurship and social firms will become much more common shortly, which should have a positive effect on society.

According to Weerawardena and Sullivan Mort (2006), changemakers are proactive, resilient social entrepreneurs or innovators who can create and carry out creative solutions for issues about society and the environment. Since its founding in 1980, Ashoka has served as a model for social entrepreneurs seeking training, to transform into a worldwide society comprised of Ashoka Fellows (Sen, 2007; Sunduramurthy et al., 2016). The promotion of education for social entrepreneurship has become a growing focus for HEIs. Several pedagogical approaches and trends for training social entrepreneurs have surfaced in recent years, posing new difficulties for the academic community (Joos and Leaman, 2014).

Weerawardena and HEIs are challenged to provide training in skills for the knowledge economy, develop creative thinking, promote entrepreneurship, and make a social impact. Changemakers are active and resilient social entrepreneurs or innovators who can design and implement innovative solutions for social and environmental problems (Hamizan-Roslan et al., 2019; Saxena, 2019; Wagner, 2012). Students today need to be prepared for their university education to comprehend the new economy and respond quickly to its socio-economic issues. Companies and other groups need to be prepared to address environmental and social issues (Voronkova et al., 2019). Thus, to conduct problem-solving actions, training programs should emphasize students' understanding of social welfare while improving corporate and public sector logic (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012). Despite research looking into the best methods at universities for training social entrepreneurs (Amundam, 2019; Pache and Chowdhury, 2012), more studies are still needed (Alakaleek, 2019).

The principles and instructional techniques of general or traditional entrepreneurship are used in many university programs designed to address the training demands in social entrepreneurship. There are conceptual and procedural distinctions between the two, though; social entrepreneurship also necessitates having "soft" (transversal) abilities that go beyond what business schools teach about finance and technology. According to Lehner and Kansikas

(2011), entrepreneurship should be developed in a transdisciplinary way with an emphasis on helping students studying social entrepreneurship build interdisciplinary profiles and giving them the chance to acquire cutting-edge social entrepreneurship competencies (Brock and Steiner, 2009; Nandan and Scott, 2013).

Research indicates that attempts are being made to teach people about social entrepreneurship outside of the fields of business and engineering. For instance, Kummitha and Majumdar (2015) suggest preparing professionals to address social issues like what other research (Akhyadi et al., 2019; Mueller et al., 2015) has documented in educational procedures taught from a transdisciplinary viewpoint. Compared to 1,500 papers about traditional or general entrepreneurship published since 1988, only 29 publications from the period of 2002 to 2020 deal with social entrepreneurship education.

Potential future research directions for social entrepreneurship education in Ghana. As the field of social entrepreneurship continues to grow and evolve, there are several key areas that may be considered as potential future research directions for social entrepreneurship education in Ghana.

**Below are some suggestions for future research in this important domain:**

1. Impact Assessment and Measurement of Social Entrepreneurship Education Programs in Ghana.
2. Pedagogical Approaches for social entrepreneurship education in the Ghanaian context.
3. Stakeholder engagement and Collaboration on social entrepreneurship education programs between academia, government agencies, non-profit organizations, and the private sector.
4. Contextualized Curriculum Development tailored to the specific needs, challenges, and opportunities faced by social entrepreneurs in Ghana.
5. Access to Financial Resources for social entrepreneurs in Ghana.

**Conclusions**

Social entrepreneurship education in Ghana represents a beacon of hope for societal transformation and sustainable development. Through dedicated initiatives, it equips individuals with not only business acumen but also a profound sense of social responsibility. By fostering innovative thinking, ethical leadership, and a deep understanding of community needs, it cultivates a generation committed to effecting positive change.

As evidenced by its impact across various sectors, from healthcare to environmental conservation and education, this education in Ghana catalyzes inclusive growth. It empowers aspiring changemakers to address complex societal challenges creatively, driving economic progress while simultaneously uplifting marginalized communities.

However, to realize its full potential, continuous support and integration within formal education structures are crucial. Sustained collaboration between educational institutions,

government bodies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the private sector can amplify the reach and effectiveness of social entrepreneurship education. Additionally, targeted investments in mentorship programs, access to funding, and networking opportunities are imperative to nurture a vibrant ecosystem conducive to social innovation.

In essence, the journey towards a more equitable and prosperous Ghana hinges upon the holistic integration and advancement of social entrepreneurship education. It stands poised not only to shape future leaders but to ignite a ripple effect of positive change that resonates far beyond the confines of classrooms, propelling Ghana towards a brighter, more inclusive future.

## References

- Aronsson, M., & Birch, D. (2004). *Education matters – but does entrepreneurship education? An interview with David Birch*. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3, 289–292. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2004.14242224>
- Bazeley, P., & Richards, L. (2000). *The NVivo qualitative project book*. London: Sage.
- Bennett, R. (2006). *Business lecturers' perceptions of the nature of entrepreneurship*. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 12, 165–188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13552550610667440>
- Bridge, S., Hegarty, C., & Porter, S. (2010). *Rediscovering enterprise: Developing appropriate university entrepreneurship education*. *Education and Training*, 52, 722–734
- Chang, J., & Rieple, A. (2013). *Assessing students' entrepreneurial skills development in live projects*. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 20, 225–241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14626001311298501>
- Cope, J. (2005). *Toward a dynamic learning perspective of entrepreneurship*. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29, 373–397. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/etap.2005.29.issue-4>
- Cope, J. (2011). *Entrepreneurial learning from failure: An interpretative phenomenological analysis*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26, 604–623. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2010.06.002>
- Cope, J., & Watts, G. (2000). *Learning by doing: An exploration of experience, critical incidents and reflection in entrepreneurial learning*. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 6, 104–124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13552550010346208>
- Corbett, A. (2005). *Experiential learning within the process of opportunity identification and exploitation*. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 29, 473–491.
- Coviello, N., & Jones, M. (2004). *Methodological issues in international entrepreneurship research*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19, 485–508. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2003.06.001> and *Management Journal*, 1, 27–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11365-005-6674-2>

- Dabbagh, N., & Menascé, D. (2006). *Student perceptions of engineering entrepreneurship: An exploratory study*. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 95, 153–164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jee.2006.95.issue-2>
- Liebenberg, L., & Mathews, E. (2012). *Integrating innovation skills in an introductory engineering design-build course*. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 22, 93–113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10798-010-9137-1>
- Ligthelm, A. (2007). *Survival analysis of small informal businesses in South Africa 2007–2010*. *Eurasian Business Review*, 1, 160–179.
- Lundqvist, M., & Williams Middleton, K. (2013). *Academic entrepreneurship revisited—university scientists and venture creation*. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 20, 603–617. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-04-2013-0059>
- McMullan, W., & Vesper, K. (1987). *New ventures and small business innovation for economic growth*. *R&D Management*, 17, 3–13.
- Minniti, M., & Bygrave, W. (2001). *A dynamic model of entrepreneurial learning*. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 25, 5–12.
- Mojica, M. N., Gebremedhin, T. J., & Schaeffer, P. V. (2010). *A county-level assessment of entrepreneurship and economic development in Appalachia using simultaneous equations*. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 15, 3–18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S1084946710001452>
- Morris, M., Webb, J., Fu, J., & Singhal, S. (2013). *A competency-based perspective on entrepreneurship education: Conceptual and empirical insights*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51, 352–369. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.2013.51.issue-3>
- Pacheco, D. F., Dean, T. J., & Payne, D. S. (2010). *Escaping the green prison: Entrepreneurship and the creation of opportunities for sustainable development*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25, 464–480. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.07.006>
- Pardede, E., & Lyons, J. (2012). *Redesigning the assessment of an entrepreneurship course in an information technology degree program: Embedding assessment for learning practices*. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 55, 566–572. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TE.2012.2199757>
- Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470754887>
- Piperopoulos, P., & Dimov, D. (2014). *Burst bubbles or build steam? Entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial intentions*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 52(2). doi:10.1111/jsbm.12116
- Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). *Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the evidence*. *International Small Business Journal*, 25, 479–510. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0266242607080656>

- DeTienne, D., & Chandler, G. (2004). *Opportunity identification and its role in the entrepreneurial classroom: A pedagogical approach and empirical test*. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3, 242–257. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2004.14242103>
- Dzisi, S. (2008). *Entrepreneurial activities of indigenous African women: A case of Ghana*. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 2, 254–264.
- Fayolle, A. (2013). *Personal views on the future of entrepreneurship education*. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 25, 692–701. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2013.821318>
- Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2008). *From craft to science*. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32, 569–593. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090590810899838>
- Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2013). *The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial attitudes and intention: Hysteresis and persistence*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51, 315–328. Fiet, J. (2001). *The theoretical side of teaching entrepreneurship*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(1), 1–24. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(99\)00041-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(99)00041-5)
- Hannon, P. (2006). *Teaching pigeons to dance: Sense and meaning in entrepreneurship education*. *Education and Training*, 48, 296–308.
- Harmeling, S., & Sarasvathy, S. (2013). *When contingency is a resource: Educating entrepreneurs in the Balkans, the Bronx, and beyond*. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 37, 713–744.
- Heinonen, J., & Poikkijoki, S. (2006). *An entrepreneurial directed approach to entrepreneurship education: Mission impossible?* *Journal of Management Development*, 25, 80–94.
- Honig, B. (2004). *Entrepreneurship education: Toward a model of contingency-based business planning*. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3, 258–273. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2004.14242112>
- Jones, C. (2010). *Entrepreneurship education: Revisiting our role and its purpose*. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 17, 500–513. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14626001011088697>
- Jones, C., & Matlay, H. (2011). *Understanding the heterogeneity of entrepreneurship education: Going beyond Gartner*. *Education and Training*, 53, 692–703.
- Katz, J. (2003). *The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 283–300. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(02\)00098-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(02)00098-8)
- Klapper, R., & Tegtmeier, S. (2010). *Innovating entrepreneurial pedagogy: Examples from France and Germany*. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 17, 552–568. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14626001011088723>

- Kuratko, D. (2005). *The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges*. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29, 577–598. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/etap.2005.29.issue-5>
- Rae, D., Martin, L., Antcliff, V., & Hannon, P. (2012). *Enterprise and entrepreneurship in English higher education: 2010 and beyond*. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 19, 380–401.
- Ramoglou, S. (2013). *Who is a 'non-entrepreneur': Taking the 'others' of entrepreneurship seriously*. *International Small Business Journal*, 31, 432–453. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0266242611425838>
- Samwel Mwasalwiba, E. (2010). *Entrepreneurship education: A review of its objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators*. *Education and Training*, 52, 20–47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00400911011017663>
- Sánchez, J. (2013). *The impact of an entrepreneurship education program on entrepreneurial competencies and intention*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51, 447–465. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.2013.51.issue-3>
- Sexton, D., & Bowman, N. (1984). *Entrepreneurship education: Suggestions for increasing effectiveness*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 22, 18–25.
- Shepherd, D. (2004). *Educating entrepreneurship students about emotion and learning from failure*. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3, 274–287. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2004.14242217>
- Smith, A., & Paton, R. (2011). *Delivering enterprise*. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 17, 104–118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13552551111107534>
- Solomon, G. (2007). *An examination of entrepreneurship education in the United States*. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14, 168–182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14626000710746637>
- Sullivan, R. (2000). *Entrepreneurial learning and mentoring*. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 6, 160–175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13552550010346587>
- Thorpe, R., Holt, R., Pittaway, L., & Macpherson, A. (2006). *Knowledge within small and medium-sized firms: A systematic review of the evidence*. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7, 257–281.
- Vesper, K., & Gartner, W. (1997). *Measuring progress in entrepreneurship education*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12, 403–421. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(97\)00009-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(97)00009-8)
- Vincett, P., & Farlow, S. (2008). *Start-a-business: an experiment in education through entrepreneurship*. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15, 274–288.
- Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J. A. (2000). *The colonial origins of comparative development: An empirical investigation*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic



Research. Akula, V. (2008). *Business basics at the base of the pyramid*. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(6), 53–57.

Alkire, S., Conconi, A., & Roche, J. M. (2012). *Multidimensional Poverty Index 2012: Brief methodological note and results*. Oxford, UK: University of Oxford, Department of International Development, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative.

Bacq, S., & Janssen, F. (2011). *The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria*. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 23(5–6), 373–403.

Baldé, A., & Dayen, C. (2012). Thabo Mbeki: “*The relationship between Africa and its ex-colonizers is illegal!*” Retrieved May 2013 from <http://www.afriknews.com/article19444.html>

Barkemeyer, R., Figge, F., & Holt, D. (2013). *Sustainability-related media coverage and socioeconomic development: A regional and North–South perspective*. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 31(4), 716–740.

Bräutigam, D. A., & Knack, S. (2004). *Foreign aid, institutions, and governance in sub-Saharan Africa*. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 52(2), 255–285. Bruton, G. D. (2010). *Business and the world’s poorest billion: The need for an expanded examination by management scholars*. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), 6–10.

Bruton, G. D., Ireland, R. D., & Ketchen, D. J. (2012). *Toward a research agenda on the informal economy*. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(3), 1–11.

Financial Times. (2013, May 6). *Value creation, a sustainable firm or venture philanthropy?* *Financial Times*, p. 9. Godfrey, P. C. (2011). *Toward a theory of the informal economy*. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 231–277.

Gulyani, S., & Talukdar, D. (2010). *Inside informality: The links between poverty, microenterprises, and living conditions in Nairobi’s slums*. *World Development*, 38(12), 1710–1726.

Günther, I., & Launov, A. (2012). *Informal employment in developing countries: Opportunity or last resort?* *Journal of Development Economics*, 97(1), 88–98.

Hearn, J. (2007). *African NGOs: The new compradors?* *Development and Change*, 38(6), 1095–1110. Herbst, J. (2000). *States and power in Africa: Comparative lessons in authority and control*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

ILO. (2012). *Statistical update on employment in the informal economy*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labor Organization. International Monetary Fund. (2013).

World Economic Outlook database. Retrieved from <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2013/01/data/index.aspx>

Julian, S. D., & Ofori-Dankwa, J. C. (2013). *Financial Resource Availability and Corporate Social Responsibility Expenditures in a sub-Saharan Economy: The Institutional Difference Hypothesis*. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(11), 1314–1330. Kamoche, K. N. (2000).

*Sociological paradigms and human resources: An African context.* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Ltd. Kerlin, J. A. (2006). *Social enterprise in the United States and Europe: Understanding and learning from the differences.* *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 17(3), 246 – 262.

Abu-Saifan, S., 2012. Social entrepreneurship: definition and boundaries. *Technology innovation management review*, 2(2).

Alegre, I., Kislenko, S. and Berbegal-Mirabent, J., 2017. Organized chaos: mapping the definitions of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 8(2), pp.248-264.

Alter, S. K (2006). Social enterprise models and their mission and money relationships. In: Nicholls, A. (Ed). *Social entrepreneurship: new models of sustainable change.* Oxford: New York.

Anthony, S. D., Johnson, M. W., Sinfield, J. V., & Altman, E. J. (2008). *The innovator's guide to growth: Putting disruptive innovation to work.* Harvard Business Press.

Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: an exploratory study. *J Appl Behav Sci*, 40(3), 260–282.

Banks, N. and Hulme, D., 2012. The role of NGOs and civil society in development and poverty reduction. *Brooks World Poverty Institute Working Paper*, (171).

Begashaw, B. and Shah, A., 2017. SDG Financing for Africa: Key Propositions and Areas of Engagement. Retrieved from [https://sdgcafrica.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/sdg-financing-for-africa\\_key-propositions-and-areas-of-engagement-.pdf](https://sdgcafrica.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/sdg-financing-for-africa_key-propositions-and-areas-of-engagement-.pdf) Discussion Paper for Development Finance Workshop.

Betts, S. C., Laud, R., & Kretinin, A. (2018). Social entrepreneurship: A contemporary approach to solving social problems. *Global Journal of Entrepreneurship Volume*, 2(1), 31-40.

Bikse, V., Rivza, B., & Riemere, I. (2015). The social entrepreneur is a promoter of social advancement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 185, 469-478.

Boschee, J. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: the promise and the perils. In: Nicholls, A. (Ed.). *Social entrepreneurship: new models of sustainable change.* Oxford: New York, pp 356–390.

Brinckerhoff. P.C. (2000). *Social entrepreneurship: the art of mission-based venture development.* John Wiley & Sons: New York.

Carland, J. W., Hoy, F., Boulton, W. R., & Carland, J. A. C. (1984). Differentiating entrepreneurs from small business owners: A conceptualization. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 354-359.

Certo, S. T., & Miller, T. (2008). Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts. *Business Horizons*, 51(4), 267-271.

Cole, A. (1959). *Business enterprise in its social setting.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Corner, P. D., & Ho, M. (2010). How opportunities develop in social entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 34(4), 635-659.
- Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1203-1213.
- Dacin, P.A., Dacin, M.T. and Matear, M., 2010. Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), pp.37-57.
- Dees. J. G. (1998). *The meaning of social entrepreneurship*. Retrieved from <http://www.fntc.info/files/documents/The%20meaning%20of%20Social%20Entreneurship.pdf>.
- Doherty, B., Thompson, J., & Spear, R. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: a different model? *International journal of social economics*.
- Drucker, P. (2014). *Innovation and entrepreneurship*. Routledge.
- Elkington, J., & Hartigan, P. (2008). *The power of unreasonable people: How social entrepreneurs create markets that change the world*. Harvard Business Press.
- El-Namaki, M. S. S. (1988). Encouraging entrepreneurs in developing countries. *Long-range planning*, 21(4), 98-106.
- Felício, J. A., Gonçalves, H. M., & da Conceição Gonçalves, V. (2013). Social value and organizational performance in non-profit social organizations: Social entrepreneurship, leadership, and socioeconomic context effects. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 2139-2146.
- Frederick, H., O'Connor, A., & Kuratko, D. F. (2018). *Entrepreneurship*. Cengage AU.
- Fortunato, M. W., & Alter, T. (2015). Community entrepreneurship development: an introduction. *Community Development*, 46(5), 444-455.
- Gali, N., Niemand, T., Shaw, E., Hughes, M., Kraus, S., & Brem, A. (2020). Social entrepreneurship orientation and company success: The mediating role of social performance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 160, 120230.
- Gandhi, T., & Raina, R. (2018). Social entrepreneurship: the need, relevance, facets and constraints. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 8(1), 9.
- Glancey, K., McQuaid, R., & Campling, J. (2000). *Entrepreneurial economics*. London: Macmillan.
- Griffiths, M. D., Gundry, L. K., & Kickul, J. R. (2013). *The socio-political, economic, and cultural determinants of social entrepreneurship activity: An empirical examination*. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 20(2), 341-357.
- Hayek, F.A., 1945. *The use of knowledge in society*. *American Economic Review* 35, 519–530

Irwin, D. (2007). *The future for social entrepreneurship and social enterprise*. Cobweb Information Ltd.: Engla