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ABSTRACT

Notwithstanding the growing interest in social entrepreneurship (SE) education, the SE field is gradually losing its “social” status. Accordingly, there is a need to emphasise the “social” aspect of SE education in order to clearly distinguish SE from the corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices implemented by mainstream entrepreneurs. It follows that in order to clearly differentiate between social value and CSR, SE education should help develop social entrepreneurs that are both responsible (i.e. social entrepreneurs who remain true to the original idea of creating social value and reinvesting profit for more social change activities) and socially innovative (i.e. come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems). SE instructors can help facilitate this developmental process provided that the right teaching content and methods are employed. The general lack of empirical research in SE education has limited our understanding of the role SE education can play. We do not understand clearly which teaching content and methods are employed or can be employed to encourage the creation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

This study has two main objectives. The first objective is to assess the current content of the SE curriculum in UK business schools in order to identify best teaching content that can enhance social innovative thinking and the development of potential responsible social entrepreneurs. The second objective is to analyze the teaching methods currently used by SE educators in UK business schools in order to identify the best teaching methods that enhance social innovative thinking and the development of potential responsible social entrepreneurs. These two objectives were met by examining the syllabi of 5 UK business schools offering SE as a course or a module at masters, undergraduate or foundation levels (Westminster University Business School, Oxford Brookes University Business School (Ruskin College), Goldsmith University of London, Northampton University Business School and Lancaster University Management School). The study interviewed 8 SE instructors responsible for designing and delivering these SE courses/modules and 30 students who successfully passed through the SE courses/modules across these five business schools. Drawing on data analysed using within and across case analysis methods and the social identity theory, this study presents a model that instructors can draw on and help students
categorise and identify as potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

According to the findings the key teaching content that has enhanced social innovative thinking includes: historical and contemporary issues of SE, the resource base/ bricolage and effectuation theories and the business canvas model/divergent and convergent thinking tools. In addition, the key teaching methods include: group social business planning, implementation and presentation, interviewing/visiting social entrepreneurs/enterprises. The findings further reveal that, the key teaching content that has or can enhance responsible SE includes: core values of integrity, measuring outcomes, ethical social enterprise branding/ the dark side of CSR and book review of the biography of social entrepreneurs. Moreover, the key teaching methods include: Group social business planning, implementation and presentation, group comparative analyses of real cases and guest speaking.

With respect to its contribution, this study proposes a model that is believed to enhance SE education in the following ways: firstly, it offers precise teaching content and methods that educators can employ and help students categorise and identify as potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. Secondly, it enables potential social entrepreneurs to value the importance of creating social value as a group.

As for limitations, this study was conducted in the UK with a focus on 5 business schools that offer SE as a module/course in England. The sampling strategy employed to select these business schools was based on whether each business school was amongst the top 50 UK university/business schools ranking according to Eduniversal ranking in 2014 and offers SE as a module/course. Though with a very selective sampling strategy, the question is whether all key findings can be generalise in different context.

While this study identified and explained how core values of integrity can enhance responsible SE, the study did not examine techniques that can be employ in a working environment to maintain these values in the long run. Further research should examine techniques that can be employed in a working environment to maintain these values in the long run.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Educating social entrepreneurs is becoming increasingly prevalent, particularly in business schools globally, thus highlighting the need for effective pedagogical approaches. Kirby and Ibrahim (2011) emphasise the importance of looking at what is needed to create more graduate social entrepreneurs. Research studies (e.g. Westley and Antadze, 2010; Smith and Woodworth, 2012; Tracey, Phillips and Jarvis, 2011) point out the need to create the awareness of social entrepreneurship (S E) amongst students and the integration of more democratic and egalitarian views to enable students motivation. The European commission (2008) noted that, globally educational institutions are challenged by their government to create change making graduates and S E education can play a great role in bringing this change. S E education can help foster economic growth (Acs and Armington, 2006) and innovation that results to increased productivity (Dobele, 2016; Kuratko, 2005). Furthermore, Wilson (2009) argued that, S E education can play a great role in addressing the urgent need to develop a more entrepreneurial culture as well as necessary skills, attitudes and behavior that will encourage young people to pursue opportunities which is a challenge facing many economies. Furthermore, Griffiths (2011) noted that, motivating graduates to build commercially sustainable enterprises that do not only create jobs but also empower the poor to improve their livelihood is a necessary strategy towards poverty alleviation.

S E education may have tangible outcomes (Thompson, 2002). The key omitted point in the literature is that, teaching methods and content should be based on solid conceptual building blocks that enable students to understand how complex social entrepreneurial activities are embedded and multidimensional in nature (Tracey and Phillips, 2007). Also, scholars in this field have failed to research on social value creation which is the fundamental goal of social entrepreneurs. Chell et al (2014) noted that, there is the need to educate and emphasize the “social” aspect of S E education as this is crucial for the status of the field. It does not necessarily follow that because something is socially oriented, then the motivation is ethically responsible (Cornelius et al, 2008). Therefore, being a S E student
does not automatically make an individual responsible. S E education needs to focus on “responsible entrepreneurship” (Bouchikhi, 2015). Moreover, several scholars have emphasised the need for social entrepreneurs to create realistic social value in an innovative way and pointed out that, thinking entrepreneurially by creating economic wealth towards achieving social value is innovation (Porter and Kramer, 2011; Tracey and Phillips, 2007). Nevertheless, Drayton (2006) thinks social innovation can take many forms. It should be noted that, though the appropriate curriculum content and teaching methods for S E programs are constantly being discussed, what should be taught and how, is the worry and demand of the majority of S E instructors (Mengel, 2016; Lawrence, Phillips and Tracey, 2012).

Recently, the number of students with an interest in becoming entrepreneurs has increased (Gailly and Fayolle, 2004). However, people will try starting up their own businesses if they believe they have the ability and if the activity they are willing to engage in is deemed socially acceptable (Kirby and Ibrahim, 2011). Thus, motivating young people towards becoming potential responsible social entrepreneurs by recognizing the importance and role of S E is necessary and can only be achieved if educational systems provide S E course instructors with the right materials needed to teach. It should also be noted that, recently, student demand for education that provides the skills needed to succeed and gain employment has increased. In response, some educational systems have encouraged this by implementing initiatives such as the S E business plan competition, lectures on the S E business concept, networking and interaction with S E practitioners (Kickul, Janssen-selvaduria and Griffiths, 2012). Common methods currently used in teaching S E are: conventional case studies and business plans methods (Kwong, Thompson and Cheung, 2012). However, though little effort has been dedicated to teaching S E, no clear evidence demonstrates how the currently used teaching methods and content within UK business schools enhance the formation of “responsible social entrepreneurs” (i.e. social entrepreneurs who remain true to the original idea of creating social value and reinvesting profit for more social change activities) and “social innovative thinking social entrepreneurs” (i.e. social entrepreneurs with the ability to come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems).
Drawing on the social identity theory, this study argues that, curriculum content and teaching methods that allow students to categorize and identify themselves as being amongst and being social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs may give students self-esteem and confidence. It may also enhance their thinking innovatively and their motivation towards potentially becoming responsible social entrepreneurs. Though, business in all forms needs to be responsible, more is expected from social entrepreneurs (Kay, 2102). This study does not focus on a broad range of issues on social innovation and socially responsible entrepreneurship. Rather, the study focuses on S E education and is geared towards understanding and identifying aspects of the S E curriculum content and teaching methods that can enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

It is important S E educators are provided with a model that incorporates aspects that encourage social innovative thinking, responsible S E as well as teaching methods and content that enable students to categorize and identify themselves as potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs as this may give students the self-confidence and the belief that, they have what it takes and the ability to effectively impact a social change on graduation (Smith and Woodworth, 2012). This study seeks to enhance the teaching of S E in UK business schools after identifying best practices from the existing S E pedagogy by developing a model incorporating teaching methods and curriculum content that can enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

1.2 Problem statement

There is a growing need to develop a curriculum within UK business schools offering entrepreneurship modules that support learning not just about entrepreneurship (Hannon, 2005), but also, implementing the notion of “responsible” entrepreneurship which business schools globally have been criticized of failing to provide. According to scholars (e.g. Chell, 2007; Blundel and Spence, 2009; Frost, 2009), S E education can provide a frame of reference for responsible entrepreneurship education and learning. This is based on the notion that, social goods can be created from entrepreneurial activities whilst reinvesting the profit in community development (Rae, 2010). Huq and Gilbert (2013) supported this
view and argue that, there is a strong need and support to reconceptualise entrepreneurial curriculum to include responsibility, ethics and environmentalism.

Though S E education can provide a frame of reference for responsible entrepreneurship education and learning, the S E field is gradually losing its “social” status (Chell et al., 2014). There is the need to emphasise the “social” aspect of S E education in order to clearly differentiate S E from the CSR practices of mainstream entrepreneurs. CSR is a side activity of a mainstream entrepreneur whose main goal is creating economic wealth. Social entrepreneurs develop social enterprises to create social value as their main objective and economic wealth creation is secondary (Porter and Kramer, 2011). Social value is one that changes the lives of stakeholders in an impactful manner (social value UK, 2016). Examples of social value creation include projects that focus on enhancing local communities, safety, reducing unemployment, enhancing social inclusion, raising health care standards and buildings good political structures and education. To clearly differentiate the social value created by social enterprises and the CSR practices of mainstream businesses, S E education should help develop social entrepreneurs that are termed in this study as responsible social entrepreneurs i.e. social entrepreneurs who remain true to the original idea of creating social value and reinvesting profit for more social change activities (Cornelius et al, 2008).

Also, there is the need for S E education to develop social entrepreneurs that create realistic social value in an innovative way (Porter and Kramer, 2011; Tracey and Phillips, 2007) i.e. come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems. Examples of social entrepreneurial innovations may include how to generate the financial resources needed to achieve social value creation objectives and creating new legal structures that will allow realistic social enterprises to flourish. In order to properly address these issues, S E education should develop innovative social entrepreneurs who are able to balance economic wealth creation and social value creation in terms of how money made through doing business can be deployed for social change (Zhu, Rooney and Phillips, 2016; Porter and Kramer, 2011).

This study acknowledges the view as established by extant studies that SE education should focus on values-led practice with emphasis on social values and ethics (Chell et al, 2014; Zhu, Rooney and Phillips, 2016; Zainal et al, 2017) and teachings that enhance the creation of
realistic social value in an innovative way (Porter and Kramer, 2011; Tracey and Phillips, 2007). However, this study based on the social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979) and argues that, the extent to which S E education can develop social innovative thinking and responsible social entrepreneurs depends to some extent on whether the S E teaching content and methods develop in students a deep seated social identity that relates to S E. First, social identity theory presents a group as an important source of self-esteem and pride. This theory also suggests that, groups members encourage each other to stay focused. In the course of thriving to respect group norms and enhance group image, group members enhance the status of the group in which they belong to. Therefore if responsible and social innovative thinking can be presented as a distinct social category to which students can aspire to and to which students can identify with and become active members, S E instructors can help facilitate this developmental process if the right teaching content and methods are employed.

The general lack of empirical research in S E education has limited our understanding on the role S E education can play in addressing the development of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. We do not understand clearly which teaching content and methods are employed or can be employed to encourage potential social entrepreneurs to keep to the original idea of creating social value and re-investing profit for more social change activities (Cornelius et al, 2008). Additionally, it is not clear which teaching content and methods can or have really enabled students to think innovatively towards creating this social value (Porter and Kramer, 2011; Tracey and Phillips, 2007).

Findings from the center for the advancement of social entrepreneurship (CASE, 2008) project which was aimed at exploring areas where academic centers could greatly impact the field particularly in research and education shows that, S E is at the critical stage of its life cycle. Mengel (2016) mentioned that, very little research has been done to investigate either the content or the pedagogy of SE education to date. Although the concepts continue to gain recognition, respect and momentum, the wide understandings of its activities has always been problematic (CASE, 2008). Furthermore, research mapping the academic curricula for emerging social enterprise, student recruitment pattern and performance as well as internal and external course evaluation that provides benchmark criteria for practitioners and academicians is lacking. Thus, empirical and robust conceptual research
will benefit most especially individuals and communities for who these social enterprises are created for as well as academics, practitioners and policy makers. In addition, results from the CASE (2008) project also noted that, the majority of practicing social entrepreneurs do not even identify themselves as such and that, this is the time to make a major leap forward as many opportunities are open for S E proponents to produce new models, frameworks and ways of thinking that will form the basis of this emerging field.

Recently, on Wednesday 30th of April 2014 the UK HEEG (higher education entrepreneurship group) organized an event that was aimed at mobilizing entrepreneurship course instructors to look at social enterprises and S E education and how UK business schools and HEIs can respond to the growing opportunities of social enterprises in today’s economy for the benefit of their students. This signifies that, there is an urgent need to develop this field particularly among academicians and students in UK.

From the above discussion, it is clear that little literature exists on the drive to equip S E educators with well-grounded educational materials that incorporates aspects encouraging social innovative thinking, responsible, S E. It is important curriculum content and teaching methods that lead to the development of social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. It is contended that, this will clearly differentiate S E from the CSR practices of mainstream entrepreneurs. This is very vital in maintaining the “social” status of the field since more is expected from social entrepreneurs to create realistic social value in an innovative way (Chell et al 2014; Porter and Kramer, 2011; Tracey and Philips, 2007). In addition, teaching methods and content should motivate students to start identifying themselves as social entrepreneurs and develop self confidence that they have all it takes and the ability to effectively impact a social change in the context of S E in UK business schools offering S E education.

To close this research gap, this exploratory study attempts to find a solution to the problem of equipping educators with the required material needed to enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs in the context of “social entrepreneurship education in UK business schools” – an area that is untapped within this field.
1.3 Study purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore the current curriculum content and teaching methods employed by S E educators in UK business schools. The study also seeks to identify which and how these content and methods enhance social innovative thinking within students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs.

1.4 Research aim.

To develop a model incorporating teaching content and methods that can enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

1.5 Research objectives

1. Assess the current content of the S E curriculum in UK business schools in order to identify best teaching content that can enhance social innovative thinking and the development of potential responsible social entrepreneurs.

2. Analyze the teaching methods currently used by S E educators in UK business schools in order to identify the best teaching methods that enhance social innovative thinking and the development of potential responsible social entrepreneurs.

1.6 Research question

Which teaching content and methods enhance social innovative thinking and student motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs?

1.7 Definition of terms

Responsible social entrepreneur: A social entrepreneur who remains true to the original idea of creating social value and reinvesting profit for more social change activities (Cornelius et al, 2008).

Social innovative thinking: The ability to come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems. For example, how to generate the financial resources needed to achieve social value creation objectives and creating new legal structures (Drayton, 2006; Porter and Kramer, 2011).
Social value: The changes that stakeholders experience through changes in their lives. (Social value UK, 2016)

Social entrepreneurs. Ambitious and persistent individuals with innovative solutions to society’s most pressing social problems (Ashoka and Brock, 2011)

Social entrepreneurship. A process that consists of identifying, addressing and solving societal problems (Ashoka, 2006)

Content.” Knowledge specific domain, skills, abilities, and processes addressed during the exchange period of teaching and learning” (Conti and Kolody, 2004, p.51)

Context. “The leaning conditions that prevail during the learning process that are not personal or psychological attributes of the learner or teacher” (Conti and Kolody, 2004, p.189)

Teaching. “Personal growth facilitation and development that impacts the learners social, professional and political aspects” (Galbraith, 2004, p.3)

Teaching methods. Techniques used in delivering course content towards achieving the learning objective (Conti, 2004)

1.8 Research Findings

The Findings show that the key teaching content that has enhanced social innovative thinking includes: historical and contemporary issues of S E, the resource base/ bricolage and effectuation theories and the business canvas model/divergent and convergent thinking tools. The key teaching methods include: group social business planning, implementation and presentation, interviewing/visiting social entrepreneurs/enterprises.

Discussing history and contemporary issues surrounding S E by employing the group teaching method encourages social innovative thinking. This exposes students to how social issues have and are currently being addressed. Through students’ group discussions, students were able to come up with new legal approaches towards tackling existing social issues. In the context of UK, the majority of the students are international students. Discussing strategies that have been used in tackling social issues in different contexts in groups has encouraged the exchange of ideas. This also acts as a starting point for students
to think on how strategies that worked in different contexts can be adopted or modified and employ in their context. For example, the cooperative and association legal framework has allowed social enterprises to flourish in the European context. Discussing this in groups encouraged students to delve deeper and think on how legal structures that worked in different contexts can be modified and employed in their country of origin. Thus, this has enabled students to potentially value the importance of cooperating as a group to create social value. It has also made them categorize and identify as part of a group that potentially seeks to provide innovative solutions towards tackling social issues. This confirms the social identity theory contention that, a group is an important source of self-esteem and pride.

Students groups also use the conception behind the resource base, bricolage and effectuation theories to develop new ways towards addressing social issues. Findings show that, these theories can re-enforce social innovative thinking to a greater extent. With “no fund” student groups employ the bricolage and effectuation theory notion of “making do” (Fisher, 2012) and examine the available resources, use what they could afford towards achieving the expected social outcome. This is very important in the context of S E education as compared to CSR since most social problem occurs in environments with limited financial resources and social entrepreneurs are expected to solve these problems (Konda, Stanc and Rodica, 2015). The findings show that, the business canvas model combined with the divergent and convergent tools can help student groups to think outside the box. The business model canvas allows the setting up on one posture of the different activities required (Paul, 2013). According to Brush, Green and Hart (2001), to encourage the transfer of an individual’s capabilities into the social venture, the divergent and convergent thinking tool can be useful. Divergent thinking encourages the collection of different ideas from each individual in the group and convergent thinking has to do with thinking as a group on those ideas the team has agreed on (Whiteboard, 2015). This enhances the thinking of each individual as a person as well as collective thinking. By employing the practice based method (group social business planning, implementation and presentation), student groups generated a social business idea, implemented it and shared their experiences through presenting them to the rest of the class.

Also, findings show that, the key teaching content that has or can enhance responsible S E includes: core values of integrity, measuring outcomes, ethical social enterprise branding/
Dark side of CSR and book review on the biography of social entrepreneurs. Key teaching methods include: Group social business planning, implementation and presentation, group comparative analyses of real cases and guest speaking.

Given the challenging nature of social activities, individual integrity is essential for success though manifested sometimes by a group. While some people are able to maintain their self-integrity when faced with challenges, others can easily deviate or be influenced (Roper and Cheney, 2005). Findings show that the integrity of an individual and the values that individual holds is what has pushed majority of the students across the five business schools to be interested in carrying out social activities responsibly. However, by employing the group social business planning, implementation and presentation teaching method, some students where encouraged and influenced by their group members. Thus, students groups can be an important source of influence and encouragement towards enhancing responsible S E.

The social return on investment (SROI) Outcome measurement technique can enhance responsible S E by getting social enterprises to prove with figures the level of social impact created on each pound invested (Ógáin, Lumley and Pritchard, 2012). As compared to mainstream entrepreneurs who only have to show the economic value (Profit) created on their financial statements, social entrepreneurs who deploy money made through doing business for social change have to show both the social and economic value created (Ógáin, Lumley and Pritchard, 2012). Findings show that, comparing in groups the social impact created by different social with non-social enterprises, has encouraged responsible S E. This can push students who are looking forward to be social entrepreneurs to be more transparent, responsible and to work harder towards achieving their social change target. Ethical issues are very pertinent for the success of social enterprises and for the social status of social enterprises (Chell et al., 2014). Emphasizing ethical issues in the context of S E while pointing out the dark side of CSR has enhanced students’ desire to be responsible by doing everything possible to create realistic social value and re-invest profit for more social change activities. Also, mission drift is common within social enterprises that deploy money made through doing business for social change (Tracey and Philips, 2007). Interviewing/ inviting social entrepreneurs from different social enterprise background as guest speakers have been a source of encouragement to stay focus. Furthermore, review books that detail how
famous social entrepreneurs overcome challenges and remain true can be an effective tool for social entrepreneurs when faced with challenges.

1.9 Research contribution

Most scholars suggested the importance of looking at what is needed to create more graduate social entrepreneurs (e.g. Kirby and Ibrahim, 2011). Others (e.g. Westley and Antadze, 2010; Smith and Woodworth, 2012; Tracey, Philips and Jarvis, 2011) emphasize the need to create the awareness of S E amongst students and the integration of more democratic and egalitarian views enabling student motivation. The emerging body of teaching materials on S E is fragmented and though some approaches and materials from existing courses might be suitable, the question is how should they be adapted and used towards developing effective educational experiences for potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

Bouchikhi (2015) noted that, business schools need to emphasize “responsible entrepreneurship” and it does not necessarily mean because something is socially oriented, that the motivation is ethically responsible (Cornelius et al, 2008). Chell et al. (2014) pointed out the need to emphasise the “social” aspect of S E education. Porter and Kramer (2011) and Tracey and Philips (2007) emphasise the need for social entrepreneurs to create realistic social value in an innovative way. In addition, steps forward from CASE (2008) project suggested that, the S E field needs to do everything possible to learn from the past and build on expertise developed. For example, the use of models, conceptual framework and S E language to describe social activities in terms of entrepreneurship is new as language makes a difference and creates new possibilities as well as changes the way we see and react towards things. Furthermore, building institutions that support this sector is also new. Though the appropriate content and teaching methods for S E programs are constantly being discussed, what should be taught and how, still remains the worry and demand of the majority of S E instructors (Lawrence, Phillips and Tracey, 2012).

The theoretical question of which teaching content and methods can actually enhance the potential creation of realistic social value in an innovative and a responsible way has not been investigated. To my knowledge, this study is the first study that draws on the social identity theory and analysed primary data collected from both S E instructors and students.
and proposes a model that instructors can draw on to enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs (see chapter 8 figure 4).

The proposed model is believed to enhance S E education in the following way: firstly, it presents precise teaching content and methods that educators can employ and help students categorise and identify as potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. Secondly, it enables potential social entrepreneurs to value the importance of creating social value as a group. Moreover, by identifying the content and methods that has or can enhance social innovative thinking and responsible S E, this study has added to the body of literature in S E education.

Though the proposed model can be applied at all levels of education, the findings of this study also illuminate the content and methods employed at the Masters, undergraduate and foundation levels (see appendixes I and J). This can help S E instructors to make more informed coursework decisions with more knowledge about the education levels. It is anticipated that, this study can promote instructional design consistency in S E education. Also, findings from this study confirm the social identity theory contention that, a group is an important source of self-esteem and pride (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Students groups can be an important source of influence and encouragement towards enhancing responsible S E given the fact that some people can easily be influenced. The findings show that, students groups encouraged each other to stay focused. Thus, this study advances the utilisation of the social identity theory.

Furthermore, this study also contributes to the growing literature by emphasizing the need to employ experiential learning teaching methods to teach entrepreneurship in general (Kuratko, 2005; Minniti and Bygrave, 2001; Sherman, Sebora, and Digman, 2008) and S E in particular (Brock and Steiner, 2009; Steyaert and Dey, 2014). However, there is a diverse range of teaching methods that are considered to be experiential. Findings from this study suggest that the experiential teaching method that allows students to generate, implement and present in groups (group social business planning, implementation and presentation) while at school can to a greater extent, provide students with the skills needed and also help them identify and categorise as potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.
1.10 Summary

This study draws on the social identity theory, explored and identifies curriculum content and teaching methods used in S E class rooms that can enhance social innovative thinking within students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. Carrying out this study helped identify best practices in the existing S E pedagogy which further helped in developing a model incorporating teaching content and methods that can enhance social innovative thinking and students’ motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. Thus, contributing in equipping S E educators with the materials needed to effectively teach S E as these teaching materials in the context of S E in UK business schools and business schools globally are currently lacking (CASE, 2008).

The rest of the chapters are organized as follows:

Chapter 2 an in-depth literature reviews on entrepreneurship and S E education, S E in UK, S E education and S E education in UK. It also reviews literature that discusses the teaching of S E, the current content and teaching methods employed in teaching S E. Chapter 3 focuses particularly on the social identity theory and draws on certain notions, concepts, and theories from S E education literature and how they influence students’ outputs in order to develop a conceptual framework for this study. The aim is to articulate these notions, theories, concepts and see how they fit in within the research background and questions of this study. Chapter 4 outlines the research methodology employed for this study. Chapter 5 presents the Cases and the results of the data collected. Chapter 6 presents the analyzed data using within case analyses method. In chapter 7, the analyzed data is presented by employing the across case analysis methods. Finally in chapter 8, the analyzed data is discussed and a brief conclusion is provided.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, an overview of literature on entrepreneurship and S E is presented. The chapter also reviews literature on S E education and S E education in the UK including different schools of thought. This study seeks to design and propose a model incorporating curriculum content and teaching methods that can enhance social innovative thinking and student’s motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. Thus, literature that explicitly or implicitly discusses teaching content and methods to teach S E, currently employed teaching content and methods to teach S E as well as the challenges associated with teaching social entrepreneurs is also reviewed.

2.1 Entrepreneurship and S E

The Kauffman foundation (2008) defined entrepreneurship as the transformation of products or services into value generating sustainable enterprises. An enterprise is “Any entity either, new or existing that provides new products or services or develops and uses new methods in producing or developing goods and services at affordable prices” (Baumol, Litan and Schramm, 2007, p.3). Reynolds (2007) noted that, entrepreneurship is considered powerful for job creation. Furthermore, the competition to attract more clients increases as more and more businesses exist. Albornoz (2011) supported this contention by noting that, entrepreneurs, in their effort to attract more clients, innovate in order to improve the standard of products, services and processes. In so doing, non-innovative capabilities entrepreneurs become less competitive and disappear.

Baron (2005) and Young (2001) see S E as the outcomes of social innovation or the practice of CSR by conventional entrepreneurs. Zahra et al. (2009) defined S E as the ability to leverage resources while addressing social problems. Some scholars defined it as the process of using business principles by governments and non-profit organizations (e.g. Austin, Stevenson and Wei- Skillern, 2006; Mort, Weerawardena and Carnegie, 2002; Sharir and Lerner, 2006). Still, Emerson and Twersky (1996) and Robinson (2006) defined it as social values generated through economically sustainable ventures. Furthermore, Ashoka (2006) defines S E as a process that consists of identifying, addressing and solving societal problems.
Agreement on a unique definition for S E is pending with more and more definitions emerging due to the infancy of the field. One of the definitions that shares common features with most definitions in the field is that of Nicholls (2006) who defines S E as innovative and effective activities with a strategic focus on solving social market failures and systematically creating opportunities in addition social values in order to bring about change and maximize social impact by using a range of organizational formats. The lack of a proper meaning, domain, boundaries and forms of S E, characterize it as a field with no unified definition (Short et al., 2009). According to Short et al. (2009), the current state of confusion surrounding the concept of S E, encourages cross-disciplinary dialogue and theory advancement in the field. However, a community of practices including those that embrace all these definitions is starting to emerge in order to maintain key players’ commitment, interest and participation while waiting for more clarity and agreement on a unique definition (CASE, 2008).

According to Konda, Starc and Rodica (2015), S E has created employment for many people. It has also encouraged social inclusion, health care, good political structures and education. However, despite these positive outcomes, there is a lack of support mechanisms for the creation of social enterprises. There is the need to overcome challenges faced by the world in the social, economic and environmental spheres. S E has been the focus of many public debates as a way forward to address these challenges. Challenges such as climate change, poverty, and social exclusion can manifest in both global and small scales within local communities (Senge et al., 2008). S E and social innovation can help facilitate the solving of these global issues internationally. Mutual collaboration from different sectors enhances successful social innovation (SIE, 2012). To be considered as innovative, social innovation must be able to bring permanent benefits to users (BEPA, 2011). Through S E, individuals with certain ideology or concerned with a particular social problem can be brought together to successfully design a social and economic activity around it (Laville and Nyssens 2001). This provides the opportunity for enterprises to demonstrate their capability to be economically innovative in the face of intermediary areas. Thus, social enterprise is viewed to be promoting a special kind of social capital by transferring from the private towards a more public sphere. Zahra et al., (2008) noted that, often, social entrepreneurs target problems with global relevance though usually start with small local efforts. The validated
innovative solutions by social entrepreneurs in their local context are often replicated in different geographical settings. For example the Grameen bank.

### 2.2 S E in UK

The concept of S E did not really spread rapidly in UK and Europe during the 1990’s, however initiatives in the field increased within the first half of the 1990’s inspired by the Italian Social Enterprise Cooperative (DTI 2002). Since then, debates in this field experienced a rapid increase within the UK in 2002. The definition of social enterprise by UK government came more than a decade after Italy first initiated the social enterprise concept. According to DTI (2002), the UK government defines S E as a business with a primary social objective whose profits are re-invested for social purposes into the business or in the community, rather than being driven towards maximizing profit for shareholders and owners. Different tools have been developed towards fostering the social enterprise initiative in the UK such as the development of the UK Trade and Industry Department, a social enterprise unit and training programs. In 2002, the “community interest company “(CIC) was approved by the British parliament and in less than just two years after this new legal form was complemented, over 1000 community interest companies have been created in UK (DTI, 2002).

Within the UK economy, agreement on what constitutes a social enterprise is pending as opposing views emerge from the literature. For example, Pearce (2003) and Drayton (2005) equate it with social movements. On the other hand, Micheal (2006) sees it as a business sector like any other business sector using market mechanism to deliver social projects. Between them, organizations within the charities, co-operatives and voluntary community organizations can be considered as social enterprises. From this definition, it is clear that UK government encourages the social sector through voluntary community organizations. The UK social enterprise has been reported to be competent in creating cost effective jobs and this can be confirmed by collected data from a social enterprise unit survey. According to the survey result, 15,000 social enterprises existed in UK in 2005 with a total turnover of 18 billion pounds, a work force of 775,000 people and 3,000,000 volunteers. As a benchmark, in 1995, the employment figure within the social enterprise sector in full time employment was 127,575 jobs in cooperatives, 22,387 jobs in mutual and 1,473,000 jobs in the voluntary sector giving a total of 1,622,962 jobs (8.42% of the UK employment rate) (Roger, 2008 cited
in Defourny and Nyssens, 2008). From these statistics, it is clear that, S E is rapidly growing in the UK. Thus, there is the urgent need to equip educators with materials needed to effectively teach S E (Lawrence, Phillip and Tracey, 2012; CASE, 2008).

Hines (2005) carried out a research aimed at identifying the challenges faced by UK social enterprises in their attempt to setup develop and gain access to the needed support. Findings from this research commissioned by the Triodes bank (a UK bank specialized in lending money to social enterprises across UK) showed that, though there is a progressive understanding of the social enterprise concept within the UK support agencies and networks, delivering this support still appear to be problematic. According to Hines survey most of the interviewed informants mentioned that, this problem may actually be due to poor understanding of the sector. Also, many mentioned that despite the task given to the UK national business support services, there is little progress in the skill support given to social enterprises as the majority of UK social organizations still rely heavily on informally obtained information from networks, friends, personal knowledge and skills. Defourny and Nyssens (2008) added that, in the UK, “social enterprise” has been used for several years for policy and development discourse. Progress in the social enterprise sector within UK has been segmented. Rogers, 2008 cited in Defourny and Nyssens (2008) noted that, more development can be seen in the field of leisure services, home care services and work integration as compared to procurement. Moreover, public policies within the UK that social enterprises can draw on for activities are lacking. Disadvantaged individuals are more linked to work integration subsidies and not to the enterprises supporting them. However, measures towards supporting the sector are beginning to be put in place for example, finance for the social enterprise unit as well as new programs for the health social enterprise emerging sector( Hines, 2005).

2.3 Entrepreneurship/ S E Education

According to Kuratko (2005) entrepreneurial perspectives can be develop in individuals. This could be through profit or non-profit enterprises, non-business or business activities, inside or outside an organisation for the purpose of generating creative ideas. This makes entrepreneurship more than just creating a business. Entrepreneurship education embodies all activities that aim to foster skills, attitudes, and entrepreneurial mind-sets (Fayolle and
Alberti, Sciascia and Poli (2004) mentioned that, in 1938, Shigeru Fijii started the teaching of entrepreneurship in Japan. In 1940s small business management courses began to emerge and in 1947 the first course in entrepreneurship was introduced in USA by Myles Mace at the Harvard Business School. It was only after half a century that education on entrepreneurship was more universally recognised. The first MBA with entrepreneurship as a speciality was launched by the University of Southern California in 1971. This was followed by an undergraduate degree in 1972. Entrepreneurship education experienced a rapid growth with over 300 universities teaching this course in the early 1980s and by 1990s, the number increased to 1,050 schools (Solomon, Weaver and Fernald, 1994). Entrepreneurship has emerged as the most powerful economic force in the world. This has brought a rapid increase in the field of entrepreneurship education. Though with this remarkable increase, the field faces complete academic legitimacy challenges (Kuratko, 2005).

Zeithalm and Rice (1987) suggested some areas which entrepreneurship education and researchers should focus on, one of which is research into the teaching methods commonly used in teaching entrepreneurship. These scholars also mentioned that, entrepreneurship education covers the entire management education. Entrepreneurship education was seen at that time to be the closest approach to the original concept of management education. As time passed by, business education continued to fragment into narrow specialisation. Ronstadt (1987) proposed the idea of designing entrepreneurial programs in a way that allows potential entrepreneurs to be aware of the obstacles involved in initiating their entrepreneurial career and to devise ways to overcome them. Ronstadt (1987) came up with two continuum models. His structured-unstructured model discusses the use of lectures, feasibility plans and case studies as teaching methods in teaching entrepreneurship education. His entrepreneurial know to how/entrepreneurial know to who model asserts that, success in entrepreneurship does not only depend on knowledge but the various networks an entrepreneur is connected to.

Robinson and Heyes (1991) conducted a survey to determine the growth and success of entrepreneurship education. One of the challenges noted was the challenge of developing existing programs and competent entrepreneurs. According to Robinson and Heyes (1991), this is due to the lack of good theoretical bases for building pedagogical models and
methods. In addition, further growth strongly depends on how new programs are integrated with the established system of entrepreneurship education. Today, entrepreneurship education has exploded and it is becoming clearer that entrepreneurship in general or certain aspects of it can be taught (Kuratko, 2005). The nature of entrepreneurship has led most people to question if it can be taught. To satisfy entrepreneurial novelty, entrepreneurship graduates must be creative and innovative. The equivocal nature of business entry must be addressed in entrepreneurship education. Entrepreneurship education must include new product development, innovative and creative thinking, and sources of venture capital, career options and idea protection. Professional and educators in the business field have grown beyond the myth that entrepreneurs are not made but born (Drucker, 1985).

In fact Drucker (1985) made it clear that, to be an entrepreneur is not magic or mysterious and it has nothing to do with genes. It is a discipline and like any other discipline, entrepreneurship can be learnt. To support this view, most of the empirical surveys carried out on small business management, enterprise and entrepreneurship education confirms that, all forms of entrepreneurship including S E can be taught or encouraged by entrepreneurship education (Gorman, Hanlon and King, 1997). With the widely accepted notion that entrepreneurship is the key to effective competition, productivity and innovation (Plaschka and Welsch, 1990), there is no doubt that entrepreneurship can be taught. The most relevant question about entrepreneurial education generally is: what should be taught and how? (Ronstadt, 1987). However, in terms of what should be taught, Kuratko (2005) summarise a list of some key themes that are now part of entrepreneurship education and research (see Kuratko, 2005).

Though entrepreneurship is the key to economic development, Wilson et al. (2009) emphasized the need to develop people with the necessary skills and attitude, people to pursue opportunities and the need for a more entrepreneurial culture are the major challenges facing all economies. Konda, Starc and Rodica (2015) noted that, there is the need to overcome challenges faced by the world in the social, economic and environmental spheres. Also, there is the need to introduce a system in which economic wealth is created in a way that also creates social value by addressing societal needs and challenges. S E encourages social inclusion, job creation, health care, good political structures and education.
S E has been the focus of many public debates as a way forward to address these challenges. This according to Porter and Kramer (2011) is different from CSR because creating social value is viewed as part of the business and S E can act as a catalyst to bring about this transition. The driving force of S E is to address the social problem in an entrepreneurial and innovative way (Chell, 2007). In a time like this with severe economic and social issues and when old methods of solving problems fail to work, there is the need for a new option or alternative. S E creates room for these alternative solutions (Konda, Starch and Rodica, 2015).

S E education has the opportunity to promote entrepreneurial solutions to social problems. It also has the responsibility to address and encourage critical thinking regarding the further limitations of such problems (Porter and Kramer 2011). Social enterprises tackle a variety of environmental and social issues and operate in all parts of the economy. Also, as a strategy to alleviate poverty, graduate should be well equipped and motivated to create sustainable commercial enterprises that do not only create jobs but empowers and improve the livelihood of the poor (Griffiths, 2011). In a recent interview with Driver (2012), Michael Porter contextualised and explores S E as a transformation of capitalism. According to Porter’s suggestion, S E is a transition vehicle towards shared value creation and a capitalist system where in, meeting social needs is part of every businesses and not just a peripheral. This is a responsibility for educators in the S E field. It demands social entrepreneurs to be more entrepreneurial and entrepreneurs to be more social. Porter and Kramer (2011) emphasise the urgent need for business schools to transform the curriculum and the way business schools are managed. According to Porter and Kramer (2011), S E students should work with mentors that are practitioners, advisers and consultants and act as a catalyst to this change. Also, business schools need to rethink the entire value chain towards producing and promoting societal impact and shared value (both economic and social value).

S E education is gradually gaining momentum in business schools, universities and other educational programs (e.g. Ashoka, Echoing and Green). Nicholls and Cho (2006) encourage greater precision and conceptual clarity allowing the building of a scientific knowledge base within the domain. Light (2006) on the other hand, emphasizes on the broadening of the S E domain. The multidisciplinary nature of S E provides business schools and their faculty with a unique academic environment and opportunity to focus the teaching of courses on
theoretical frameworks and practical skills. Aspects of S E education programs are widely intergraded in over 148 global institutions with over 500 academicians teaching or researching on S E education (Ashoka and Brock, 2011). Furthermore, S E education is currently becoming more and more important. Brock and Kim (2011) noted that, more than 500 institutions (business schools and public policy schools) were reported to be involved in teaching S E in 2011 around the globe. According to Kickul, Janssen-Selvadurai and Griffiths (2012), little attention has been paid to the role and extent to which entrepreneurship education influences future S E activities and the adoption of new curricula and innovative pedagogy that assist students to address the complex nature and scale of social problems through resource mobilization and the capabilities students need to initiate, develop and grow their own operations. Similarly, Kickul, Griffiths and Bacq (2010) and Tracey and Philips (2007) noted that, despite recent efforts made towards conceptualizing S E education in order to strengthen and encourage the field by organizations such as Ashoka and Aspen, to date, the S E education field still lacks clear theorizing.

The international social entrepreneurship research conference (2005, 2006) and the Minnesota ethics and entrepreneurship conference, (2006) in their attempt to define the specific boundaries of S E noted that, often, S E educators describes social ventures in different dimensions (for e.g. non-for profit, public, private, communities/funders). Others focus on the role of institutions on social enterprises, the resource constrains atmospheres within which social enterprise generates and how resources are acquired by social entrepreneurs to achieve their social mission objectives. Pache and Chowdhury (2012) emphasize that, knowledge on the specific nature of social ventures and opportunities needs to be acquired by aspiring social entrepreneurs. Doherly and Thomps (2006) noted that, due to the continuous increase in the size of S E organizations and as the field tries to distinguish and define its unique domain in academic research, building a knowledge base for the field is challenging. S E educators need to provide potential social entrepreneurs with a combination of managerial, opportunity-specific and venture-specific skills which allows them to understand how to create, seize new market opportunities and manage social organizations. It should be noted that, the driving force of S E is to address social problems in an entrepreneurial and an innovative way (Chell, 2007).
2.4 SE education in UK

Business schools in the UK as compared to public administration or non-profit management schools are leading in the SE education. Though, UK business schools and universities are beginning to enter the social enterprise market, domestic coordination is lacking in the standard of research agenda. Somers (2005) identified the urgent need to overcome existing gaps such that once best practices in developing the field are identified and refined by experts, institutions to deliver and develop potential social entrepreneurs and social enterprise manager will be ready. Therefore, this confirms the relevance of this study since this study seeks to identify and develop a model incorporating best curriculum content and teaching methods that SE instructors can draw on and enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs after collecting information that seeks to answer the question: Which teaching content and methods enhance social innovative thinking and student motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs?

In the UK, as compared to mainstream entrepreneurship education which has been firmly included on majority of UK business schools’ curriculum, SE education is still a new comer with only a minor number of courses taught to potential social entrepreneurs or those working in social organizations at undergraduate and post graduate levels. Moreover, it should be noted that, due to the infancy of the field only very few universities within UK (e.g. Goldsmith and Oxford universities) offers social and community enterprise courses at the post graduate level. Majority of UK universities and business schools offering SE education offer it at the fundamental level or include it as just as part of the mainstream entrepreneurship curriculum content. However, the field is gradually gaining ground in the UK with many SE specialized groups created by interested academicians (Haugh, 2005).

2.5 Teaching SE

Different kinds of teaching philosophy should be encouraged in SE education for e.g. integrating more democratic and egalitarian views enabling student’s motivation and engagements (Smith and Woodworth, 2012). Supporting this view, Brookfield (1995) and Weimer (2002) emphasized that students need to be taught to be competitive as well as cooperative in their learning approach. Scholarly teaching also includes reflection on
curriculum, processes and content, instruction and pedagogy at the level of course rationale (Kreber, 1999). According to Weimer (2002) suggestion, constructivism should be at the core of teaching philosophy where content acts as a means to knowledge rather than the end, according to this notion, S E educators should be learning facilitators by inspiring students to become self-directed learners during their formal education and to apply this skills through their personal and professional lives. This can only be achieved by equipping S E educators with the right learning materials.

Levie (1999) mentioned that, two main types of entrepreneurial teaching are evident: courses for entrepreneurs and courses about entrepreneurs. According to Levie, courses about entrepreneurship employ traditional teaching methods. These types of entrepreneurship courses are design to create awareness and are more of content or subject led. Courses for entrepreneurship turn to engage students more in projects, activities and tasks that allow them to acquire key competences and skills. Choosing a teaching technique depends on the content, objectives and the expectation of the institution in question (Levie, 1999).

The review of literature in this section is divided into four sub sections. The first section provides a review of literature related to the challenges in educating social entrepreneurs. Section two reviews literature related to the proposed and currently employed teaching content and methods that is believe are employ to teach about S E. The third section review literature related to the proposed and currently employed teaching content and methods that teach for S E. finally section four review literature related to propose and currently employed content and teaching methods in S E. Section four also reviews literature that suggests the need to address aspects related to social innovative thinking and responsible S E teaching outcome. The aim here is to point out the literature gap this study attempts to fill.

2.5.1 Challenges in teaching S E

OECD (1999) argued that, what makes social entrepreneurs distinct is their ability to combine social purpose with entrepreneurial strategies. Dees and Anderson (2006) named a school of thought called social innovators and this emphasizes an entrepreneur from the Schumpeter’s perspective. Here, social entrepreneurs are defined as change markers who carry out new combinations in either of the following ways; new service quality, new
production methods, new organizations forms, new production factors and are more about social impact outcome than income. Drucker (1985) sees Innovation as the process of creating and providing to the society something with value that is new and/or different from what has been previously provided. Social innovators have a transformative potential effect and create novel solutions to social problems (Leadbeater, 2008). The concept of S E and social innovation by early writers was located in non-profit sector. Thus, leaving business school uncertain of their relevance and unclear about how financially viable courses and programs in this area are. However, according to Lawrence, Phillips and Tracey (2012), S E and social innovation in the past decade, has proven to be part of the growing movement seeking solutions to some of the world’s social problems and business schools have a big role to play in this movement.

As compared to other forms of entrepreneurship, S E in particular is demanding. Intractable problems of the world: economic development, education, health, energy, water, poverty, agriculture, technology, food/nutrition and environment are responsibilities of social entrepreneurs as they are expected to effectively and innovatively address and potentially solve these problems (Tracey and Phillips, 2007). Literature covers three key challenges peculiar to S E which need to be addressed in S E education and this is due to the social objective and the hybrid nature of social enterprises. Accountability, identity and double bottom line management are key challenges faced by social entrepreneurs.

Charkham (1994) pointed out that, accountability issues are complex for social enterprises. Broadly, organizations members make decisions taking into consideration the interest of their owners since they have to operate according to their interest. Supporting this view was Emerson (1999) who affirmed that, for social entrepreneurs, this is even more difficult since they have to create additional stakeholders whom they must consider and communicate with in their venture building and strategy development process. In addition, Franks and Mayer (1995) argued that, social entrepreneurs like any other entrepreneurs need to generate profit based on competitive products and services, and consulting stakeholders may slow down decision making and captivity. Furthermore, providing the organization with the needed legitimacy and connecting the social enterprise to key stakeholders require skills which social entrepreneurs must have and students needs to be well equipped with all this (Cornforth, 2003). Educating students about what social ventures are and their existence in
today’s market may be challenging. Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern (2006) acknowledge that, what makes S E different is the fact that, social entrepreneurs sometimes use their own resources to achieve social objectives and students need to understand that, the prime aim of S E is the creation of social value and their success is measured based on the extent to which they achieve “social transformation”.

Moreover, Tracey and Phillips (2007) noted that, what is peculiar about social entrepreneurs with earned income streams is the identity problem since the goal of trying to generate income from for-profit activities in order to achieve social objectives, confuses people as to what they are and what their actual objective is. Thus, curriculum content and teaching methods that expose students to this identity issue and how to manage it is essential for the long term success of this type of social organization.

Furthermore, some social entrepreneurs may opt for fully non-profit organizations which depend totally on grants, donations and government funding. Others may be for-profit but serve a social mission and sell products and/or services to fund their activities. Still, others may be non-profit but supplement grants and donations received with income earned from for-profit activities. What makes these types of social entrepreneurs different according to Tracey and Philips (2007) is the fact that, they do not deal only with achieving social missions but also the economic success needed to meet social objectives and this is termed the “double bottom line”. However, all are social entrepreneurs since they both have a prime mission of achieving social objectives. Educating students about this is necessary as this is important for the sustainability of social enterprises.

2.5.2 Teaching about S E

According to Gorman, Hanlon and King (1997), the use of case material and simulation are amongst some of the approaches used in delivering all forms of entrepreneurship education. Also, Hills (1988) affirmed that, the production of a Business plan is the most common curriculum format in entrepreneurship education. Supporting this view, Kwong, Thompson and Cheung (2012) noted that, mentoring students to prepare a business plan for a social enterprise and the application of conventional case study approach towards teaching S E was found to be valuable for S E teaching approaches. According to their research, these methods increase student interest in social issues. Kwong, Thompson and Cheung (2012)
concluded that, S E education is effective when varieties of teaching study modes are applied. On the other hand, Gastrogiovanni (1996) argued that, the usage of business plans both theoretically and practically are poorly understood though there are many curricular resources on their training and supervision and that, little evidence exists as to whether business plans actually lead to successful new ventures.

Also, Fiet (1998) argued that, listening to successful entrepreneurs talk about how they launch their ventures and using case studies is not enough. According to him, to support student learning experience, students need to be taught theories and provided with a conceptual background that will allow them to engage with the real business world. Fiet (1998) proposed that, to improve what is taught to all forms of entrepreneurship students, there is the need to pursue research that is theory driven and integrate research findings in a way that students can easily apply and understand. According to Fiet, educators become useless teachers if unable to apply theories as tools towards answering students’ questions. Pittaway and Edwards (2012) explored entrepreneurship assessment practices and noted that, researchers should use empirical research to observe actual practices and understand assessment practices. In addition, Pittaway et al. (2009) focus group research on entrepreneurship education revealed that, entrepreneurship education assessment practices are complex. Pittaway et al. (2009) suggested the need to consider and properly match the intended entrepreneurial learning outcome with effective course design. Moreover, there is lack of innovative assessment practices that includes peer, self and stakeholders assessments (Fiet, 1998).

Fiet (1998) mentioned that, instructors depend on the lecture teaching method because this method demands less investment and can be accomplished easily. However other used methods includes: guest speaking, study visit, business plan, projects and presentations. The effectiveness of every form of entrepreneurship education is to a large extent dependent on the teaching methods employed and the teacher’s skills. According to Rae and Carswell (2001), by nature, all forms of entrepreneurship involve teachable and non-teachable skills. Identifying what matches the students and the teaching techniques best and to effectively teach the teachable skills is the key to a successful entrepreneurship education (Arasti, Kiani and Imanipour, 2012). The choice of the teaching technique depends on the content, objectives and the expectation of the institution in question (Levie, 1999).
Recently, efforts have been made towards learning in higher education institutions. Branford, Brown and Cocking (2002) noted that, the national research council and the American psychological association are examples of institutions that have focus on what is call “the new science of learning” towards improving the educational system. According to Dewey (1938) theory of experience, traditional education had little need for theory as tradition was the bases on which practiced was determined. Kegan (1994) added that, written paper test cannot give students the required experience. Though creating and holding learning spaces is not easy, people can only grow well when they continuously experience an ingenious blend of challenges and support. Also, educational institutions have quite been successful in challenging students but have been less successful in providing the support, which may be due to the fact that challenges may be specific and immediate but support most go beyond an immediate climate or culture where in learners can trust to “hold” over time and this is an essential requirement in creating and holding learning spaces (Kegan, 1994).

Kolb and Kolb (2005) noted also that, most often, management classes in all forms conveys information with little attention on student’s performance which mostly occurs as written paper tests and exams. These techniques are quite good for foundational materials where students are provided with the tools needed in analytical decisions making but as compared to contemporary managers or adults, this method is not suitable. In addition, Mintzberg and Gosling (2002) noted that, most academic learning present information in a manner that can easily be predictable where students are allow to read, digest and repeat abstract, problems and solutions previously dictated as they are often faced with complex and dynamic problems.

Similarly, reports from the national research council reiterate that, effective learning does not only require factual knowledge but organizing this fact and ideas in a conceptual framework as well as the ability to retrieve and transfer knowledge for application in different contexts. In addition, Dowey (1934, p.45) noted that, “nothing takes roots in mind when there is no balance between receiving and doing. Students need the space to meet and reflect as decisive actions are needed to establish some degree of contact with the world’s reality such that learners may be impressed with the fact that, value is tested and organized. Many business schools still focus on filling information in the minds of the
learners rather than providing opportunities where learners can actively test and express what has been learned. Often, according to Dowey (1934), learners are tested only through a couple hours’ multiple-choice exams. In the same line, Keeton, Sheckley and Griggs (2002) mentioned that, deliberating recursive practices on learner’s goal related area is essential. Thus, curricula development should allow space where students can pursue such deep experiential learning in order to develop their life purpose expertise.

Peterman and Kennedy (2003) assert that, research is lacking on the impact all forms of entrepreneurial intentions have on education in terms of students’ desirability and feasibility in starting their own businesses. According to Honig (2004), generally, suggestions from the research findings affirm that, an individual intention to create a business increases when exposed to certain types of entrepreneurship education and real world practical experience programs have been proven beyond reasonable doubt to enhance the desirability and feasibility of individual intentions to begin a business. Frequently, entrepreneurship consist of an inductive approach in which different products, services and ideas are either examined, modified or delivered and the result of this inductive activity acts as an end point to the process (Sarasvathy, 2001). Also, all forms of entrepreneurs are considered experts in their respective entrepreneurial activities and suggestions from research on expert knowledge emphasis that, familiarity and experience enable experts to be in a position of approaching problems from a qualitative broader perspective while maximizing their efficiency when moved to quantitative activities (Glaser and Chi, 1988).

2.5.3 Teaching for S E

Several attempts have been made in designing curriculum that provide students with the opportunity to get the hands-on experience that would increase their employability (Barr and McNeilly, 2002) and because of its ability to reflect a real world working environment. Kuratko (2005) suggested that, this pedagogical approach needs to be a key component of entrepreneurship curriculum. A solid experiential component is the key to all forms of entrepreneurship education (Ashour, 2016). The majority of entrepreneurial knowledge is tacit and cannot be easily codified, thus indicating that it will be extremely difficult to transfer teaching on entrepreneurship within classroom boundaries or lecture theaters (Aronsson, 2004). In addition, the product of tacit knowledge is what most entrepreneurs
do. Tacit knowledge which according to Polyani (1967) is also referred to as knowledge by doing is often acquired through learning by experience. Thus, it is important that, experiential education (informal education) is incorporated in the S E curriculum.

Experiential learning is how individuals develop practical skills both within and outside the formal teaching environment and as defined by Coombs (1985, p.25), experiential knowledge is the “life long experience whereby, knowledge, skills, attitude and insights is being acquired and accumulated by individuals from daily experience and exposure to the environment at home-at work, and at play”. Research confirms that, students participating in experiential or practice-based learning exhibit varieties of criteria demanded by employers. This includes team building negotiation, communication and interpersonal skills, maturity and emotional intelligence and other extra-curricular activities that develop the graduates in terms of their personality, motivation, identity and culture which are all important drivers of employability (Ashour, 2016; Anderson and Green, 2006; Nicholls and Walse, 2007, Huq and Gilbert, 2013).

Bandura (1986) argued that, all forms of entrepreneurship education can serve as a preparatory ground for start-ups and new venture creation. Knowledge transfer and skills acquisition and development can increase the effectiveness and self-efficacy of potential entrepreneurs. What is needed in entrepreneurship is practice. Locke’s (1993) supported this view and argued that, the paradigm for business education for the nineteenth century was the British learning by doing model. Thus, tying academic learning to the real world and linking theories to business models is very much needed. Furthermore, there is the need to employ pedagogical approaches that involve the use of experiential learning that embeds hands-on experience. This is believed to be most effective by the majority (Minniti and Bygrave, 2001; Sherman, Sebora, and Digman, 2008).

Similarly, a study by Koo et al (n.d) aimed at defining S E, presents a framework for S E education, S E lectures issues and a report of students’ performance and teaching methods in Yonsei University. Their study also outlines ways to develop S E education in universities. Their study suggests the encouragement of students to find solutions to the peculiar problems their society is facing, for example, community-based-learning, project oriented learning. Furthermore, Jack and Anderson (1998) noted that, often students lack good
business ideas which result in low skills and barriers to proposing and developing ideas. To overcome this, Jack and Anderson (1998) proposed that, S E students should work with students from other disciplines and practicing social entrepreneurs. This offers varieties of social entrepreneurial knowledge application and exposure to varieties of context. In addition, Robinson and Haynes (1991) proposed that mentoring may be one such avenue. Social entrepreneurial learning can be enhanced through placements, personal networks and the provision of role models. Economic security will continue to depend on skills, and adaptation to changing requirements and ideas.

Also, Ashour (2016) survey of 1,080 students attending different disciplines in 14 UAE public and private universities reveals that, despite the high level of interest in SE, the limited access to SE education, training and experience leads to a drive–preparedness gap that must be reduced in order to maximise the potential of the UAE’s next generation. Ashour (2016) findings suggest that, the introduction of internships and “hands-on” experiences, coupled with the creation of incubators for both social and business entrepreneurs can foster SE among university students. Ashour (2016) emphasized that, SE courses should include how social entrepreneurs develop their ideas, how they fund their ventures, the ways in which they overcome the challenges of integrating various levels of economic performance with social/environmental impact and the types of organisations that social entrepreneurs create (for-profit, non-profit, cooperative, hybrid, etc.).

Moreover, it has been emphasized by scholars that action is required to understand all forms of entrepreneurship (Baron, 2007a; McMullen and Shepherd, 2006). Entrepreneurs pursue business opportunity through action. The setting up of a viable business and the gathering of resources demands continuous action in order to succeed (Gartner, 1985). Scholars have noted that many entrepreneurship training programs focus more on business plans and lack active participant engagement methods (Honig 2004). By being actively involved, participants learn through action by engaging in start-up activities as it is the case in the real entrepreneurship world (Neck and Greene, 2011). According to Fiet (2001), a solid theoretical foundation is also needed. Theories guide participants on what to do instead of just describing what others have done. Frese et al. (2012) argued that, the use of action principles is a way of including theories in training. Action principles provide knowledge on how things can be done and can be derived from scientific evidence and theories.
Gielnik et al. (2015) supported this view and developed an entrepreneurship training program based on action regulation theory. According to these scholars, action plays an essential role in all forms of entrepreneurship education. Using a randomized group design, Gielnik et al. (2015) evaluates over a 12 months period the impact of their training program. Findings show that, business opportunity recognition and entrepreneurial action mediate the effect of the training on the creation of a business. Also, for action-based entrepreneurship, action-regulatory mechanisms play an essential role. In addition, there is the need to combine both short and long term outcomes to explain why and how things work. Long term evaluation helps to better understand the training impact on entrepreneurship and its lasting effect (Gielnik et al., 2015).

According to Clark (1993), transformative learning is “learning that induces more far-reaching change in the learner than other kinds of learning, particularly learning experiences which shape the learner and produce a significant impact, or paradigm shift, affecting the learner’s subsequent experiences.” Mehta et al (2012) study drew on the transformative learning theory and addresses how transformative learning can be applied to stimulate business undergraduate students’ interest in S E activities. Comparative case studies from two universities: one from the U.S and one from Ireland were used to address how the transformative learning approach can be used to get students interested in social activities. Mehta et al (2012) suggested that a S E pedagogy rooted in transformative learning theory can actually enable educators to get students to achieve the deeply transformational rooted thinking habits of a new entrepreneurial mind-set of critical reflection, problem solving and analysis. The teaching methods in the studied United States universities focus on getting S E students to think in an entrepreneurial way and integrate students into the global entrepreneurial community. In this university, teaching content is based on four main pillars which include: resource identification, opportunity recognition, planning and creativity and execution for success. S E programme is based on the transformative learning theory and is designed to transform students by implementing teaching content and methods that stimulate critical reflection and act as a catalyst for problem solving and entrepreneurial thinking.

On the other hand, the Irish universities facilitate transformative learning by eliminating the traditional method of students sitting for end of year exams. Instead in this university,
students are required to organise an event for a charity of their choice. Mehta et al (2012) noted that, this approach is employed to give students the chance to contribute to the society and also to acquire the experience of behaving entrepreneurially. Picard et al (2004) argued that, there is a danger that in today's high-tech society, learning and thinking may be primarily conceived as information processing. This is because if care is not taken, the education system may prioritise skills-oriented and cognitive learning over affective learning. Mehta et al (2012) emphasized that, pedagogies based on transformative learning fully value the importance of effective learning in critical reflection, transformation and self-identification.

Gundlach and Zivnuska (2010) conceptual study introduced the practical organizational behaviour education (PROBE) approach to teaching triple bottom line, sustainability and entrepreneurship related courses. Their study focused on the application of this experiential learning approach (PROBE) to the triple bottom line concept of S E education and suggests the modification of the type of social enterprises students build on graduation. Following the triple bottom line concept, educators need to emphasize to students the importance of creating a financially viable social enterprise that addresses both social and environmental needs. Students should be encouraged to set profitable goals as part of their social business plan. This prepares students for the real business world. According to Mehta et al (2012), without the motive to make profit, students focus on one-time events and small scale projects such as raising funds for a particular charity organization. Students need to understand that, S E is not just about doing good. For a social enterprise to be sustainable, there is the need to identify and create social business opportunities that allow students to do good while making money (Boschee, 2001; Oster et al., 2004). This exposes students to an adequate learning opportunity. The profit motive in this experiential learning approach according to Mehta et al (2012) acts as a stimulant to get students to think and fully partake towards the quality of the project as grades will in the traditional class-room exams.

Chang and Chalcraft (2014) examine how opportunity recognition in S E education by students can be understood better by using the real world experiential learning teaching method. Their study coded data compiled by 125 students on a business entrepreneurship module in a UK business school. Findings from Chang and Chalcraft (2014) study emphasized that, engaging students in real-time experiential learning enable them to learn how
opportunities are identified and created by social entrepreneurs to realise their social
dependencies. This teaching method provides SE education that is realistic. Furthermore,
encouraging students to engage in real-time generation of revenue for a social enterprise
can be an effective teaching method. Starting with no resource, students were required to
take part in revenue generation projects for six social enterprises. The aim was to study the
behaviours students’ exhibit when trying to identify opportunity activities that employ
effectuation, causation and bricolage towards generating value for their social enterprises.

Similarly Mehta et al (2012) research used the eplum model and describes how 120
humanitarian engineering and social entrepreneurship (HESE) students at the Penn State
University are involved in the designing of a technology-based social enterprise that is
scalable and sustainable in a resource constrained environment. The impact and
effectiveness of HESE on student learning was examined using a mix method research
approach. Data was collected through student focus groups, online survey and students’
responses to a course blog were examined in the areas of SE education, global awareness
and multidisciplinary team work. Mehta et al (2012) suggested that, realistic and innovative
solutions in a resource constrained environment generated through student teams from
different disciplines can also enhance system thinking. Also, social entrepreneurs need to be
well skilled in taking joint actions and bringing diverse parties on board. Furthermore,
students have to be exposed and work with a vast network of collaborators and partners
(faith-based organizations, communities, NGO, government and UN agencies and industries)
to ensure the synergies and capital required to facilitate sustainable solutions.

Entrepreneurship education at the policy level is believed to be a cost-effective and efficient
means to producing more quality entrepreneurs in most economies (Matlay, 2006). Entrepre
neurship education also contributes towards the development of skills deemed
important by employers for example team skills, innovation and problem-solving skills
(Heinonen, 2007). Some researchers on entrepreneurship education have emphasized the
use of group-based learning method and team work. This is believed to create a forum for
reflection and generate a pull of experience individuals. Reynolds (1993) and Welsh and
Tullar (2015) mentioned that, the rapid growth in entrepreneurship education has
challenged and pushed educators to think more critically about what should be taught and
how. Welsh and Tullar (2014) focused on quantitative methods and the use of teamwork and
the experiential learning approach. A survey was used to examine and measure pedagogical variables that could increase the scores of students on the construct of change, goal setting, risk taking, achievement and feedback. The finding of this study confirms the need to rethink the use of teamwork as a method to teach all forms of entrepreneurship education. Also, Hytti et al., (2010) publication addressed the impact a person’s motivation to study entrepreneurship has on their performance to generate a business idea while taking into consideration the effect of students’ team behaviour. Their findings show that, team work positively effects the relationship between outcome and intrinsic motivation.

Moreover, Dobbs and Hamilton (2007) and Packalen (2007) support these views by saying that, relationship building is very important in entrepreneurial opportunity identification. Relationships are important sources of information, idea development and resource acquisition (Puhakka, 2007). According to Umble, Umble and Artz (2008), companies formed through teamwork have been found to be more international and growth-oriented in comparison to others. Teams offer a diverse set of skills and knowledge, encourage specialisation and the sharing of responsibility and risk. Thus, teams influence the learning outcome. Umble, Umble and Artz (2008) research reveals that, students’ performance increases through cooperative learning. Active interaction within teams can lead to opportunity recognition through the sharing of different views. Also, pressure from group members may positively contribute to the performance of the group.

Entrepreneurship is comparable to the military strategy in the sense that the fight between two armies is compared to the struggle entrepreneurs experience as a market leader (Onoda, cited in Cambell and Roberts, 1986, p.190). The common element shared by an entrepreneur and war is the “uncertainty” wherein, the environment and resources can become unpredictable. Like the military strategy, entrepreneurship should focus on developing the skills needed to re-evaluate, revise and adapt activities in a manner that can fit in with the changing environment. The old habit of teaching based on general principles should be avoided and embrace pedagogical techniques that focus and emphasis on the application of hands-on activities that result in entrepreneurial learning. Also, pedagogy should advise students to be prepared for surprises and novelty as this is the exact environment they will be involved in and according to Sitkin (1996) is called “training by inoculation”.
2.5.4 Teaching S E, ethics and innovative thinking.

Brock and Steiner (2009) noted that, S E teaching employs experiential components such as students’ exposure to social enterprise leader’s networks, field study programs, conferences and case-based discussions. Brock and Steiner’s (2009) empirical study analysed 107 S E syllabi in the U.S and abroad and examined methods that can help students become change agents. Their study also focused on the definition of S E used by institutions in their course design, the most used cases, articles and text books in the field of S E education and the influence of experiential and service learning teaching methods in the designing of S E courses. Findings from this study suggest that, there is a wide use of the service learning teaching method by most institutions in the U.S to advance education on S E. These include: writing for a social enterprise a social business plan, consulting with a social venture, developing for a social organisation an earned income strategy, starting a social venture, writing a grant proposal for a social organization. Common teaching content includes: opportunity recognition, examining innovative ideas, measuring outcomes, how to build a sustainable business model, mobilising and obtaining resources for social entrepreneurial activities. Brock and Steiner (2009) study also noted that, Bill Drayton quotation that “Innovations can come in a variety of forms – not just in terms of new products and services, but in terms of the ways that the organization operates and delivers value to its constituencies is commonly cited. Also, Hamel (2002) book is widely used. According to Brock and Steiner (2009), S E students can be provided with the tools needed to communicate the value of a social organisation in the long term by teaching the concept of business model. Also, further research should look at in-class experiences (course content) and hands-on projects that have the greatest impact on students in developing a social entrepreneurial mind-set and whether the skills and capabilities students desire to acquire are different from the approaches S E course instructors employ.

Hull and Berry (2016) paper focused on the development of technology –based enterprises that prioritize social value by women engaged in engineering programs. Their finding indicates that, women were motivated to make a difference by employing theories learned in school to address a social problem. Hull and Berry (2016) explained further that, the provision of opportunities such as ethical decision making, multi-disciplinary teamwork, system thinking and practical real world experiences have the potential to motivate and
contribute to students` potential success. Hull and Berry (2016) data suggest that it is not
eough to just discuss ways that engineers can make a world of difference. Engineering
education must also be re-conceptualized in the minds of educators. Traditional classrooms
do not meet the diverse needs and wants of today’s students and is not sufficient to the
evolving nature of the engineering profession in the today’s global economy Hull and Berry,
2016).

Mehta et al (2016) article examined the overall university strategic plan for the explicit
mention of themes that occur most frequently in the discourse around undergraduate
learning of 14 colleges at Penn State. The findings indicates that, common approaches to
enhancing students’ global competencies and developing social entrepreneurial mindsets
reach only to those who can afford them. Barriers such as rising travel costs and risk
management issues hinder the growth of such opportunities especially to emerging
economies in Africa and Asia. Mehta et al (2016) suggest that, there is a need to expand
these global educational experiences to the vast majority of students by embedding
engagement opportunities into regular credit classes. Providing non-travel-based
experiences is essential to scale student engagement in SE globally. Mehta et al (2016) went
ahead to list a number of things that can set an institution apart and these includes:
extremely multi-disciplinary student and faculty teams, emphasis on sustainable and
scalable solutions, a market-centric implementation approach, integration of scholarly
research and publication, and focus on execution - getting the job done in the field. Also
according to Mehta et al (2016), asking pertinent questions such as does this project result in
sustainable value for partnering communities? How will the value be measured? Does the
project lead to self-determined development for the community? What are the results of the
venture in the long-term? Can we scale-up to a multi-million smile enterprise?

Jim Wu, Kuo and Shen (2013) examined how SE related courses were taught in 100 business
schools by employing the web-based content analysis method. Their study was based on the
Beyond Grey Pinstripes (BGP) 100 global list in 2009-2010 and focus on business courses that
have social, environmental and ethical aspects. Findings from this study show that, common
teaching methods include: speakers, case study, conferences and discussion. Common
assessment methods includes: participation, exam, assignment and presentation. The
arrangement of the SE program and the learning by doing teaching method enhances the
balance between theory and practice. It also enables students to create their own social enterprises.

Porter and Kramer (2011) and Tracey and Phillips (2007) noted that, S E is not the end of the positive change journey but rather a crucial beginning towards transforming what is known today as capitalism. This means S E is encouraging a system where companies pursue higher profits that are used to produce positive social change and are rewarded by financial markets for doing so. Dobele (2016) support these views by saying that the huge obstacle for the development of SE in society is ‘architecture of capitalism’ where the main focus is on profit making. Porter and Kramer (2011) noted that, business schools should include the study of deeper human needs and public policy in their curricula. Also, S E curricular should include S E speakers, cases, consulting projects, internships and business plans and underline their importance as a transitional phase. Furthermore, S E educators should address and point out the clear difference between S E and CSR which is not going far enough to address social change and is just a side activity of a business. In addition there is the call for a rethink on existing ideas about S E as part of a larger movement that is calling for a more ethical and socially inclusive capitalism (Dacin, Dacin, and Tracey, 2011). Also, Porter and Kramer (2011) emphasised that, S E represents a new opportunity in business schools by addressing how our social needs can be met by doing business rather than just the commercial ones. Teaching financial statements that also reflect social and environmental impact is important. Porter in an interview with Driver (2012) noted that, the problem today with NGO, charities and social activities with social orientation is that, they have not thought in economic value terms. There is the need to think entrepreneurially about creating economic wealth in order to meet or address the societal problems that they are trying to solve. This according to Porter is innovation. i.e., better ways of solving social issues and creating value where it has not existed before in a sustainable way. To be considered as innovation, social innovation must be able to bring to users permanent benefits (BEPA, 2011).

Research has shown social entrepreneurs are less likely to abandon their efforts when they develop skills to operate in situations where both social and economic demands must be balanced. To address this, Frid, Chowdhury and Green (2016) present a field study theoretical and practical approach to teaching new venture creation and stakeholder management vis-à-vis the specific actions and behaviours undertaken by social
entrepreneurs. Field study according to Frid, Chowdhury and Green (2016) addresses hands-on, experiential education in SE and the challenges and opportunities social entrepreneurs must confront as they act to balance the needs of multiple stakeholder groups. Kedmenec, Rebemik and Tominic (2016) research findings suggest that, activities that empower students and focus their attention on social problems such as making donations, volunteering and activism should be part of SE programmes.

In an attempt to ensure social entrepreneurs maintain a balance between social welfare and commercial success by creating social value in an innovative and sustainable way, Zhu, Rooney and Phillips (2016) based on social-practice wisdom (SPW) and developed a curriculum matrix. The SPW curriculum matrix features includes: teacher should give students sufficient opportunities and space to develop their character and practice focusing on social values and outcomes, compare and clarify their perspective with various stakeholders from relevant sectors, learn-by-doing through dealing with the competing social and commercial logics in simulations and case studies, shadowing social entrepreneurs, internships, and consulting projects in social enterprises, to combine in creative ways both quantitative and qualitative assessment tools to develop sustainable social enterprises and create social impacts. Zhu, Rooney and Phillips (2016) further argued that, social entrepreneurs have complex identities and run the risk that their social entrepreneur identity may be overwhelmed by their commercial identity. Business schools can engage in character development an essential part of practice-based wisdom that encourages one to act in particular ways (Zhu, Rooney and Phillips, 2016).

Steyaert and Dey (2014) in their attempt to find out whether inherently, social is ethical, draw on sociological power, freedom and subjective perspectives and concluded that, the best way to understand and avoid the situation of pre-supposing a ‘true self’ or glibly ethical expectation by social entrepreneurs is by using the practice-based approach of ethics. Also, not all social entrepreneurs enact goodness. Identifying as a social entrepreneur does not inherently means in contrast to others you are a moral being who does the right thing. On the other hand, Tracey and Philips (2007) argued that, the complex demand of the double bottom line management is a challenge faced by social entrepreneurs towards maintaining responsibility in social business transactions. According to Tracey and Philips (2007), the success of social enterprises depends on how social enterprises combine social outcomes
with entrepreneurship strategies towards achieving social missions in a real world marketplace. However, in order to live an ethical and a responsible life, social entrepreneurs must be able to overcome pressure and external powers. Identifying competencies that differentiate a responsible social entrepreneur from others when under pressure and how to manage the complex demand of the double bottom line is an important SE teaching content (Tracey and Philips, 2007). Zainal et al (2017) support these views by saying that, ethical trainings and discussion can increase moral reasoning for some individual and bring a positive implication for people to be less likely to engage in unethical behaviour. Thus, ethical concepts should be included in the teaching of SE. Furthermore, the broader application of SE globally is expected to reduce the ethical egoism of the self interest behaviours reflected in the capitalist business practitioners (Zainal et al 2017).

Miller, Wesley and Williams (2012) noted that, there is little information on the required competencies needed by a social entrepreneur to be successful and whether the competencies taught addresses what is required most from social entrepreneurs and the needs of social entrepreneurs. Miller, Wesley and Williams (2012) used content analysis to analyse the competencies SE courses base on when teaching and evaluate the competencies SE practitioners deemed necessary. Their study also investigated the extent to which competencies are prioritized by practitioners and how it aligns with SE coursework. The competency content analysis of their study found that, the top 5 competencies taught in SE class rooms are managing strategy development, financial capital management, ability to measure outcome, innovativeness/creativity, opportunity exploitation, identification and evaluation. Developing social skills and the confidence to succeed at challenging tasks were lacking in the syllabi. Also, their analyse revealed that, business schools, as compared to non-business schools, focus more on building effective teams, logistics, technology and financial capital management. In addition, findings from Miller, Wesley and Williams’ (2012) survey show that, both educators and practitioners valued the ability to measure outcomes competency. The most interesting finding from their survey was that practitioners of SE ranked least the important in terms of teaching students to value social impact over financial impact. This is shocking given the fact that social entrepreneurs are said to be mission-driven and economic value is just a supporting role (Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern, 2006). The
question therefore arises as to whether the so-called social entrepreneurs are making deceptive claims?

On the other hand Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern (2006) suggested that, the social purpose of S E makes it difficult to teach how to measure outcome in S E because unlike traditional businesses who can rely on performance that is tangible and quantifiable such as customer satisfaction and market share, social change performance measurement is challenging due to it being non-quantifiable and multi-causality and the difference in perception in the social value created. Auerswald (2009) supported this view by arguing that, there may be a difference in the competencies needed by S E practitioners as compared to traditional or non-profit organizations since S E practitioners needs to balance financial goals with social value creation. For example, a social enterprise that is for-profit and invests in social activities by using profit generated from the sale of goods may be more interested in managerial competencies that are business-like, for example financial management and marketing skills, while a social enterprise that is not for-profit may be interested in interpersonal or relationship-based skills between managers and founders in order to legitimize the organization mission in the beneficiary community.

However, Kay (2012) noted that, social enterprises belong and commit to particular places. They must be able to build and maintain strong ties and trust among stakeholders. Thus, social entrepreneurs are expected to remain true to their social objective and values. In addition, Dacin, Dacin and Matear (2010) acknowledge that, creating and maintaining a significant social value greatly differentiate social entrepreneurs from others. Indicating social entrepreneurs are recognised depending on the significance of the social impact they make. Furthermore, findings show that, often in entrepreneurship, vision does not always precedes action (Waddock and Steckler cited in Chell et al., 2014). In addition, Chell et al. (2014) noted that, we should avoid the assumption that all social enterprises are set up to “do good”. Bouchikhi (2015) supported this view by saying; “I was exposed recently to a young entrepreneur who claimed openly that his internet platform is a for-profit business although its mission is framed as a social business”. How a social enterprise is organised, its intention and outcomes needs to be examine and Chell et al. (2014) relates this to the link between S E, ethics and “the social” and suggested that aspect concerning social outcomes and ethics, ethical aspects of measuring and scaling social capital should be stressed.
Furthermore, Konda, Starc and Rodica (2015) noted that, there is the need to overcome challenges faced by the world in the social, economic and environmental spheres. Also, there is the need to introduce a system where, economic value is created in a way that also creates social value by addressing societal needs and challenges. S E has encouraged social inclusion, job creation, health care, good political structures and education. S E has been the focus of many public debates as a way forward to address these challenges. This according to Porter and Kramer (2011) is different from CSR because it is viewed as part of the business and S E can act as a catalyst to bringing this transition. However, to achieve this, how a social enterprise is organised, its intention and outcomes, need to be examined. Chell et al (2014) noted that, there is the need to educate and problematize how ethical responsibility and S E are related as this is crucial for the status of the field. Sud, Vansandt and Baugous (2009) noted that, things like focusing on the local community, safety, and unemployment are social issues but these issues have always been viewed as a different agenda in the form of CSR. To address these issues properly, we need to use money from what is made through doing business and deploy it for social change. Moreover, there is a need to think in an innovative way on how to use resources in order to exploit and explore opportunities to meet our social needs in a sustainable way. Drayton (2006) noted that “Innovations can come in a variety of forms – not just in terms of new products and services, but in terms of the ways that the organization operates and delivers value to its constituencies. Also, according to Porter and Kramer (2011), social innovation means better ways of solving social issues and creating value where it has not existed before in a sustainable way.

This study defines a responsible social entrepreneur as a social entrepreneur who remains true to the original idea of creating social value and reinvesting profit for more social change activities (Cornelius et al, 2008). Also, Social innovative thinking is defined as the ability to come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems. For example, how to generate the financial resources needed to achieve social value creation objectives and creating new legal structures (Drayton, 2006; Porter and Kramer, 2011). Based on these definitions, this study posed the research question: Which teaching content and methods enhance social innovative thinking and student motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs?
2.6 Summary

Agreement on a unique definition for S E is pending with more definitions emerging due to the infancy of the field. However, a community of practices including those that embrace all these definitions is starting to emerge in order to maintain key player’s commitment, interest and participation while waiting for more clarity and agreement on a unique definition (CASE, 2008). The lack of a proper meaning, domain, boundaries and forms of S E, makes it characterized as a field of no unified definition and the current state of confusion encourages cross-disciplinary dialogue and theory advancement in the field (Short, et al., 2009). Though Dacin, Dacin and Matear (2010) think recent efforts delineating S E as a theoretical domain on its own may limit the opportunity and the potential the general S E context may hold, this study strongly supports the teaching of S E as a separate and unique field since the context of social entrepreneurial activities is different though they engage in similar entrepreneurial activities like other entrepreneurs (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012).

However, more scholars (e.g. Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern, 2006; Hockerts, 2006; Weerawardena and Mort, 2006) see S E as a distinct field due to its challenges, mission and motives. Also, this study is based on Ashoka’s (2006) definition of S E and the definition of social innovation by Porter and Kramer (2011) and Drayton (2006).

According to literature, the application of experiential leaning is widely spread and diverse. Solomon, Duffy and Tarabishy (2002) noted that, business activities are totally different from managing a business. Thus, the choice of the teaching content and methods employed greatly affect the quality of S E graduates business schools produce. It also says whether S E educators apply experiential learning approaches or teaching approaches in general that teach about S E or for S E. Fiet (1998) argued that, teaching students theories provides them with a conceptual background that will enable them to engage with the real business world. Dowey (1934) noted that, “nothing takes roots in mind when there is no balance between receiving and doing.

Gastrogiovanni (1996) argued that, the usage of business plans both theoretically and practically are poorly understood though there are many curricular resources on their training and supervision. Kwong, Thompson and Cheung (2012) confirm that, S E education is effective when varieties of teaching study modes are applied and their research findings confirmed that, the business plan and case study teaching methods increased students’
interest in SE. Most scholars (Kuratko, 2005; Minniti and Bygrave, 2001; Sherman, Sebora, and Digman, 2008) suggest that, entrepreneurship education in all forms should focus their teaching by employing hands-on experiential teaching methods because of their ability to reflect the real world working environment. The question is, which of these content and methods really do teach for SE and give students the skills and competences needed to manage a social business. Kwong, Thompson and Cheung (2012) talk about the use of case studies and speakers. On the on the hand, Fiet (1998) argued that these teaching methods do not really give students the required experience to manage a business. However, suggestions from research findings affirm that, the intention of an individual to create a business increases when exposed to certain types of entrepreneurship education and real world practical experience programs have been proven to enhance the desirability and feasibility of individual intentions of beginning a business. Chang and Chalcraft (2014) and Gundlach and Zivnuska (2010) argued that experiential methods with a profit motive can encourage students to engage in sustainable large scale social projects. There is the need to expose students to social business opportunities that allow them to do good while making money (Boschee, 2001; Oster et al., 2004).

Miller, Wesley and Williams (2012) research findings show that the confidence to succeed at challenging tasks and develop social skills is lacking in SE education syllabi. Also SE practitioners rank the least important in teaching students to value social impact over financial impact where the success of SE depends on the level of social impact created and economic wealth is just to support the achievement of social value in a more sustainable way. Furthermore, Dacin, Dacin and Matear (2010) noted that, the ability to think innovatively and challenge the traditional ways of thinking is not also a common competency taught. This competence is very important because social entrepreneurs are to play the role of change agent in the social sector and often emerge to revolutionize the way social needs are met or in areas of institutional void. Thus, carrying out this empirical research and developing a model that will guide educators of SE towards teaching potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs is important.

SE as compared to other forms of entrepreneurship is demanding. OECD (1999) argued that, what makes social entrepreneurs distinct is their ability to combine social purpose with
entrepreneurial strategies. Accountability, identity and double bottom line management are key challenges faced by social entrepreneurs and this is due to the hybrid nature and social objectives of social entrepreneurs. Educating student on this is challenging but necessary as this is important for the sustainability of social enterprises. When S E educational content and teaching methods are matched properly to outcomes, there is the high probability that, education will play a great role in motivating and creating social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs and by so doing, maintaining the social status and the overall performance of social enterprises. Steyaert and Dey (2014) concluded that the practice-based approach of ethics by social entrepreneurs is the best way to determine how ethical they are and not just pre-supposing a ‘true self.’ Indicating, practice-based learning may be a suitable way to motivate, teach and enhance social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. However, since not all social entrepreneurs enact goodness, social enterprises or projects needs to be examined to make sure students are involved and linked up with ethical and responsible social entrepreneurs and projects. This may greatly contribute in motivating and instilling in students the ethical and responsible social entrepreneurial competencies required (Zhu, Rooney and Phillips, 2016; Zainal et al, 2017). Furthermore, Miller, Wesley and Williams (2012) pointed out that marketing and selling the organization is a lacking competency addressed by S E courses. Maintaining and stressing the ethical component to the practice of marketing a social organization and not making deceptive claims of social or environmental impact is a necessary competency in the S E education content. Also, Miller, Wesley and Williams (2012) and Chell et al. (2014) noted that the sense of moral imperatives/ethics is not a frequent topic in S E classes. Including all this alongside how to identify/create, assessed/measure the social value created and maintain a significant social change opportunity may guide students to avoid mission drift by not prioritizing economic over social value creation.

This section has reviewed literature that outlines the proposed and currently employed content and teaching methods in S E. Thus, this section acts as a starting point towards identifying the teaching content and methods of SE curriculum. It is clear from the reviewed literature that, there is the need to rethink the importance of including aspects related to the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs in the S E curriculum. Though Brock and Steiner( 2009) noted that, the experiential component,
such as students exposure to social enterprise leaders networks, field study programs, conferences and case-based discussions are some of the methods employed in teaching S E, no empirical research justifies which and how these experiential components enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. Also, there is little or no literature that examines and identifies which and how the currently employed teaching content and methods enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs in UK business schools. Thus, confirming the importance of this study as it attempts to answer the main research question outlined in Chapter 1 section 1.6.
CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This study draws on the social identity theory and presents below a conceptual framework.

Figure 1: Conceptual framework

A critical analysis on the conceptual framework and the suitability of the social identity theory for this study is provided in section 3.1 below.

3.1 The social identity theory and conceptualisation

Social identity is a person’s sense of belonging to their group membership(s) and according to Tajfel and Turner (1979) proposal, an important source of self-esteem and pride is the group (e.g. family, social class etc.) to which people belong to. Also, groups give us a sense of belonging to the social world and a sense of social identity. Tajfel and Turner noted that, individuals will always strive to increase their self-image and by doing this, enhance the status of the group to which they belong to. The social identity theory states that, in the social categorization process, the in-group (the social group to which an individual belongs
to) will discriminate against the out-group (the social group to which an individual does not belong to) to enhance their self-image. In evaluating in-group and out-group Tajfel and Turner (1979) propose the involvement of three mental processes which take place in a particular order.

Social categorization ➔ social identification ➔ social comparison

Firstly, we categorize objects in order to understand and identify them and individuals categorize themselves as belonging to one and not another group. Similarly, we use social categories like white, black, Christians, Muslim etc. to define ourselves and categorize people in order to understand the social environment. By knowing what categories we belong to, we find out things about ourselves and while making references to the norms of the groups we belong to, appropriate behaviours are defined and we develop a self-perception and start acting and seeing ourselves as more similar to other members of the group. The vital theoretical consequence of Tajfel and Turner (1979) is that, categorization and our group membership affect our self-esteem, emotions, self-confidence and a sense of who we are and of what value we are in the world. As members of a category, individuals start acting as group members and putting in all their emotions in the faith of the group. Something happens in the psychology of individuals when they belong to a group that is quite distinct from being a unique and a separate individual. It confers a social identity or a shared collective representation of who one is or of how one should behave.

Next is social identification where after identifying and categorizing themselves as belonging to a particular group, individuals tend to adopt the identity of the group and their self-esteem is bound up with group membership and this gives individuals the self-confidence to believe in their capacity to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, power and action to exercise control over life events (Wood and Bandura, 1989). Thus, if students are made to identify themselves as social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs, they will tend to adopt the identity and norms of social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs before and after graduating. By so doing, students will be emotionally attached to the norms of social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs and their self-esteem will be bound up as social innovative thinking, responsible, S E members. It is believed that, individuals with high social entrepreneurial self-efficacy that is the ability and confidence to exercise a positive social change will likely get involved and persist in an
activity that leads to social value creation in an innovative and sustainable way.

Finally, social comparison where individuals after categorizing and identifying with a group tend to strive for positive distinctiveness by comparing their group with other groups in order to maintain self-esteem and once groups identify themselves as rivals or better off than other groups, they will do everything possible to compete in order to maintain members self-esteem and the status of the group. Thus, in order to be better off, maintain their status and self-esteem, competing in this case will force social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs to do everything possible to maintain the original idea of social value creation and re-investing profit for more social change activities. Competing will also force them to constantly come up with new social ideas or new ways towards solving the existing social issue they seek to address. For example new ways to generate the financial resource needed and new legal structures that will allow their social business ideas to flourish.

The S E field is gradually losing its “social” status (Chell et al., 2014) and there is a need to emphasise the “social” aspect of S E education in order to clearly distinguish S E from the CSR practices implemented by mainstream entrepreneurs. It follows that in order to clearly differentiate between social value and CSR, S E education should help develop social entrepreneurs that are both responsible and socially innovative (Porter and Kramer, 2011).

This study contends that, the extent to which S E education can develop social innovative thinking and responsible social entrepreneurs depends, to a certain extent, on whether the S E teaching content and methods develop a deep seated social identity that relates to S E in students. Social identity theory presents a group as an important source of self-esteem and pride. Therefore social innovative thinking, and responsible S E, should be presented as a distinct social category to which students can aspire, identify with and become active members. Furthermore, S E instructors can help facilitate this developmental process provided that the right teaching content and methods are employed. Thus, S E educational content and teaching methods should include aspects that will motivate and give students the confidence that they have the ability to create socially acceptable businesses and succeed. To clearly differentiate S E from CSR and succeed, social entrepreneurs need to be responsible in social business transactions (Chell et al, 2014; Porter and Kramer, 2011). Also, there is the need to think innovatively towards solving social issues and creating social value
in a sustainable way. Thus, to succeed, educators need to provide students with an innovative thinking mindset and the responsible social entrepreneurial competencies that are required most from social entrepreneurs. The general lack of empirical research in S E education has limited our understanding of the role S E education can play. We do not understand clearly which teaching content and methods are employed or can be employed to encourage the creation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. The purpose of this study is to explore the current curriculum content and teaching methods employed by S E educators in UK business schools. The study seeks to identify which and how these content and methods enhance social innovative thinking within students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. This framework guide the entire research study towards answering the main research question as well as meets up with the research objectives and aim outlined in chapter 1.

Whilst placing a particular focus on the social identity theory, this study also draws on certain notions, concepts, and theories from S E education literature related to curriculum content and teaching methods and how they influence student outputs. The aim here is to articulate these notions, theories, concepts and see how they fit in with the research background and questions of this study.

3.2 The theory of planned behavior

According to Ajzen’s (1991) theory of planned behaviour, when people have time to plan how they are going to behave, the best predictor of that behaviour is one’s intention. This theory is based on the premise that, the best predictor whether or not a person will perform a given behavior is the person’s intention which also depends on people’s attitudes towards this behavior. In other words, to predict what people are going to do, you need to know what they intend to do. According to this theory, intention does not always accurately predict behaviour when there is a reflex or condition response involved. The vast majority of what we plan to do, that is, our plan behaviour, does not involve involuntary response. So intention is still the best overall predictor. Intention is believe to be determined by three things: attitude, perceive control and subjective norms.
Attitude can be defined as the evaluation of ideas, events, objects or people. Generally, attitude is positive or negative (Ajzen's, 1991).

Perceived control refers to the degree to which individuals are capable of controlling their behavior. That is, the amount of direction one thinks they have over the environment. It also suggests if the task will be easy or difficult to accomplish.

Subjective norms are attitudes or behaviours that are considered typical, normal, or average. They determine the approval or disapproval of the behaviour. This can also be refer to as people believe about what they think others expect them to do.

Attitude, perceived control and subjective norms predict people’s intention which further predicts their behaviour. If someone feels positive towards behaviour and believes it will be easy and approved by others, then the person’s intention will be strong and will likely perform their behaviour. If someone feels negative towards behaviour and believes it will be difficult and not approved by others, then that person’s intention will be weak and
unlikely to perform the behaviour. This suggests that, people will try to start a business only if they believe they have the ability to do so and if the activity is socially acceptable.

Liñán and Fayolle (2015) noted that, the theory of planned behaviour has been used widely in entrepreneurship education in general. The majority of published work that employed this theory focused on entrepreneurial intentions. Liñán and Fayolle (2015) carried out a literature review on entrepreneurial intention between 2004 and 2013. Their analysis confirms that, findings from the majority of research work carried out shows that, entrepreneurship education has a positive effect on entrepreneurial intentions (e.g. Fayolle et al., 2006; Pittaway and Cope, 2007 and Franke and Luthje, 2004, Bakotic and Kruzic, 2010; Tounés 2006; Ozgen and Minsky, 2013 and Pihie, Akmaliah and Bagheri, 2009). Research in the category of entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention suggests that, for entrepreneurship to achieve its full potential, different teaching methods and content should be employed. In addition, empirical findings show that there is a great difference in attitude and the level of intention between students who take part in entrepreneurship education programs and those who do not ( Liñán and Fayolle, 2015).

Applying the theory of planned behavior in the S E education context in Egypt was Kirby and Ibrahim (2011). Findings from their research show that, the main reason given by students for not becoming self-employed is neither money nor the risk involved but lack of knowledge, training, support, awareness and above all experience. Thus confirming the contention that, people will start a business only if they believe they have the ability to do so and if this is the case, then providing S E educators with the right materials needed to educate and enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs (e.g. educating students on the ethical aspects of measuring and scaling social capital, morals, trust, managing accountability, double bottom line, identity) would definitely overcome the major barriers to the creation of new social ventures. This also indicates that, more potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs could be developed if ongoing support is made available and this also implies mentoring and dedicated training programmers’( e.g. through networking with S E leaders, project, field programs) are essential in the curriculum of S E.
3.3 The institutional theory.

The term institution can be referred to as the formal rules and regulations put in place that individuals and organisations are expected to follow (North, 1990). Institutions define in an objective sense what is appropriate. It also renders other actions unacceptable or beyond consideration (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991). Institutions derive rules from governmental agencies, regulatory structures, professions, court, laws, societal and cultural practices to create expectations that determine actions for organisations. The institutional theory focuses on how organisations and individual respect the rules and norms of the institutional environment to secure their legitimacy and positions. Institutional theory as a theoretical lens is increasingly being used by entrepreneurship researchers in general (Bruton, Ahlstrom and Li, 2010). The legal environment, culture, economic incentives and tradition have an impact on entrepreneurial success and the industry. Some entrepreneurship researchers have used the institutional theory as a theoretical lens to examine these issues.

According to Roy (1997), rather than solely focusing on efficiency-seeking behaviour, the institutional theory is concerned with the social, cultural and regulatory influences that promote an organisation survival and legitimacy. The social pillar of the institutional theory represents the individual and organisational behaviour model. This pillar is based on social, professional and organisational interaction obligatory dimensions. By defining what is expected and appropriate in the entrepreneurial world, entrepreneurial institutions guide behaviours (Scott, 2007). The cognitive pillar is based on constructed rules and meanings that limit beliefs and actions and represents the model of individual behaviour (Scott, 2007). This pillar operates more in terms of language and culture at an individual level. This pillar is widely applied in entrepreneurship research in terms of how different societies inculcate values and create cultural atmosphere that encourages and accept entrepreneurship (Bosma et al., 2009; Harrison, 2008). The regulatory pillar of the institutional theory represents a model of behaviour known as the rational actor model and is based on conformity and sanctions. Through enforcement, monitoring and role of the game, institutions guide behaviour. Individuals and new entrepreneurial organisations are expected to use this rules as a guide.
Bruton and Ahlstrom (2003) noted that, institutional theory provides the basis to identifying which beliefs, activities, attitude, was institutionalized, which ones were respected or have been taken for granted which in turn constrain entrepreneurship from flourishing in different environmental context. Bruton, Ahlstrom and Li (2010) literature review between 1990-2009 on entrepreneurship research shows that, the institutional theory provides approximately a 3% theoretical foundation to the articles that were examined from the journal of business venturing and Entrepreneurship theory & practice. According to Bruton, Ahlstrom and Li (2010), measure research streams were: institutional entrepreneurship (DiMaggio, 1988; Lawrence, Hardy and Phillips, 2002), legitimacy (Freeman, Carroll and Hannan, 1983) and institutional setting (Aldrich, 1990; Gnyawali and Fogel, 1994; Hwang and Powell, 2005). Kury (2012) employed the institutional theory as a theoretical foundation and explored how societal issues can be address through S E, the natural science and entrepreneurship. According to Kury (2012), the goal of institutional entrepreneurs is to change the institution. This goal could be to eliminate poverty or environmental sustainable development.

3.4 The notion of responsible entrepreneurship

According to the United Nations Commission on sustainable development (1998), a responsible entrepreneur is “someone who supports actively sustainable development, does not harm the environment, public health or the society social fabric and reveals all possible social and environmental impact of their practices to the public”. There is a serious need to reconceptualise the entrepreneurial curriculum to include responsibility, ethics and environmentalism (Huq and Gilbert, 2013). A skilled work force is increasingly becoming the basis of competitive advantage and the ability of both the individuals and firms in innovative and new economic activities which are linked specifically to enterprise skills related to new venture creation (Hytti and O’Gorman, 2004). In addition to their non-provision of “hand-on” experience to students, business schools have also been criticized for lacking ethical consideration and educating “critters with lopsided brains, icy hearts and shrunken souls” (Leavitt, 1989, p.39). This, led AACSB to revise its standards of accreditation to emphasis “social responsibility” and its focus on designing curriculum in business schools (AACSB, 2004). This is an important aspect for this research since the research is also motivated by the fact that, S E education can provide a frame of reference for responsible
entrepreneurship education and learning (Chell, 2007; Blundel and Spence, 2009; Frost, 2009) and this is based on the notion that, social goods can be created from entrepreneurial activities whilst reinvesting the profit in community development (Rae, 2010, p.595).

3.5 The concept and forms of entrepreneurship

The different forms of entrepreneurship includes; conventional, institutional, cultural and S E (Dacin, Dacin and Matear, 2010, p.43). Individuals who develop businesses by bringing innovation to the market are conventional entrepreneurs (Schumpeter, 1934). Institutional entrepreneurs, has the feature of introducing operational models and this is not associated to other forms of entrepreneurs (Battilana, Leca and Boxenbaum, 2009). According to De-jean, Gond and Leca (2004), the mission of institutional entrepreneurs is to establish norms and patterns of behavior that assist them in achieving highly valued goals and can operate in both profit and non-profit sectors. Also, Maguire, Hardy and Lawrence(2004) noted that, institutional entrepreneurs have the ability to exert influence on the external environment and stimulate ground breaking social, economic and political reforms and are experts in leveraging what Fligstein (1997) called the resource of “Social skills” that is, framing, negotiating, networking and building alliances. Often, institutional entrepreneurs mobilize resources through storytelling (Zelber, 2007) and bricolage (Maguire, Hardy and Lawrence, 2004).

DiMaggio (1982) defined cultural entrepreneurship as a function of “cultural capitalists” that identifies an opportunity in the cultural domain to produce something of cultural value through risk assumption and dissemination of vision. DiMaggio (1994) noted that, culture does not only apply to the “cultural industry” but also, the norms driving social patterns of behavior in a given society. Social position, status seeking motives, creativity, alertness to opportunities and the ability to creatively combine resources are particular aptitudes and skills of cultural entrepreneurs.

According to Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skiller (2006), people, context, deal and opportunities are key four elements that social entrepreneurs must be able to manage. The macro-economy, social infrastructures, regulatory structures are certain external resource constraints incorporated in the context. Distinguishing S E from other forms strongly relies on the extent social entrepreneurs are able to engage and use external resources focusing
on “unique-competency based factors”. Relation, cultural and institutional resources are the three key resources of SE (Dacin, Dacin and Matear, 2010).

Robinson (2006) noted that, the relation resources such as “social capital” and “social skills” includes prowess in social inter-action, establishing formal and informal network ties as well as having access to communication networks and channels. This resource provides information exchange, opportunities, interpersonal relation leverage and realizes objectives. As for cultural resources, knowing what is permitted not permitted and what is considered legitimate are key factors to be considered in developing successful social entrepreneurial strategies and operational plans. Institutional resources on the other hand include the political and legal structures. This resource is a key factor to be considered as lack of institutions can hinder the success of entrepreneurs (Robinson, 2006). This, according to Dacin, Dacin and Matear (2010) can be somehow critical in the SE context as social ventures are more likely to operate successfully in environments with significant socio-economic, cultural and environmental problems. Although, existing institutions in most cases may be in place, the presence of firmly norms and constraints may hinder the willingness and ability to do so.

Dees (1998) and Nicholls and Cho (2006) attempted in differentiating SE from other forms of entrepreneurship but their attention was based on “Social” and how it might differentiate SE from other forms. On the other hand, Mair (2006) argued that, the fact that all successful enterprises generate directly or indirectly “Social value” by solving a social problem or generating tax revenues at the same time creating employment, it might be all forms of entrepreneurs are “social”. However, more scholars see SE as a distinct field due to the challenges, mission and motives of SE (e.g. Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern, 2006; Hockerts, 2006; Weerawardena and Mort, 2006). Also, what primarily differentiates SE from commercial entrepreneurship is the type of value generated. Economic value creation is the primary interest of commercial entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurs have the drive of creating social value (Austin, Stevenson and Wei-skillem, 2006) and their main mission is to create a social impact and not wealth creation (Dees, 2001) thus social value creation is a distinctive element of the SE domain. Table 1 below summarizes different forms of entrepreneurship, their mission, processes and resources.
Table 1: The different forms of entrepreneurship, their mission, processes and resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Conventional</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Agent who creates successful innovation based on new ideas (Schumpeter, 1934).</td>
<td>Agent who through resources mobilization can change or influence institutional rules towards supporting or destroying existing institutions, or creating new ones (DiMaggio, 1982).</td>
<td>Individuals who create social, cultural, or economic value by acting upon identified opportunities (Wilson and Stokes, 2004)</td>
<td>An actor who solves social problems by applying business principles (Tracey and Philips, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of wealth</td>
<td>Shareholder</td>
<td>Stakeholders and/or shareholders</td>
<td>Stakeholders and/or shareholders</td>
<td>Stakeholders and/or shareholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational form</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Nonprofit or profit</td>
<td>Nonprofit or profit</td>
<td>Nonprofit or profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal or motive</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Institutional reform</td>
<td>Cultural diffusion</td>
<td>Social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Create and distribute to consumers products or services</td>
<td>Establish legitimacy</td>
<td>Establish values and new norms</td>
<td>Promotes social change/ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Business service provider Tourism companies</td>
<td>Edison Apple</td>
<td>Museums Folk art festivals</td>
<td>Aravind Eye Clinic Rugmark Ashoka Grameen Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Dacin, Dacin and Matear (2010, p.44).

3.6 The concept and forms of S E

According to Defourny and Nyssens (2008), a dozen years ago, discussions about social enterprises, social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs were rare however new amazing breakthroughs particularly within the EU countries and US have been made. The concept of social enterprise first appeared in Italy in 1990 and was considered the 3rd sector. In addition, the Italian social cooperative was an inspiring model in Europe in the 1990’s as the concept was closely linked to the cooperative movements within this country. In 1991, Italy experienced an extraordinary growth after the parliament created a special legal form for “social co-operatives”. One of the milestones in this sector in 1991 was the Launched of the “social enterprise initiative” by the Harvard Business Schools. Since then, debates on this concept has grown in various institutions with major universities developing training...
programs and research for example, the setting up of the Social Enterprise Knowledge Network (SEKN) by Latin-America leading business schools and the Harvard business school in 2001. Light (2005) noted that, the term S E was used by Edward Skloot of the Surdna foundation to highlight the income generation possibility by non-profit ventures.

The entrepreneurial theories of Hayek (1945), Kirzner (1997), Schumpeter (1942) and most recently, Yunus (2010) social business model have been instrumental in deriving the four typologies of S E. These authors create four archetypes that fill an important and distinctive portion of the S E field.

Amongst the four different types of S E is the social bricoleur and according to Hayek’s (1945) study this type of S E is largely undertaken locally and focuses mainly on local concerns and is driven partly by first-hand exposure to problems. Here, the motivation to solve local problems is the primary aim and this acts as a source of opportunities and basis for measuring success. The outcomes of the social value developed by this type of S E are generally small in scale and scope. Also, there is a resource constraint with this type of S E as focusing locally limits the pool of resources as larger resources can only be drawn if their local focus is expanded thus indicating resources create as well as limits the mission of this type of S E. Similarly, Baker and Nelson (2005) points out that, resource constrained social entrepreneurs, tend to engage more in bricolage behavior. “Bricolage” behavior is a set of actions driven by social entrepreneurs who go out in search for resources (often scarce resources) that can either be combined or recombined to create solutions affecting their respective markets. Bricolage behavior also involves the notion of “making do” and develop smart social change sustainable project through the use of whatever is in hand link with fundamental social shift. The bricolage behavior encourages catalytic innovation as it enables entrepreneurs to be creative in the way they attract and distribute resources, identify served, unnerved and over served markets segments (Christensen et al., 2006).

Social constructionist is the next identified type of S E who, identifies market gaps (Kirzner, 1997) and tries to field them up (Burt, 1992). These types of social entrepreneurs are more alert to opportunities and are different from social bricoleur as it is more market focus. According to Zahra et al. (2009) though social constructionist focus on local concern issues, their outcome may be applicable in different context and this is a peculiar characteristic of
the social constructionist. This form of S E requires resources to support their mission scalability as they are resource driven and geography plays a key role here by not defining the problem as is the case for social bricoleur but creating an opportunity for their solutions to be applied in different contexts.

Social engineer is another form of S E. As envisioned by Schumpeter (1942) social engineers engage in entrepreneurship projects. Schumpeter concept of creative destruction is embodied in social engineers whose mission is to replace current solutions provided by existing institutions through the implementation of social ventures. The quest for legitimacy is the primary concern here as they require massive support for their entrepreneurial ventures. Thus, this form of S E focus on large scale issues with mass appeal and this in most cases are issues that are generally known and can easily be understood by individuals of all literacy background or individuals with very little knowledge of the problem as everyone is generally aware of such problems. The required resources by social engineers may be existing already but are simply held back by institutions social engineers seeks to replace making support and legitimacy by the masses as well as the political capital that provides access to the required existing resources very important.

Recently, Yunus (2010) outlined another type of S E which he named “social business”. Yunus social business definition is based on seven key principles which includes: nonprofit maximization and overcoming societal intractable problems should be the main objective of social business entrepreneurs (e.g. health, education, technology and environment), sustainable both economically and financially, investors should not receive a return on investment that is more than the amount invested in the business (that is no dividend given), loan interest received from borrowers is retained for expansion and improvement by the company, must be an environment conscious business, better wages and working conditions should be given to the work force, and above all, “Do it with joy”.

According to Yunus in his interview with Kickul, et al. (2012), while other forms of social entrepreneurship relate to a person and describe a social consequence initiative with a social venture created by an entrepreneur where the initiative may be economic, non-economic, charitably or business with or without personal profit, social business is a non-dividend, non-loss company with a social objective. Social business is not a self-profit making
business but the desire to solve social problems with a business model. Other forms of S E may not actually be involved in a business like social business and they could just be helping a neighborhood or assisting people to do things differently which often includes the sharing of dividends between investors and this is not the case with social business says Yunus. He also made an important point peculiar to this form of S E by pointing out that, unlike other forms of S E, a social business, is directly involved in problem solving where in, he/she picks up a problem and designs a business towards solving that particular problem and will not just give the money and sit but get involved. In addition, faculties should always remember when teaching towards the developing of social leaders the fact that, social business is a specific sub set of S E which requires the fulfillment of certain conditions. Table 2 below summarizes the different types of SE.

Table2: The different types of S E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What they do</th>
<th>Hayek social bricoleur</th>
<th>Kirzner social constructionist</th>
<th>Schumpeter social engineer</th>
<th>Yunus social business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What they do</td>
<td>Addressing a local social need by acting upon perceived opportunities and are motivated individuals with the required skills and resources to address the social need</td>
<td>Provides goods and services through the building and operation of alternative structures and addresses social needs that governments and businesses are unable to</td>
<td>Replace existing systems that are unable to address important social needs by creating new and effective ones</td>
<td>The direct involvement in the designing of a social and environmental conscious business and the use of a business model towards solving the social problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale and scope</td>
<td>Episodic in nature, small and local in scope</td>
<td>Designed to be institutionalized to address a progressive social need, small to large scale with a local to international scope</td>
<td>Extremely large in scale with a national to international scope and seeks to challenge existing structures by building lasting ones</td>
<td>Small to large scale with a national to international scope and seeks to get all partners (shareholders, stakeholders etc.) directly involve and enjoy the joy of identifying and designing a business towards solving a social problem with a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social importance</td>
<td>Maintain social harmony with their collective action in the face of a social problem.</td>
<td>Help maintain social harmony within existing broader social structures by addressing pressing social needs</td>
<td>Represent an important social change force and seek to replace existing social structures with new ones.</td>
<td>Maintain social harmony, a non-dividend, non-loss company that is strictly out for a better world and encourages the use of business models to solve social problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretion source</td>
<td>On the spot skills to address a social problem with a quicker response time due their small scale and local scope</td>
<td>Address unaddressed needs with limited or no competition and may even be welcome and seen as a “release valve” who prevent publicity or social problems that may eventually affect existing businesses and governmental organizations</td>
<td>Massive support to prove that existing social structures and incumbents lack the capability to address pressing social needs</td>
<td>Non-self-profit making, get every partner directly involved so as to jointly experience the success and daily challenges involve and this type of social entrepreneurs may gain more respect from the society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretion limits</td>
<td>The local nature in both laws and regulations may limit geographical expansion and the ability to address other needs</td>
<td>As an ongoing concern, the acquisition of financial and human resources is needed to institutionalize and fulfill mission. Employees and voluntary experts to operate organizations are needed</td>
<td>Seen as illegitimate and threats by existing parties which may limit their ability to raise from traditional sources financial and human resources which may result in being captive by the parties to supply the needed resources</td>
<td>Needs shareholders with caring hearts with non-profit making intentions and this may limit the source of resources since such persons are difficult to find as most people often engage in business to make profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Potential entrepreneurs local training and education programs</td>
<td>Standardized food and drugs multi-regional assistant programs</td>
<td>International financial training programs targeting specific groups</td>
<td>Establishing micro financial institutions and banks that aimed at giving loans to start-up businesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Compiled from Smith and Stevens (2010, pp.579-580)*
Curriculum content incorporating the different types of entrepreneurship and pointing out how unique social entrepreneurs and their ventures are, may contribute to better prepare potential social entrepreneurs to be more responsible particularly when it comes to social business transactions. Also, curriculum content incorporating the different types of S E may act as a starting point towards preparing the minds of students on what type of social entrepreneurs they eventually want to become on graduation.

3.7 Summary

To succeed, social entrepreneurs need to clearly differentiate from mainstream entrepreneurs who respect CSR by being responsible in social business transactions (Chell et al, 2014; Porter and Kramer, 2011). They also need to think in an innovative way and more entrepreneurially towards addressing social issues sustainably (Porter and Kramer, 2011). To achieve this, educators and business schools have a huge role to play. This study defines a responsible social entrepreneur as a social entrepreneur who remains true to the original idea of creating social value and reinvesting profit for more social change activities (Cornelius et al, 2008). Also, this study defined Social innovative thinking as the ability to come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems. For example, how to generate the financial resources needed to achieve social value creation objectives and creating new legal structures (Drayton, 2006; Porter and Kramer, 2011).

This study draws on the social identity theory and argues that, curriculum content and teaching methods that allows students to categorize and identify themselves as being amongst and being social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs may give students the self-esteem and confidence. It may also enable them to get involve and start seeing themselves as social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs before and after graduating. In addition, though the distinct features of S E may not stimulate social innovative thinking within students, the fact that, the external environment plays a great role in whether or not social enterprises should be launched indicates that social entrepreneurs need to be more responsible in social business transactions as this is important in forming relational ties towards achieving social objectives (Robinson, 2006). Thus, educating students on the different types of entrepreneurship and S E and pointing out how unique social entrepreneurs and their ventures are, may contribute to better
preparing potential social entrepreneurs to be more responsible particularly when it comes to social business transactions as well as help to start preparing the minds of potential social entrepreneurs to select the type of social entrepreneurs they eventually want to become.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a detailed description of the design, strategy and the techniques and procedures adopted in conducting the entire research. Furthermore, a description of the study population and sampling strategy, data management, quality of the study, validity, reliability, researcher’s role and a brief summary is provided.

4.1 Methodological choice (Research design)

For this study, the qualitative research design with an exploratory nature was employed. What justifies the suitability of this methodological choice for this study is the fact that, this research design is often associated with the interpretive research philosophy (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Here, the phenomenon under study needs to be well understood by the researcher as they are expected to make sense out of the subjective and socially constructed meaning expressed (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2012).

The interpretivist philosophy of research adapts the empathetic stance by entering the social world of their research subject and trying to understand from the point of view of the world (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2012). In addition, this research philosophy allows the researcher and the participant to engage in dialogue and collaboratively generate findings and interpretations (Farquhar, 2012). Also, according to this research philosophy, humans interpret the world and attribute different meanings in the way they view the world (Creswell, 2007). Moreover, this research philosophy allows the integration between the researcher and what the researcher seeks to investigate. Thus, creating room for deeper understandings towards answering the research question (Easterby-smith, et al., 2008).

Employing interpretivism for this research enables the researcher to explore S E educators and students who have successfully passed through the S E module/course views. This enables better understandings of the subjective reality and a rich insight about the current content and teaching methods employed by S E educators in UK business schools. Also, it helps the researcher to understand better which currently employed teaching methods and content stimulate social innovative thinking within students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs.
Also, qualitative research with an exploratory nature is often associated with the inductive approach and richer theoretical perspectives than those already existing in the literature are expected to be developed (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

The inductive approach involves direct interaction with participants through interviews in order to best understand the nature of the problem. Here, researchers are tasked with making sense of the collected data through data analysis which results in the formulation of theories often expressed as a conceptual framework (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2012). The inductive research approach is most common with case-study research and is concerned with exploration and understandings (Farquhar, 2012). The research question for this study is rooted in the theories related to S E pedagogy for business schools. That is, the curriculum content and teaching methods currently employed. The research question was formulated to guide the researcher’s understandings on the current content of S E curriculum and the currently used teaching methods. Below is the research question guiding this study.

Which teaching content and methods enhance social innovative thinking and student motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs?

The fact that, the above research questions are rooted in the theoretical context of S E education justifies the suitability of this methodological choice for this study (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2012).

4.2 Research strategy

According to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2012), a research strategy is an action plan detailing the way a researcher will go about answering research questions. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) defined it as a methodological link between a researcher philosophy and the subsequence choice of data collection and analysis method. The choice of a research strategy helps maintain a reasonable level of coherence throughout the research design which enables the answering of research questions and meeting up with the research aim and objectives (Bryman, 2007; Yin, 2009)

Experiment and survey research strategies are exclusively link to quantitative research designs, archival and case study are linked to either quantitative, qualitative or both. While
ethnography, action research, grounded theory and narrative inquiry are associated to qualitative research design.

The Case study research strategy is advantageous because, in a case study research, the boundaries between the studied phenomenon and the phenomenon context of study are not always apparent. Also, a case study research explores a research topic or phenomenon within a variety of real life contexts or within its context (Yin, 2009). In addition, the case study is most relevant when a researcher seeks to gain a rich understanding of the research context and the processes being enacted (Farquhar, 2012; Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007). Case studies can generate answers to “why, what and how” research questions by employing different data collection techniques and sources to best answer research questions. Thus, indicating the case study strategy is suitable for exploratory and explanatory nature of research design.

A case study can be single, multiple, holistic or embedded (Yin, 2009). Single case studies are often used where a critical case or an extreme or unique case is represented. Multiple cases can be incorporated in a case study strategy and the rational here is whether, findings can be replicated across cases (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2012). For a multiple case study strategy, cases are chosen carefully on the basis that, similar results are predicted to be produced from each one which results in literal replication if realized (Yin, 2009). Multiple case studies are likely to produce more evidence though single case study is chosen due to the nature of the case (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2012).

The multiple case study strategy was employed for this study because it facilitate the researcher’s understanding of the current content of the S E curriculum and the currently used teaching methods. In addition, this research strategy allows the combination of different data collection methods such as interviews, questionnaires and documentaries. It can also be used to test a theory (Anderson, 2003) or generate a theory as well as allow the understandings of the research context. In the context of this study, is understanding the content, teaching methods and how they enhance social innovative thinking within students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. Furthermore, replicating findings across cases which Yin (2009) describes as literal replication is possible
with the multiple case study strategy. This increases the reliability of findings (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2012).

4.3 Study population and sampling strategy

The study population for this study includes UK business schools offering S E either as a module or a course at the foundation, graduate or master’s levels in the 2014/2015 academic year. In the UK, very few business schools offer S E either as a module/course or even just as part of entrepreneurship curriculum content. Most common entrepreneurship classes taught are; entrepreneurial finance, business plan development, and management of small businesses without actually looking at S E as a module/course. However, some business schools have actually responded to the recent call to teach S E as a module/course and these are the business schools this study focused on. Out of the 50 UK universities and business schools according to eduniversal ranking by palmeres league in 2014, 11 business schools offered S E as a module/course, 6 in England, 3 in Ireland and 2 in Scotland. This study focused on 5 out of the 6 business schools offering S E as a module/course in England and these includes; Goldsmith University of London, Westminster University Business School, Lancaster University Management School, Northampton University Business School and Oxford Brookes University Business School.

Purposeful participant selection presents a key decision in qualitative studies (Patton, 2002). Sampling cases are selected in purposeful selection because they are not just illuminating but also rich in information that are capable of offering rich inside about the phenomenon of interest (Patton, 2002, p.40). The phenomenon of interest for this study are those curriculum content and teaching methods that can enhance the development of potential social innovative thinking , responsible, social entrepreneurs.

Careful selection of sample cases is needed for maximum learning potential about the studied phenomenon. Cases may be selected in case studies to provide examples of polar types (Eisenhardt, 1989) or fill theoretical categories. The criterion and maximum variation sampling strategy was used to select cases that potentially represents UK business schools offering S E as a module/course. Each case comprises of S E course instructors and students who successfully passed through the S E module/course. These instructors and students
were key informants for primary data collection who provided rich information on the phenomenon of interest for this study.

Criterion sampling involves selecting cases that meet with the predetermined criteria of importance. For this study, the inclusion criterion for selecting a case was; UK business schools offering S E as a module/course and a case for this study is a UK business school offering S E as a module/course either at the foundation, graduate or master’s levels. Business schools offering S E just as part of entrepreneurship curriculum and not a full module/course on its own were excluded for the reason that, the time taken, the concentration and the richness of the material covered when teaching S E as a full module/course will be more as compared to when taught just as part of the entrepreneurship module/course. This greatly influences the quality of the information to be gathered on the phenomenon of interest. For the same reason, the instructor’s experience greatly influences the quality of the information to be gathered on the phenomenon of interest.

Maximum variation sampling strategy allows the display of multiple perspectives. Thus, giving the researcher the chance to best answer the research questions (Creswell, 1998) and involves the selection of cases that demonstrate the edges of the phenomenon under study (Patton, 2002). The edges of the phenomenon for this study are; UK business schools offering S E as a module/course, being an experienced S E instructor, being an experience S E instructor in at least one of the business school under study and being a student who has successfully passed through the S E module/course in one of the business school under study.

4.4. Techniques and Procedures

This section details the techniques and procedures employed to conduct multiple case studies. The first part of this section describes selected cases, key informant and sources of evidence. Also, case construction, data analysis and an explanation of each data collection method is discussed. Lastly, data management, researcher’s role, measures of integrity and a summary is included.
Case selection.

In case studies, data should be collected on the lowest unit of analysis possible (Patton, 2002). The unit of analysis and a case for this study is each of the UK business schools under study. This relates to the purpose of this study which is to identify the curriculum content and teaching methods that can enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. Five cases were selected. Each case corresponds to one business school. Each of this business school comprises of S E course instructors and students who successfully pass through the S E module/course.

After selecting the cases, instructors were contacted. The web blog of each business school helped in providing contact information of instructors. In cases where the researcher was unable to obtain the contact information directly from the school web blog, the researcher visited the school in person and search for information on how to get through to these instructors. An email request, inviting instructors to take part in the study was sent (see appendix A). After a series of email exchanges to clarify doubts and a few face to face meetings with some of the instructors, nearly all of the instructors contacted accepted to take part in the study. Access to the students was obtained through the instructors.

There are in total eight S E course instructors. One course instructor from Westminster University Business School who teach S E at the undergraduate level, two course instructors from Oxford Brookes University Business School (Ruskin College) who teach S E at the foundational level, two course instructors from Lancaster University Management School who teach S E at the undergraduate level, two course instructors from Goldsmith University of London who teach S E at the post graduate level and one course instructor from Northampton University Business School who teach S E at the undergraduate level. These eight course instructors fulfilled the following criterion: at least 2 years of experience in teaching in the entrepreneurship or S E field. Also, there are in total 30 students who successfully passed through the S E module/course. 8 undergraduate level students from Westminster University Business School, 5 undergraduate level students from Northampton University Business School, 6 foundation level students from Oxford Brookes University Business School (Ruskin College), 5 undergraduate level students from Lancaster University Management School and 6 masters level students from Goldsmith University of London.
These 30 students fulfilled the following criterion: have successfully passed through the S E module/course in one of the business school under study.

**Table 3: Distribution sampling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Number of instructors</th>
<th>Instructor(s) teaching SE with at least 2 years of experience</th>
<th>Foundation course with successful students</th>
<th>Undergraduate module with successful students</th>
<th>Masters course with successful students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>8/20</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
<td>5/25</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key informants.**

Using UK business schools and universities according to eduniversal ranking by Palmes League in 2014, six business schools and universities offer S E as a module/course in England. This study focused on business schools offering S E as a module/course in England. Five out of Six of these schools accepted to take part in the research. Key informants for this study were S E course instructors and students who successfully passed through the S E module/course in the five business schools under study. The inclusion criteria to select S E course instructors were: 1) have at least 2 years of teaching experience in entrepreneurship or S E and 2) currently teaching the S E module/course in at least one of the business schools under study. The inclusion criterion to select students was: A student who successfully completes the S E module/course in one of the business schools under study.

**Sources of evidence.**

This study employs both the secondary and primary data collection methods. Secondary data was obtained through documentaries related to the current S E curriculum content and teaching methods from the business schools under study. Key informants for primary data collection include: S E course instructors and students who successfully pass through the S E module/course.
Primary data collection was carried out in two phases since documents on the S E syllabi may not cover the amount of learning in the course and S E course instructors’ opinions. In the first phase of primary data collection, semi-structured interviews were administered to S E course instructors in order to draw more information on the curriculum content and teaching methods that can enhance social innovative thinking in students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. The second phase of primary data collection involved the administering of semi-structured interviews to students who successfully pass through the S E module/course to draw their feedback on those currently employed content and teaching methods that enhanced their thinking innovatively and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs.

A syllabus is a document designed to describe the responsibilities of students and instructors. It also details the reading outline, objectives, methods, and provide a guide to the students in the course. Syllabi usually contain an action plan with topics correlated with assignments to be discussed in the class (McKeachie and Marilla, 2006). The way content and teaching methods to be employed are organized in a syllabus vary and this depend on the course instructor. According to McKeachie and Marilla (2006) it is important to include in a syllabus, the teaching methods that will be used to teach each topic, teaching goals, expectations, policies, and when each topic will be covered. Through the syllabus, instructors communicate their course design to students. Also, for students to have a significant learning experience, the teaching processes involve two related activities: gathering information to design a course and how the course will be taught (Davis, 1993). In addition, syllabi are used to: convey our expectations and enthusiasm for the course and topics to be address, show how the course fits into the broader context, establish a contract with the students by stating the course policies, procedures and requirements, help students identify areas of prerequisite and their preparation and readiness for the course, communicate the course goals and content and teaching methods to colleagues (Fink, 2003).

Each S E course instructor was asked to share additional documents that may be useful during the interview. This includes their publication(s) in the S E field, conference papers or any document they think will be useful. If an instructor is unable to provide any additional document, this still meet the inclusion criteria. Additional documents are important because they may better explain what the instructor could not explain or what could not be found in
the syllabus. The syllabi were examined to identify teaching content, methods and their goals. The purpose here was to identify content and teaching methods employed with the goal to enhance the formation of social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. Some participants were sent follow-up e-mails during the data analysis phase to clarify discrepancies that arose between the syllabi and the transcript interviews.

Interviews.

It should be noted that, inherently, no one data collection method is better than the other and collecting credible data is not an easy task (O’Leary, 2004). Thus, the advantages and disadvantages of each data collection method and the researchers’ goals play a great role in determining which methods to use. Interviews offer the opportunity for the researchers to talk and listen to participants systematically. It also promotes the gaining of knowledge and the collection of data in a conversation way. Kvale (1996) noted that, interviews facilitate the exchange of views between the researcher and the participant on a topic of mutual interest. In addition, collecting data through interviews promotes the social situatedness of research data. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000, p. 267) assert that, interviews are not all about collecting data about life but are part of life itself.

According to David and Sutton (2004), semi-structured interviews are frequently used in qualitative analysis. Also, semi-structured interviews allow flexibility and touch novel areas during the interview and this produce rich data. With semi-structured interview, data standardization is possible and it also helps facilitate the focus on the topic under study (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). According to Patton (2002), interviews explain better what cannot be understood by merely observing a situation or a person. Here, the researcher has a list of key issues, questions and themes to be covered. With semi-structured interviews, the researcher can change the order of the questions depending on the direction of the interview. Corbetta (2003) noted that, with semi-structured interviews, additional questions can be asked while using the interview guide. In addition, Interviewers are free to conduct the interviews in a way they think best fit and ask questions that are considered to give best explanations to the research questions. Also respondent can be prompt to clarify answers and explain further if necessary.
Semi-structured interviews were administered to each participant. Each participant was contacted by email to set up a location and time that is mutually convenient for a face-to-face interview. Arrangements for a Skype interview were made for participant that could not make it face-to-face. A digital voice recorder was used to record the interviews for back-up purposes. Interview guides are also important component for conducting interviews Corbetta (2003). It includes a list of questions, topics, and issues to be covered by the researcher during the interview. To avoid ambiguity, interview guide needs to be clear. The interview guides for this study contains questions targeted towards answering the main research questions (Those listed in Chapter 1 section 1.6).

Section A of the S E course instructors interview guide (see Appendix D) was design to understand the objectives of course instructors in employing a particular teaching method and the teaching methods they employ in teaching some common S E conceptual issues. Section B contains questions that were designed to understand the teaching content and teaching methods that can enhance social innovative thinking in students. Section C questions were structured to understand content and teaching methods that can enhance students’ motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. As for the students’ interview guide (see Appendix E), the first section was design to draw general feedback on whether successfully passing through the S E module/course has enable students to identify as responsible social entrepreneurs and social innovative thinkers. The target of the second section was to identify teaching content and methods that have enhance students thinking in an innovative way. Lastly, the third section was to identify teaching content and methods that has enhance responsible S E. It should be noted that, the interview guide for students was generated and students were interviewed after all the syllabi were examined and all the course instructors interviewed.

With semi-structured interviews, researchers can easily probe to get more views and opinions. Gray (2004) defined probing as a way the interviewer can use to explore new paths which were not considered initially. Patton (2002) encourages researchers to probe, explore and ask questions that will elucidate and illuminate a particular subject. This also enables the researcher to build a conversation within a particular subject area, word questions spontaneously and to further establish a conversational style but with the focus on a particular subject that has been predetermined.
Follow-up questions or probes were used to understand the content and teaching methods that enhance social innovative thinking within students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. Follow-up questions or probes gives cues to the desired level of responses and enable more clarity to participant's responses to the main research questions (Patton, 2002).

All interviews were transcribed by the researcher. To improve accuracy of the transcripts, the researcher and two other researchers from the peer support group read the transcripts and listen to the audio together. Peer support group members and my supervisory team also check the interview guides (both the instructors and students interview guides) to ensure consistency between the guides and the research questions. Based on their feedback, the interview guides were revised. Yin (2009) noted that, it is important investigators conduct a pilot study in order to refine data content and the procedures to be followed so that the research questions are answered.

Pilot studies increase the likelihood of success in the main study and a good research design most conduct a pilot study. Baker (1994) argued that, it is important to try out or pre-test research instruments. According to Baker (1994), pilot studies are advantageous because it might warn the researcher in advance about areas that might bring failure to the research project. It may also help the researcher to know whether the proposed research instruments or methods are good enough or too complicated and inappropriate. Adding to this was De Vaus (1993) who said “Do not take the risk. “ Pilot test first.” Also, Frankland and Bloor (1999) noted that qualitative researchers have a clearer definition of the study focus when they conduct a pilot study. This helps the researcher to narrow and concentrate the collection of data on projected analytical topics.

To test if the procedure worked, the revised interview guides were piloted with a S E course instructor and a few S E students from Lancaster University Management School. An email invitation was sent to this course instructor to participate in the study. This invitation requests the course instructor to share the currently employed syllabus for the S E module and to send an email that introduces the researcher to students undertaking the S E module copying the researcher in the email. The researcher contacted the students individually to
request their participation in the study. A preliminary analysis was conducted on the syllabus before the interviews.

This analysis yielded that the course instructor takes theories outside S E and employs them into S E to enhance creative thinking. Case study and group presentation on particular topics were also among the teaching methods employed. It was realized during the pilot interview that, questions related to common conceptual issues and the teaching methods employed in general with objectives made the instructor feel more comfortable while expressing his objectives as to why he chose to employ a particular teaching method(s) and some common conceptual issues. The guide was then revised following this insight to start with questions that gave the instructors the chance to express their objective as to why they chose to employ a particular teaching method(s) and common conceptual issues in general. After about 45 minutes talking about teaching content and methods that can enhance social innovative thinking in student and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs, the instructor valued the research and was cooperative.

As for the students, it was realized during the pilot interview that, students express themselves better when asked to share the knowledge acquired or skills developed while undertaking the module/course. It was also realized that students were more expressive with non-restrictive questions. Based on the pilot feedback, the student guide was readjusted to begin with questions that allow them to share what they acquired while undertaking the module/course. Also, students were not restricted to the list of teaching content and methods. The guide was readjusted to allow them to share and explain any other conceptual issues or methods outside the list.

*Case study Protocol/ ethical consideration*

Developing a case study protocol before the study is important and is very essential for multiple case studies (Yin, 1994). Protocols increase the reliability of case study research. Case study protocol formulation process makes the planning phase solid. At this phase, researchers are able to decide the data sources to use and the type of questions to ask. Case study protocols are the field procedures involve in carrying out a particular research project. They also serve as a guide when collecting data (Pervan and Maimbo, 2005). Case study protocols include research instruments (interview guides, questionnaires etc.) which ensure
consistency when collecting data. The case study protocol for this study comprises: a) purpose of the study, b) field procedure, c) interview guides, d) participant information sheet, e) participant consent form (see Appendixes B, C, D and E). Singer and Vinson (2002) emphasised that, ethical consideration are essential at the time of designing a case study. Robson (2002) noted that, it is preferable to handle consent agreement as a contract between the researcher and the participant. For this study, a consent form and a participant information sheet were issued to each participant before interviewing (see appendixes B and C).

Data analysis.

Case study analysis is the most difficult part in conducting case studies (Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 1994). According to Bogdan and Biklen (2007), data analysis is the process of systematically searching and organizing documents, transcripts to develop findings. Before data analysis, cases must be constructed. For this study, data analysis proceeds in two stages: (a) data preparation and within case analysis and (b) across case analysis. This method is used when there is no clear evidence between the context and the phenomenon (Yin, 1994). Thus, providing the opportunity to uncover pertinent contextual conditions. Also, this method is suitable for explanation seeking questions.

Stage one: Data preparation and within case analysis

Within case analysis allows the researcher to describe each case in detail which enables the researcher to treat and become familiar with each case as an entity on its own. Employing the within case analysis for this study enabled the researcher to treat and become familiar with each of the business schools, the current curriculum content, teaching methods, as well as how the content and teaching methods enhance social innovative thinking and student motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. Within transcripts and documents, important parts of the text that represent a theme or a concept were identified to develop a coding system. Concepts are ideas important to the research question. Themes are statements and explanations of how things happen (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). Developing a coding system and within case analysis for this study followed several steps.

Step one: preliminary analysis of documents.
Rossman and Rallis (1998) defined coding as the process of assigning labels to chunks of text. Before each interview to S E course instructors, the documents obtained on the syllabi were reviewed in order to have an idea of some of the content and methods currently employed and refine the interview guide if necessary. The interview guide for instructors and students were the same for all the instructors and students that participated. However, follow up questions were developed as each interview proceeds for more clarification. During this step, author notes and preliminary codes from the syllabi documents reviewed emerged.

**Step two: preliminary interviews analysis.**

Immediately after each interview, the researcher debriefed and wrote down what happened during the interview. After which, the researcher listened to the audio record of the previous interview to prepare for the next interview. This debriefing and the preparation for each interview yielded preliminary concepts and themes that formed part of the analysis.

**Step three: case construction.**

The unit of analysis for this study is each of the business schools under study. Cases must be constructed before data analysis. For each business school, the case was constructed by assembling for each business school the previously coded syllabi, researcher notes and the interview transcripts from both the interviews administered to S E course instructors and students.

**Step four: transcripts coding and coding system.**

Coding systems are developed by searching for patterns and topics within the data (Bodgan and Biklen, 2007). While having in hand the preliminary codes, the transcripts were coded. The preliminary coded data were revised and a new coding system that takes into consideration all the material was developed. Each code was named and defined. New themes emerged while synthesizing and clarifying codes (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). Once the transcripts and syllabi for each case were coded, the data was revisited to see if codes are redundant or are subsets of each other. To do this, all data sources were examined together. Codes were clarified and redefined. The NVIVO software program was used to complete the coding of one case at a time before beginning work on the next one.

**Step five: within case analysis.**


Within case analysis involves a detailed description of each case. The overall idea is to become familiar with each case as an entity on its own and to develop a descriptive framework to organize the Cases (Eisenhardt, 1989). Within case analysis explored the content and teaching methods that can enhance social innovative thinking in students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. Within Case analysis was carried out in two parts. Each part comprises of one or more steps: a) within Case b) within group comparison.

Part 1: Within Case analysis

Step 1: Teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking.

Here, instructors’ syllabi reports and interview responses are analysed separately from students’ interview feedback on a case by case basis. The purpose is to explore separately emerging codes related to teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking.

Step 2: Teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E

Instructor’s syllabi reports and interview responses are analysed separately from students’ interview feedback on a case by case basis. The purpose is to explore separately emerging codes related to teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E.

Part 2: within group comparison

Within group focus on the big issues outlined in the research questions. The strength of the analysis is dependent on the researcher’s own knowledge and experience (Yin, 1994). The objective of the group comparison is to further identify similarities and differences in groups. This will give more strength to the analysis. Here, cases are grouped and compared according to levels. These include: the Masters, undergraduate and the foundation levels. The purpose is to explore similarities and differences between the instructors/syllabi and the students at each level.

Step 1: Master’s level.
a) By comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking, b) By comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E.

Here, instructor’s teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking are compared with student’s teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking. The aim here is to explore similarities and differences in emerging codes related to social innovative thinking at the masters’ level. Next, instructor’s teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E are compared with student’s teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E. The aim is to explore similarities and differences in emerging codes related to responsible S E at the masters’ level.

**Step 2: Undergraduate level.**

a) By comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking, b) By comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E, c) By comparing between Cases instructors and students teaching content and method enhancing social innovative thinking, d) By comparison between Cases instructors and students teaching content and method enhancing responsible S E.

At this level, three Cases are involved. The aim is to explore similarities and differences in emerging codes related to social innovative thinking and responsible S E at the undergraduate level.

**Step 3: Foundation level**

a) By comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking, b) By comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E.

Here, instructors teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking are compared with student’s teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking. Also, instructor’s teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E are compared with student’s teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E. The aim
is to explore the similarities and differences in emerging codes related to social innovative thinking and responsible S E at the foundation level.

During the within Case analysis, codes from each student transcript were compared with that of other students. Similar codes identified in half or more than half of the students’ transcripts in each case were noted. These similar codes were then compared with codes from the syllabi and course instructors’ transcripts to further identify key similarities. All the course instructors’ transcripts in each case were considered as one since it is a single module/course that is being taught by one or two instructors. This process was repeated for each case. Decision point for this study is defined as similar curriculum content and teaching methods identified from the syllabi, the course instructors’ transcripts and students transcripts within and across the Cases. Each Case was completely analyzed before the across Case analysis began.

Stage two: Across Case analysis.

Here all cases are compared across. Comparing each business school and the other. This comparison further identified the similarities and/or differences that exist between the codes that were developed during the within case analysis. Relationships, themes, and patterns are generated from these similarities and differences. At the individual level, four comparisons are possible. Considering there are five Cases and each case cannot be compared against itself.

4.5 Interpretation

Data interpretation began by exploring curriculum content and teaching methods that can enhance social innovative thinking in students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. Also, the data is explored to see how it is consistent with previous research about the content and teaching methods employed in teaching S E. To interpret the data further, a model is developed, presented and explained. The model aims to explain curriculum content and teaching methods that can enhance social innovative thinking in students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. Complements are made on the content and teaching methods student confirmed increased their thinking innovatively and their motivation to potentially become
responsible social entrepreneurs. The content and teaching methods are obtained from the analyzed data.

4.6 Data Management

A file will be created for each case. Each file will contain course instructor’s transcripts, student transcripts, syllabi and all tapes. All documents, transcriptions, researcher’s notes, tapes, backups computer files will be kept in the researcher’s home office file cabinet. All files will be maintained for up to 3 years after the completion of the study.

4.7 Quality of the Study

Yin (1994) noted that case studies give the opportunity to collect data from different sources. In order to ensure credibility and accuracy, the study collected data from three different sources (interviews to S E instructors, interview to students and syllabi) to explore the content and teaching methods that can enhance social innovative thinking in students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. The study collected data from instructors teaching S E as a module/course in five different UK business schools. Students who successfully passed through the S E module/course in these business schools were also interviewed.

By comparing and contrasting the content and teaching methods instructors employ with students feedback both within and across cases, triangulation occurred. To identify repeated themes across cases, the study triangulated data from five different cases (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Repeating the same phenomenon from multiple evidence increases the credibility and validity of the research (Yin, 1994). Also, to judge the quality of empirical research, Yin (1994) noted that, reliability, construct validity, internal and external validity are commonly used

4.8. Construct Validity

This study reduces construct validity by using several data sources which also provide the possibility of replicating findings. To further address construct validity issues, a rich description of all evidence that support findings is provided to enable readers to have access to relevant materials that support the findings of this study.
4.9. Internal Validity

Internal validity establishes causal relationships. Here, certain conditions are yield from other conditions. To have a good chain of inference, producing converging results from different sources of information increase internal validity (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Comparing this study with previous literature also increased internal validity (Eisenhardt, 1989).

4.10. External Validity

This study improves external validity by replicating findings across cases (Yin, 1994) and by comparing the study with previous literature (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

4.11. Reliability

Reliability demonstrates that, the same results can be obtained by repeating the procedures employed to conduct the study. A study with minimal errors and biases is reliable. Also, for a study to be reliable, it should be able to allow other researchers to replicate the study (Kidder and Judd, 1986). Furthermore, the methods and instruments employed to collect data need to be well described and documented. This study will document all the procedures taken. Case study protocol will be used to compliment all the documentation of the study process (see appendix B, C, D and E). To allow other investigators to directly review the evidence and not only through written reports, the researcher will organize and provide a documentation of the data collected if required.

4.12. Researcher’s role

I grew up in Mbengwi in the Northwest region of Cameroon. I am my parents’ last born child. My entire family is educated. My mother works for the Cameroon Presbyterian church as a women work helper for the Meta presbytery. My dad is a retired teacher. I have three elder bothers and one elder sister who is a high school English language teacher. The first born of the family is an electronic engineer. The second and the third work for Nyaa and Partners, a multi-service company that was established in 2006 by the third born of the family who is also currently a PhD student and a lecturer at the university of Bamenda, a state university in Cameroon.
Today, Nyaa publishers is the leading publishing house in Cameroon and employs almost 25 people. In Cameroon, a lot of people depend on the public sector for employment with very few successful companies. The political structure of the country makes it difficult for businesses to flourish. However, my experience while working with Nyaa and Partners before moving to the UK for studies shows that, with constant innovation, honesty and the identification of new opportunities, businesses can still be sustainable in Cameroon. My university education experience also showed that, business schools in Cameroon do not really employ teaching content and methods that equip graduates with the right tools needed to be successful business owners. Before moving to the UK I was very conscious of the fact that, there is the urgent need to re-structure the business curriculum and employ conceptual issues and teaching methods that can enhance the formation of potential business owners. Thus, promoting the creation of jobs via the private sector as a lot of people still depend on the public sector for employment. While in the UK, I was introduced to S E. I became so interested in this rapidly increasing new way of doing business. Instead of working towards a traditional entrepreneurship curriculum, I became interested in working towards a S E curriculum as it offers the opportunity to create both social and economic value.

With respect to professional experience, Doreen Nyaa Amundam is an entrepreneur. She is a lecturer and a researcher. She has been acting as a business developer in NYAA & PARTNERS (N & P). Today, NYAA PUBLISHERS (The publishing department of N&P) is currently the leading publishing house in Cameroon. My current project is to re-form N&P as a social enterprise and through its publishing house, design and propose a curriculum for social entrepreneurship education to the Cameroon State universities. N&P enterprise is registered in the Cameroon ministries of Justice, Economy and Finance, Commerce and Culture under registration n° RC / YAO /2006 / A / 966 and tax payer’s contribution N°: P038000393628U.

NYAA & PARTNERS specialises in publishing, printing, sale of papers, translation, consultancy, computer graphics designing, Secretariat duties, dealers in agricultural products (cocoa, plantains etc.) and supply of stationeries.

We have already published more than 50 books, some of which are used in schools nationwide and are on the official book list of the Ministry of Secondary Education. NYAA
PUBLISHERS upholds the fight for transparency, the respect of human rights, good governance, democracy, patriotism, youths and women empowerment. It also promotes research in the arts, letters, business, science and technology. Writers and researchers who grapple with any of the issues above are given priority to by NYAA PUBLISHERS. It should be noted that we also run a printing press.

4.13 Summary

This multiple case study focuses on the curriculum content and teaching methods that can enhance social innovative thinking in students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. The study uses different sources to collect data (semi-structured interviews to SE course instructors, semi-structured interviews to students and syllabi) to understand and draw information on the content and teaching methods that can enhance social innovative thinking in students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs.
CHAPTER 5

CASE SUMMARY

The cases included are described in this chapter. A case corresponds to each of the UK business school under study. Each case includes: analyzed syllabus and interviews that were administered to SE course instructor(s) in each business school, analyzed interviews that were administered to students who successfully passed through the SE module/course. Five cases are presented. Three business schools offer SE as a module at the undergraduate level. Two business schools offer SE as a course at the foundational and master’s levels. Though, SE is taught at different levels, the purpose is to identify the best curriculum content and teaching methods for enhancing the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. Information on the criteria each business school met is presented in table 4.

Table 4: Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case number</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Top 50 UK BSs/Uni</th>
<th>SE instructor(s) with at least 2 years teaching experience</th>
<th>Students have successfully pass through the SE module/course</th>
<th>Foundational level course</th>
<th>Undergraduate level module</th>
<th>Master’s level course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Oxford Brookes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 present the Case number, Pseudonym, whether the Case presented is a UK business school that is amongst the top 50 UK business schools/universities according to eduniversal
ranking by PALMES LEAGUE in 2014, SE instructor(s) years of experience, whether students have successfully passed through the S E module/course and teaching levels. For example: Case 1 corresponds to Westminster university business school which is ranked amongst the top 50 UK business schools/universities according to Palmes. This case also has an instructor teaching S E with at least 2 years of teaching experience in S E or entrepreneurship in general and students who have successfully passed through the S E module at the undergraduate level.

Case 2 corresponds to Oxford Brookes business school which is ranked amongst the top 50 UK business schools according to Palmes. This case has instructors teaching S E with at least 2 years of teaching experience in S E or entrepreneurship in general and students who have successfully passed through the S E course at the foundation level.

The presented data in this chapter was collected through syllabi and interviews. The information collected includes teaching content and methods from the syllabi. Documents on the S E syllabi may not cover the amount of learning and S E instructors’ opinions. To draw more information, interviews were administered to S E course instructors. In addition to this, interviews were also administered to students who successfully passed through the S E module/course. The purpose was to draw students’ feedback on the teaching content and methods that did actually enhanced their thinking innovatively and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. A summarized overview of each case is provided below. Data collected during interviews and data from each business school official web page was used to construct this summary.

5.1. Westminster

This business school is located in the city of London in the UK. Westminster has a total enrollment of about 4,000 students and offers 20 courses at the undergraduate level. Business management- entrepreneurship is a 3 years full time undergraduate course with 20-25 students in the 2015/2016 academic year. The tuition for this course is £9,000.00 for Home/EU students and £12,250.00 for overseas students. In the first year of this course, 5 different general business modules are offered and these include: Accounting and Finance Fundamentals, Analyzing and Managing Information, Global Business Environment, Marketing Principles, People and Organizations. In the second year, students begin to study
their chosen pathway and students who specialize in entrepreneurship study 6 core modules in year 2 and these includes: Business Decision Making, Entrepreneurial Practice, Managing and Leading People, New Venture Creation, Operations and Digital Business, Project Management. Students chose in this year between SE and entrepreneurship. In the final year, a full entrepreneurship curriculum based on “learning by doing approach” is run in this year with a lot of social enterprise concepts taught. Students are expected to carry out a real project either in the SE context or in the context of entrepreneurship in general depending on what they chose in their second year. Alongside carrying out a project, students are also expected to undertake the following modules: Commercializing Your Enterprise, Creating Entrepreneurial Leadership, Current Themes in Entrepreneurship Global Strategic Management, Social Media for Business and Sustainable Business

The course instructor interviewed in this business school has more than 2 years of teaching experience in SE and entrepreneurship. The course instructor is a PhD holder and has published quite a good number of articles in the context of SE education. According to the syllabus report, this instructor expects students to: demonstrate the ability to critically review practically: a range of entrepreneurship and SE theories applicable to micro and small businesses, a range of business and marketing concepts and theories. Use this to offer innovative and cost effective solutions to a number of problems. Students are also expected to understand the research process and the construction of knowledge by using their learning experience and research as data. By doing this, students are expected not just to remember and understand research concepts but also to be able to analyse and create new theories or insights. According to this course instructor, knowledge process in this manner, through connection with personal experience becomes more ingrained for future application.

Teaching content includes: the concept of bricolage and effectuation, practice based theory, competence, learning contract and team building theories and core values of integrity. This instructor believes that, the most effective way to understand SE is to practice it. The syllabus report shows that, the module takes an experiential learning by doing teaching method approach and students are expected to interact with the business community. Also, a guest speaker who owns a social enterprise is invited to speak and gives student some ideas about the concept of SE at the beginning of the module. Real case studies are used to
expose students to a variety of new business ideas and concepts. Students present in groups to generate the ability to work in groups and communicate effectively.

8 students were interviewed. These are students who chose and successfully undertook a project in the context of S E. Appendix F (Case 1: Westminster) gives examples of student’s responses on the skills acquired, whether they are motivated and have identified themselves as responsible social entrepreneurs and social innovative thinkers.

5.2 Oxford Brookes

This business school is located in the city of Oxford in the UK. Oxford Brookes offers S E (business and social enterprise) as a 2 years full time course at the foundation level through its partner Ruskin College. This course is equivalent to the first two years of a university degree. Students can apply after completion to Oxford Brookes University for entry into the final year of their BA (Hons) Business Management. Ruskin College is also located in the city of Oxford in the UK and offers two courses at the foundation level. All the courses at Ruskin College are centered on small class sizes and the S E (business and social enterprise) course has a total enrollment of 8 students in the 2015/2016 academic year. The tuition fee for this course is £6,000.00 per year for Home/EU and international students. In the first year of this course, 7 modules directly related to S E are offered namely: critical skills/personal development, foundation of business and social enterprise, introduction to business in a social enterprise context, business ethics, corporate social responsibility and social enterprise, marketing and social enterprise, understanding financial management of social enterprise and historical and contemporary issues in social enterprise. In the second year, 7 modules are offered and these includes: business strategy and innovation, leading and managing through mission, leadership and managing people, finance for developing business, identities and legalities, network and networking, social enterprise work-base projects and research skills.

Two instructors who both have more than 2 years of teaching experience in S E or entrepreneurship were interviewed. One of the instructor interviewed is a PhD holder and one a PhD student. The syllabus report shows that these instructors expect students to: recognize reasonable arguments that are based on evidence and not opinion, understand the key terminology use in S E and the uniqueness of social organizations when compared to
nonsocial organizations, have a good knowledge of what makes a social enterprises “ethical” and what makes it different from corporate social responsibilities and the advantages of ethical branding, have the potentials of using established analytical tools to effectively exploit resources needed to create the social value and to develop skills needed to control finance to ensure the funds needed to develop the business is available whilst upholding the core mission, conduct a research in the social enterprise field that is of value and can be of practical use to employers.

Teaching content looks at the management and leadership style of world known social entrepreneurs. Key theories include: leadership and motivational theories, change management theories and Milton Friedman and corporate social responsibility. Teaching methods includes taking students out for fieldwork to visit local social enterprises and a guest speaker who owns a social enterprise is invited to talk to students. Lectures cover real life cases and weak and strong students are mixed to work in teams. Students presents individually or in groups throughout the course.

Out of the 8 students undertaking this course, 3 were S E practitioners. 6 students were interviewed. Appendix F (Case 2: Oxford Brookes) gives examples of student’s response on the skills they expected to achieve, whether they are motivated and have identified themselves as responsible social entrepreneurs and social innovative thinkers.

5.3 Goldsmiths

This University is located in the city of London in the UK and has 20 academic disciplines with over 10,000 students. The institute of creative and cultural entrepreneurship (ICCE) is one of the academic disciplines in this university and offers 13 courses at the masters’ level. The ICCE offers cultural management, entrepreneurship and policy education to the cultural and creative sector. This institute has an interdisciplinary nature which makes it different. Its serves as an experimentation area where disciplines such as music, drama, dance, communication, fine art, technology and media can come together and learn from each other. The approach of this institute is to take creative approach to develop new businesses and the infrastructures supporting them and to integrate entrepreneurship within the development of creative practices. MA social entrepreneurship is a full time one year
A master’s course offer by this institute with 8 students in the 2015/2016 academic year. The tuition for this course is £9,000.00 for Home/EU students and £16,280.00 for overseas students. The different modules taught includes: Foundation to social enterprise, social return on investment (SROI), entrepreneurial modelling and governmental policies and theoretical framework.

Two instructors who both have more than 2 years of teaching experience in S E or entrepreneurship were interviewed. One of the instructors interviewed is a PhD holder and one a S E practitioner. The syllabus report shows that these instructors expect students to: have a good knowledge on how to evaluate social impact using a variety of different techniques, understand the context of S E in different countries and how social impact affects governmental policies, design a business model, and understand the essential insights into social entrepreneurial practices.

Teaching content includes: measuring social outcome which covers varieties of different techniques and methodology for example SROI, social auditing, social accounting, and participatory monetary evaluation. Key theories includes: The resource base theory, the theory of individual psychological motivation, institutional theory, economist theory of Carl cololaira, and structuralist theory. Teaching methods includes: Inviting up to 20 guest speakers from different social enterprise background for example: practicing social entrepreneurs, people who have set up social enterprises, people who support social work, people who help in establishing social enterprises, people who have experience in different varieties of social enterprises. Use case studies for illustrative purposes and students are taken on a fieldwork to visit social enterprises in London. Students also carry out field work cases in their research projects.

Out of the 8 students undertaking this course in this institution, 6 were interviewed. Appendix F (Case 3: Goldsmith) gives examples of student’s responses on the skills they expected to achieve, whether they are motivated and have identified themselves as responsible social entrepreneurs, social innovative thinkers and new ideas achieved.
5.4 Northampton

This business school is located in the city of Northampton in the UK and has a total enrolment of about 3500 students. Northampton offers 8 courses at the undergraduate level. Business entrepreneurship is a 3 years full time undergraduate course with 25 students in the 2015/2016 academic year. Students doing this course have an option to do it either as a joint honour (BA/BSc) or as a BA (Hons). The tuition for this course is £9,000.00 for Home/EU students and £10,700.00 for overseas students. In the first year, all the students doing this course either as a BA/BSc or BA undertake the S E (introducing social enterprise) module. In year 1, students undertake the following compulsory modules: enterprise and opportunity, entrepreneurial skill development and introducing social enterprise, foundation of marketing, introducing accounting and finance, business modelling for marketers. Second year compulsory modules includes: New ventures, issues in small businesses and entrepreneurship, tactical and strategic marketing, management skills in development and the consultant entrepreneur. In year 3 compulsory modules includes: Marketing dissertation, opportunity, innovation and entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial marketing and entrepreneurial strategy.

Northampton has been offering S E (introducing social enterprise) for more than 2 years. The course instructor interviewed has more than 2 years of teaching experience in S E and entrepreneurship. The syllabus report shows that this instructor expects students to: develop personal attitude and entrepreneurial spirit to successfully grow their own business ideas in an innovative way, develop skills needed to start a small business, have a good knowledge of the vision of tomorrow’s entrepreneurs in order to potentially succeed, develop skills needed to identify social problems and pitch for funding needed to practically operate their social business proposals, develop creative thinking skills that enable a distinctive approach towards solving business problems, be knowledgeable on how to offer consultancy solutions to projects in an entrepreneur’s small business.

Teaching content includes: looking at social impact, comparing and contrasting social from non-social organisations, business generation canvas to develop social business ideas and tribunal model analysis. Teaching methods involves the invitation of pass students who have start and are successfully running their own social businesses to talk and motivate the
students. Students visit on field work local social enterprises to interact, ask questions and improve their knowledge. Students Generate and present social business ideas with the help of theoretical models in teams. Use of video footage to improve students understanding on the different forms of S E, how they operate and how they are different from charities and CSR. Use exams assessment methods to ensure students understand the concept.

Five Out of the 25 students undertaking this module were interviewed. Appendix F (Case 4: Northampton) gives examples of student’s responses on the skills acquired, whether they are motivated, have identified themselves as responsible social entrepreneurs and social innovative thinkers and new ideas achieved.

5.5 Lancaster

This business school is located in the city of Lancaster in the UK and has a total enrolment of about 4,000 students and offers 61 courses at the undergraduate level. Management and entrepreneurship is a 3 years full time undergraduate course with 30 students in the 2015/2016 academic year. The tuition for this course is £9,000.00 for Home/EU students and £15,950.00 for overseas students. Student studying this course undertake S E (The social context of entrepreneurship) module in year 3 and is taught based on an interactive student -led model of learning. First year modules includes: Entrepreneurship: key debates and concepts, an introduction to management, an introduction to statistics, and computing for management. Second year modules includes: management and consulting, entrepreneurship within a global context, small business and the SME Sector and franchising. Year 3 modules includes: Social Contexts of Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurial Learning, New Venture Planning, Family Business and Innovation

The course instructors interviewed are PhD holders and both have more than 2 years of teaching experience in S E and entrepreneurship. The syllabus report shows that these instructors expect students to: have an understanding of social responsibility practices, understand the different variety of social contexts of entrepreneurship, and analysed, discuss and present complex social ideas drawn from cases coherently and with understanding.
Teaching content includes: Pears (2003) account diagram, Alan (2006) Venn diagram. Theories includes: institutional theory of organizational legitimacy, social origin theory, theories of trust, responsibility, and altruism stewardship. Teaching methods involves inviting a guest speaker mid-way into the course. Use real case studies by looking into local social organizations that combine both social and commercial objective with the belief that the capabilities use in running a commercial enterprise can strengthen the social enterprise under social objectives. Students are taking on a field work to a local social enterprise and they are expected to reflect on what is learned and make a report. Students work in teams and present on international organizations around the world, use S E theories and general management theories with the help of the business model generation canvas as a presentation structure and present in the context of S E. Students also get involve in social enterprise leaders network which encourage critical thinking.

Five Out of the 30 students undertaking this course in this institution were interviewed. Appendix F (Case 5: Lancaster) gives examples of student’s response on the skills acquired, whether they are motivated, have identified themselves as responsible social entrepreneurs and social innovative thinkers and new ideas achieved.
Table 5: Data sources and use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources and type of data</th>
<th>Use in analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary data: semi-structure interviews (120 pages in total)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with instructors</td>
<td>Identify current S E teaching content and methods, which and how these content and methods enhance social innovative thinking and students motivation of becoming potentially responsible social entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster (1: 4 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Brookes (2: 7 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith (2: 7 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton (1: 4 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster (2: 8 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with students</td>
<td>Confirm and identify teaching content and methods that have enhance students thinking innovatively and their motivation of potentially becoming responsible social entrepreneurs, confirm whether students have acquired the expected skills and whether they have identify as social innovative thinkers and responsible social entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster (8: 24 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Brookes (6: 18 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith (6: 18 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton (5: 15 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster (5: 15 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary data: Syllabi (32 pages in total)</td>
<td>Identify current S E teaching content and methods, which and how these content and methods enhance social innovative thinking in students and their motivation of becoming potentially responsible social entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster (1: 5 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Brookes (2: 7 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith (2: 10 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton (1: 4 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster (Lancaster2: 6 pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Summary.

Information about each Case has been provided in this chapter. This includes: Information about the location, a brief background, whether S E is taught as a module or a course and the levels. This chapter outlined the criteria each business school met to be selected as a Case. The chapter also provides a summary overview of each business school, data sources and their use in analysis. In this chapter information about instructors’ experiences, their level of education, their general expectation from students and general teaching content and methods employed is provided. Furthermore, example of students’ responses on the
skills they have acquired, whether they are motivated and feel identified as innovative thinkers and responsible social entrepreneurs. It should be noted that, for each Case, each student interview response was read to determine which code represents best the students’ responses in each Case. In some cases, students’ responses received multiple codes. Cases where fully describe to allow familiarity with each Case before the within and across Case analysis begins.
CHAPTER 6

WITHIN CASE ANALYSIS

Analysing case study data can be done in two parts which includes: data organisation and the interpretation of results. Eriksson and Koistinen (2005) noted that, coding and thematic analysis are key tools in the process of organising and interpreting case study results.

6.1 Coding.

The coding process begins by identifies within the sources of data chunks of text that represents a theme or a concept. Themes are statements with explanation of how things happen. Concepts are ideas important to the research question (Rubin and Rubin, 2005).

The first sets of codes were developed after several times of reading the transcripts and the syllabi documents. Theoretical orientation guided the process of searching for relevant concepts and themes. Theoretical orientation for this study is based on the social identity theory. As outlined in chapter 4, section 4.6, before starting with thematic analysis, preliminary set of codes needs to be developed. In the first process of coding, 153 codes were developed (78 from instructors’ transcripts/syllabi and 75 from students’ transcripts). Figure 3 gives an idea of the type of themes and concepts that emerged during the process of reading the instructors and students interview transcripts and syllabi.

Figure 3: First list of preliminary codes in order of how they emerged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary codes from instructors’ transcripts/Syllabi</th>
<th>Preliminary codes from students’ transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>Fashion business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speaking</td>
<td>Social investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE concepts</td>
<td>Right structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>Growth theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New business ideas</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New concepts</td>
<td>Community interest companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work</td>
<td>Beneficiary needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Triple bottom line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE theories</td>
<td>Legal framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business theories</td>
<td>Organisational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models</td>
<td>Practical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remembering social problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply business skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social enterprise idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employ immigrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charity enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business model canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborating as a team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Using the 153 codes above, within case analysis began. The research questions were used as a guide. The goal here was to identify decision points and influencing factors related to teaching content and methods that can enhance social innovative thinking in students and their motivation to become responsible social entrepreneurs. Many of the 153 preliminary codes were redefined during the second review and a new list of 62 first order codes (32 from instructors/syllabi and 30 from students) and 22 second order codes were developed. Other themes and concepts that emerged relevant to the study apart from those directly answering the research question were identified. During the second review, 62 first order and 22 second order codes families emerged and through redefining the first codes and second review, within case analysis began.

These families of codes were used as preliminary themes that generated the first ideas of
what the answers to the research questions might be. Quotes from transcripts and participants' pseudonyms are cited. Pseudonyms are used to refer to information from the instructors, students and the syllabi. For example the pseudonym for the two instructors interviewed in Lancaster and the syllabus are LI1, LI2 (Lancaster instructor 1 and 2) and LS (Lancaster syllabus) for the syllabus. The same is applied for the students. For example OBS1, OBS2, OBS3 etc. (Oxford Brookes student number 1, 2, 3 etc.). LS1, LS2, LS3 etc. (Lancaster student number 1, 2, 3 etc.). Pseudonyms are used to protect participant's confidentiality. These preliminary themes were used to create a codebook which was used as a starting point and a frame for the across case analysis. Based on information from one case and with the use of the coding system, an effort to answer the research questions was made. Within case analysis constitutes the results of the analysis and is presented in two parts. In the first part of within case analysis, instructor’s syllabi reports and interview responses were analysed separately from students’ interview feedback on teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking and responsible S E. The second part compares instructor’s syllabi reports and interview responses with students’ interview feedback on teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking and responsible S E.

6.2 Part 1: Instructors and students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking and responsible S E.

In this section, instructor’s syllabi reports and interview responses were analysed separately from students’ interview feedback. The purpose was to individually explore, emerging codes related to teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking and responsible S E. The analysis for the instructors/syllabi is organised below under two headings case by case: teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking and teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E.

Also, the analysis for students is organised under two headings case by case: teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking (see appendix G) and teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E (see appendix H).
6.3 Teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking: case by case
emerging codes from instructors/syllabi

Case 1: Westminster

While reviewing the syllabus and during the interview, four preliminary codes related to
teaching content and methods that might enhance the formation of innovative thinking
social entrepreneurs emerged.

1) Bricolage and effectuation.

Westminster emphasises the concept of bricolage and effectuation as teaching content.
From the syllabus report, students are expected to read and practically apply the concept of
effectual entrepreneurship in the context of S E.

You will be exposed to a variety of new business ideas and concepts. In the spirit of
the entrepreneurship, you are expected to keep those new ideas confidential, and
not share them outside the class without permission. If you want to work on one of
the opportunities presented in class; 1 team per opportunity, first come, first serve!
Read Chapter 2 & 3 in Effectual Entrepreneurship. Notify your seminar tutor the
entrepreneur that you wish to work with for your individual assignment. In
embedding opportunity recognition theories into the S E curriculum we hope to
produce individuals who aspire to be agents of change.WS

Here is the instructor response to the question whether it is important to teach students to
think innovatively and the current conceptual issues employed to enhance this.

Yes. We spent a lot of time teaching creativity. Creativity through bricolage and
effectuation. These two methods are accompanied by team work for they cannot
work alone. So they have to work with different models we teach them all this. W11

From the syllabus report and interview responses as can be seen in the above quotes,
Westminster believes in working in teams towards identifying or achieving a social
entrepreneurial opportunity. This may actually enhance a collaborative effort to think in an
innovative way toward developing new social entrepreneurial insights and individuals who
are willing to be agents of change.
2) Experiential learning (Learning by doing in teams)

Westminster employs experiential learning as a teaching method. According to the syllabus report,

The most effective way to understand entrepreneurship is to practice it. This module takes an experiential approach and students are expected to interact with the business community. Entrepreneurship requires the ability to see what others do not. If opportunities were clear to everyone, they would not be opportunities. To succeed, you must engage your creative side, and remain open to challenging your current assumptions and beliefs. The group work element is specifically designed to help students work with others as they would need to in the world of work both in terms of developing their communication skills as well as learning from each other.

Here is the instructor’s response regarding teaching methods employed towards enhancing social innovative thinking

Learning by doing. Experiential learning and practice based learning. WI1

3) Experiential learning (real case studies, guest speaking and interviewing mentors)

The instructor also believes that social innovative thinking can be enhanced by employing experiential teaching methods that expose students to real business situations and people.

Our entrepreneurship course actually does real projects. That is what we believe. We also do case studies but everything is real. It is not a classroom theoretical kind of thing. We believe in real experiential learning where students interact with real business people. The business plan will be what they believe and their experience in the real world. We see it as reflective. WI1

4) Group presentations

The syllabus report shows that, Westminster expects students to present in groups the knowledge acquired through connection with personal experience. Students are expected to:

Demonstrate that they can work positively in groups and communicate effectively using text and presentation skills both internally and externally where necessarily. They should be able to offer solutions to a number of problems in a cost effective and innovative way for a specific organisation that could be in the for profit or not for profit by processing knowledge in this manner, through connection with personal
experience, it becomes more deeply ingrained and available for application in the future.

**Case 2: Oxford Brookes**

Two preliminary codes relating to teaching content and methods that might enhance social innovative thinking social entrepreneurs emerged.

1) **Thinking tools (book review, historical and contemporary issues)**

The syllabus report shows that critical thinking in the context of S E is developed when students review and write reports on the books of well-known social entrepreneurs. Also, one of the instructors believes social innovative thinking can be enhanced by looking at historical issues as a teaching content.

   Looking at what has already been innovated at the moment and then possibly developing it in the future. We do a module call strategy and innovation. We look at historical and contemporary issues. For example we ask them to look at co-operative movements and their history and then ask questions when it was socially innovative or how innovative they are at the moment. OBI2

2) **Experiential learning (real case studies, field work approach)**

Interview responses from one of the instructors interviewed revealed that, this instructor really believes innovation is the way forward for social organisations and students need to be well armed. Here is the instructor’s response when asked if teaching students to think innovatively is important and what teaching methods were employed to enhance this.

   Yes. I think that innovation is the way forward for this type of organisation. The organisation we work with here in Oxford is not easy for them to fulfil the role they want to and occupy the space they wish to. Teaching students to think outside of the box is very important to take this type of target when they finish their degree program. They have to be really prepared to be able to change directions depending on the circumstances surrounding them. OBI1

This instructor also mentioned that,

   The research projects they undertake in their second year get them to have a relationship with a local social enterprise. This enables them to do their research in the field work. The huge part of the current curriculum particularly case studies get them think outside the box and not to restrict them with what textbooks say.
Sometimes you might need to do something differently and that relationship with real life organisations is very important.

Here is the instructor opinion on teaching methods that can enhance innovative thinking:

I think the best will be the engagement with the real world. This could be done through real case studies. Real problems through research. Meeting those involved in social enterprises. Putting it in one heading will be the engagement with the real world.

**Case 3: Goldsmith**

Five preliminary codes relating to teaching content and methods that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs emerged.

1) *Opportunity recognition*

One of the instructors interviewed mentioned that, encouraging critical innovation and recognising new opportunities is important. Here is the instructor response when asked if it is important to teach students to be innovative and what current teaching content was employed to enhance this.

Yes. Firstly, any form of entrepreneurship is innovative by definition. It might be innovative to see an opportunity where others have not, it may be innovative in terms of the ways of looking into opportunities, it may be innovative in design sense, designing a different approach to a particular problem and critical innovation. Critical innovation is something we try to encourage. In the sense that, we encourage students to be sceptical about established theories in social enterprise. We hope to provide students not just with the tools and techniques required for entrepreneurship or S E but for supporting S E. This includes the ability to think about new legal structures. Legal framework in terms of new type of financial support for instance.

2) *Thinking tools (mapping and case studies illustrative techniques)*

This instructor also mentioned that:

I think techniques about mapping the individuals own capabilities. Techniques in mapping and identifying marketing values in which a business is going to operate. Techniques for imaginatively making new combinations of capabilities. We use case studies to illustrate the issues in choosing the correct legal structure.
We have a whole module on business planning. A very important element of the program is to use very advanced techniques for mapping the environment within which the students intend to work. Gi1

Also, the syllabus report shows that students are expected to provide answers to the question:

Why would people working in the area of social enterprise need to understand the history of social enterprise and related activities? Illustrate your discussion with reference to your own experience of one or two organisations.GS

3) Resource identification

During the interview one of the instructors mentioned that:

We use the resource base theory and techniques of thinking about the resources that one has or how to get access to resources. Gi1

In the foundation to social enterprise module, we use case studies to illustrate the issues around for instance the appropriate mix around grants, donations and trading.Gi1

4) Exposure (guest speakers from different social background)

As for teaching methods, here is the interview response from one of the instructors on the current methods employed to enhance social innovative thinking

We have a lot of guest speakers. We have over 20 guest speakers from different social enterprise background. So we invite practising social entrepreneurs, people who have set up social enterprises, we invite people who have supported social works, like social enterprise UK. We invite people who have helped social enterprises to establish. We particularly focus on public sector mutual which has span out of the public sector. Example is the great leisure which is a leisure service social enterprise another is Hackney transport. Gi1

5) Experience (Learning by doing)

Here is one of the instructor’s opinion and suggestion on methods that might enhance social innovative thinking.

I would like to use internships and using action research within internships. In an ideal world, this will require students to address real world concerns but also draw from many resources and peers.Gi1
Case 4: Northampton

While reviewing the syllabus and during the interview, six preliminary codes relating to teaching content and methods that might enhance the formation of innovative thinking social entrepreneurs emerged.

1) Thinking tools

The instructor interviewed believes social innovative thinking can be enhanced by encouraging students to use different techniques and tools. Here is the instructor’s response when asked whether teaching students to think innovatively is important and the teaching content employed to enhance this.

Yes absolutely. There are problems that have been existing for many years and there is the need to think of different ways to approach them. We have to be innovative so a lot of what we are doing is to encourage students to use a lot of different tools and techniques to enable them to think in a more creative way and to develop their thoughts and ideas. NI1

2) Explore and present business ideas in teams

As for teaching methods, the syllabus report shows that to enhance social innovative thinking, student are encouraged to explore their own enterprising ideas.

Entrepreneurial strategies and innovations are explored across a wide range of opportunities. This then enables you to further explore, if you wish, your own enterprising ideas through your dissertation or to further understand small business practices through a consultancy project with an existing small business. NS

During the interview, the instructor also mentioned that:

We are going on a trip in two weeks’ time to go and visit two local social enterprises that have been growing drastically since they started. So students visit these social entrepreneurs and get to hear from them and ask them questions to improve their understanding. Students have to present on their social enterprise idea in groups.NI1

3) Pitching for funds

From the syllabus report, students are expected to pitch for real funding.

As well as guest speakers, industry experts and experienced staff, you will develop creative thinking skills, you will engage in real projects where you will be pitching for real funding to enable you to carry out your business proposal. NS
4) Social business plan

The instructor mentioned that, to try and get students to think outside the box, the business plan teaching method is used.

We use case studies and social enterprise business plans are covered in the second term where students use the business model canvas to set them up. NI1

According to the syllabus report,

The module will investigate the motivations and activities of social entrepreneurs in the start-up phase of a new business. The module also aims to develop the understanding of social enterprise necessary for an existing or future manager, adviser or consultant to a third sector organisation, including an emerging or established social enterprise. NS
You will also deliver a live client consultancy project to an entrepreneur's small business. NS
This is your chance to develop a business plan for a venture. This could be a new commercial business, a development of an existing business, or a social enterprise (such as community project or charitable enterprise). NS

5) Experience (Hubs, alumni guest speaking, teams)

The instructor also mentioned that one of the methods currently used to enhance social innovative thinking is by inviting past students who have set up their own social enterprises and teamwork.

We have past students who are running social enterprises who come in and talk to students. We have the change maker hub and students are encouraged to engage. We had a change maker two weeks ago where students carried out activities across the campus that are related to the social enterprise agenda and they came back and reported to other students what they learned and shared their experiences.NI1

We get students to think and improve on their own ideas and values by mixing students from different countries in teams. NI1
Students have to assess what is first of all required and needed generally before they start thinking of different ways to address them.NI1

6) Personal connection

Here is the instructor’s opinion on teaching methods that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs.

I think students have to be given something to work with. I think students need to be exposed to structures and get students to reflect and think whether this is something
they might want to be involved with in the future. Get students to challenge their own ideas and their own values and think about what is important to them. And to think innovatively on how issues could be addressed. I think that you have to encourage students to think about their own perspectives and what their personal values are. I think if students have a personal connection with the subject, they are going to be much more open to ideas to be creative. For example challenging students to come up with a social enterprise idea and find out whether students have personal connection with those particular issues. They will turn to be very well engaged in it to be much more innovative and committed to it and because you are challenging and taking students out of their comfort zones, you have to be aware of that and make sure they have the view and understanding. NI1

**Case 5: Lancaster**

During the interview, six preliminary codes related to teaching content and methods that might enhance the formation of innovative thinking social entrepreneurs emerged.

1) **Thinking tools (Mapping technique, convergent and divergent)**

During the interview, one of the instructors mentioned that the mapping technique is used to map where social activities are taking place in an organisation having a social and a commercial purpose.

We use the osterwalder business model canvas to map the organisations. This is an academic exercise. By looking at an organisation run by a charity, we assume that, the capabilities used in running a commercial business can strengthen the business run by a charity within the charity objectives. LI1

We use the Alan (2006) Venn diagram with 3 circles of social, commercial and economics to map where social activities are taking place within organisations that may be charitable or commercial organisations with social objectives. This is to map where their social activities are taking place. LI1

Here is the instructor’s response when asked if teaching students to think innovatively is important and teaching content currently employed to enhance this.

Yes personally, I do. We expect students to think of new and innovative ways to handle social problems. According to Mohammed Yunus we can only kick out poverty if we think about new ways of how to solve it. LI1

I employ a whole range of tools. I look at the divergence and convergence thinking tools by Telebesong (2006). I apply the morphological analysis to get students to
openly put in as much thought as possible without criticism. And then use divergence thinking that is, if you do not accept everything in the beginning, you cannot identify which one is the best. So this enables the examination of all ideas before selecting the best. LI1

Here is the instructor’s opinion on teaching methods that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs.

The whole concept of divergence and convergence thinking is a good one. The case study approach which involves looking at organisations is rare and this enables students to think outside the box. The point of applying theories from other disciplines into the social context of entrepreneurship really gets students to think outside the box. Students start thinking about the social impact of theories that may be obtained from marketing, accounting etc., which makes them think about and discuss the social impact of this. There are 3 points: thinking tools, drawing on example (organisations) and drawing on theories from outside S E and apply them to S E.LI1

4) Experience (field work, network)

As for teaching methods, the instructor mentioned that:

In the 2nd week, we take students to an organisation to spend some time with the staff and talking to them and learn from their experiences. At the end of the course, students are expected to reflect on the learning they get from this organisation so is a very much a case study approach.LI1

As well as being an academician, I also help run a social enterprise network for my region. We ask all students to get engage in that network so that they can start to think critically and get involved in social enterprises. LI1

3) Transferring knowledge via presentation

One of the current teaching method employ to enhance social innovative thinking is by getting students to take models that have worked elsewhere, take concepts from the managing field in general and apply them in the context of S E.

For the rest of the course, we ask students to present to us by looking at all the management modules and ask them to apply all that has been learned in the widest context of the social context of entrepreneurship.LI1

We expect students to be interactive with other students and to draw practices from all other management courses. Each week, we run seminars, the first seminar students are expected to draw from international organisation from around the
world. The second seminars involve using a particular theory from S E or from other management courses and applying them in the social context of entrepreneurship and this could be about marketing, or about the triple bottom line etc.LI1.

We try to use models that have been developed elsewhere so that they can see that, the concept of S E can be interpreted differently in different contexts. We look at the UK and Northern America. LI2

4) Comparative analysis on real cases

One of the instructor's also mentioned that the comparative analysis teaching method is employed

We look at the social origin theory. This explains the forms of organisations within a particular context. Comparing and contrasting organisations within different countries of the world and how they have come up with different forms of social enterprises which can be explain in terms of the social origin.LI1

Also, according to the syllabus reports,

The module will provide greater understanding of social responsibility practices. LS

Discuss and present complex ideas coherently and with understanding, analyse case studies and draw out key issues. LS

6.4 Teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E: case by case emerging codes from instructors/syllabi

Case 1: Westminster

During the interview, five preliminary codes related to teaching content and methods that might enhance responsible S E emerged.

1) Practice base theory/Identity

Here is the instructor’s response to the question on the current content employed to enhance responsible S E

We also teach them practice base theory that means, they need to think that they are social entrepreneurs. This is something quite new that we have discovered. They have to believe. Otherwise they will not see themselves like part of the system. They themselves have to be their main drivers. They have to be convinced and transform. Entrepreneurial effectiveness that will build their competence and see that they can
actually achieve those things they want to. WI1

2) Core values of integrity

During the interview, the instructor noted that:
We teach ethics. We ask students how they see the world and what type of world they want to create. From there, they can develop a kind of social enterprise. This we believe will shape their minds about the social enterprise they eventually want to create. We teach students about the core values of integrity. WI

3) Measuring outcomes

According to the instructor’s opinion, firm operational models needs to be put in place to ensure responsible S E. This issue according to this instructor is very pertinent and potential social entrepreneurs need to be taught all this. Here is the instructor opinion and suggestion on teaching content that might enhance responsible S E.

Meeting the social value must be included in the cost. There must be a matrix. The balance score card. These are operational issues that they need to come up with. For example, the cancer research has to first of all generate the income in order to carry out the research. S E is more challenging in comparison to traditional entrepreneurs who only have to think about the value for themselves, the profit. These are things that students need to know. The beneficiary side plus the economic side. They need to come up with a matrix depending on what kind of social industry there are in. There is no universal matrix system. It’s all about ethics and how integrity is involved in teaching S E. The students most believe and be transformed and become doers. It is not just a classroom kind of thing. Though we call it entrepreneurship, all aspects of S E are taught.WI1

What happens is that social enterprises create value but that does not mean that they will run at a loss. They have to make sure that they meet the cost and satisfy the beneficiary. They have to make sure that the revenue generated most exceeds the cost. Otherwise they cannot create value. There are two important things. One is to cover the economic cost and two is to create the social value. So we have to teach our students that if you become a social entrepreneur it does not mean you live on oxygen alone. They have to cover costs. What is happening is a lot of social enterprises depend on volunteers. They do not have their own source of income. They need to have income. Even their own pay. WI1

4) Network with ethical mentors and practitioners

Westminster believes in exposing students to real social entrepreneurs. Here is the instructor response on current methods employed towards enhancing responsible S E
We do invite guest speakers and do group learning. Our entire curriculum is quite well incorporated. In the final year, students will have to find their own mentor. They work with their own mentors and have their own networks with social entrepreneurs depending on the type of enterprise they want to create in the industry. WI1

This instructor also mentioned that,

We have a very different method of teaching actually. We also employ a teaching method where students sit in a circle and discuss issues. We invite social entrepreneurs to talk about their ethics. It is very important that they actually follow ethics. We look at the value of S E and what value they want to create. What kind of world they want to see in the future. Is their generation not my generation? This is very important. This is so pertinent. S E will actually vanish. That is why many organisation say they do S E, they do CSR but is not genuine and they know that is not only about earning money and making profit but this will be achieved in the new generation because that is the kind of social entrepreneurs we want to create. S E will actually vanish because it will incorporate the new way of entrepreneurship in CSR. The way mainstream businesses operate but with a social objective. WI1

5) Practice base integrated curriculum

Here is the instructor’s response when asked for opinions and suggestions on teaching methods that might enhance responsible S E,

Practice based integrated curriculum. This is something very new. It’s just like medicine, if you want to be a doctor, you need a hospital. Similarly, if you want to produce a social entrepreneur, you need a system where the students can become social entrepreneurs. An environment for them to practice. Only then can they see themselves as part of the system. This is in six criteria. The first one is embodiment where they have to be taught, the second is material, and we came out with these six criteria. WI1

Case 2: Oxford Brookes

Five preliminary codes emerged during the interview with both instructors on teaching content and methods that might enhance responsible S E.

1) Biography of well-known social entrepreneurs

One of the instructors interviewed believes responsible S E can be enhanced by looking at famous social entrepreneurs. Here is the instructor’s response to the question concerning current content employed towards enhancing responsible S E.
As I say the main focus is on social enterprises. We do a lot of work on leadership. We do look at some famous entrepreneurs for example Mohammed Yunus. We do a lot of work on him. We get students to read his biography and book review of his life. We can also look at a political leader and we might also look at mainstream business leaders. We might look at Richard Branson or Steve Jobs. So we might take some famous people and look at their leadership and management style.

We look at the social background of famous social entrepreneurs to see the philosophy and the values that they hold.

When asked about opinions and suggestions on teaching content that might enhance responsible SE, this was the instructor’s response.

I think one way is to look at the biographies of social entrepreneurs. Look at their history and their life and what they have done and then work out whether they were genuine or whether they were simply unable to do the things they wanted to do. We can ask the question how much you can be paid to abandon your value. Will you abandon your value if someone wants to pay you 20 million pounds? With a social entrepreneur, they can take that money and then do something with it. It is important to ask questions regarding what is really expected from a social entrepreneur.

2) Identity

These instructors also mentioned that:

We look at case studies. We look at multinational companies and ask whether their corporate social responsibilities are being met. Furthermore, we look at social enterprises and ask whether it’s possible to run a social enterprise and remain true to your social mission? We look at case studies of social enterprises that have grown and make a judgement as to whether they remained true to their social mission.

In year 2 there is a module that is actually linked with this called identities and legalities. It looks into the legal possibilities of social enterprises. It explores what is actually the framework of good business that can create value. We cover this quite very well in running this program.

3) Ethical branding

During the interview, one of the instructors mentioned that, ethical issues are very important for social organisations. Here is the instructor’s response.

We have the responsibility when advertising the program and recruiting students to be very clear about what they will be doing in the program.
As an organisation we certainly take this very seriously. One of the things we are very keen with from the beginning is to make students aware of the lack of a legal framework for social enterprises. Probably anybody can work-up and set up anything and call it a social enterprise. Ethical issues are incredibly important. OBI1

4) **Comparative analysis of real cases**

As for current teaching methods employed towards enhancing responsible S E, here is the response from one of the instructors.

In the first year, the students have a module that is called business ethics and corporate social responsibility. Students have to analyse what cooperate social responsibility is. This is a big area where they get a lot of different ideas around S E. We get them to explore what is meaningful and how ethical considerations and CSR can be applied to social enterprises. They do that by comparing and contrasting between multinationals. For example we might get them to compare between shell and social enterprise type of organisations. OBI1

5) **Guest speaking**

Here is one of the instructor’s opinions on teaching methods that can enhance responsible S E.

I think practical application is very important. Guest speakers who came in and say this is why we are a social enterprise and this is what we do, why we fill that we tick those boxes that add social value. I really feel interaction with the real world will tackle ethical issues. OBI1

During the interview, one of the instructors also mentioned that:

We called the CEO from Aspire to come and talk to students last week and he gave a talk on the social impact of Aspire and he gave them a book which they gave to the council to justify their funding so he gave them the book. So we are trying to bring in real life example. There is a bit of a balance between real life examples and theories.

We will look at the financial aspects and we might look at some other broader concepts like balance score card. We might talk a bit about cost benefit analysis. But we are trying to relate it to real social enterprises. So in this Aspire book you find a case study of individuals that have been affected by their activities. OBI2

**Case 3: Goldsmith**

Four preliminary codes emerged during the interview with both instructors on teaching content and methods that might enhance responsible S E.
1) Measuring social outcome

Here is one of the instructors’ responses on the teaching content employed.

We have a whole module on evaluating social outcomes. This covers a wide variety of different techniques and methodologies. It focuses in particular on the SROI technique. It also looks at social auditing and social accounting. It looks briefly at methodologies for participatory monetary evaluation. A lot of interesting work has been done on evaluating social impact in the development program. It is not just measuring social outcomes but evaluating them in a more qualitative way.

We use case studies in very different ways. In SROI modules, case studies are used to illustrate the techniques and issues around identifying the social impact of a particular enterprise.

The syllabus report also shows that, students need to understand impact measurement among charities and social enterprises and the relevance of theories about the third sector.

Here is the syllabus report of what is expected from students:

Write a proposal for a Social Impact Evaluation of a Social Enterprise of your choice. You do not have to actually carry out the Social Impact Evaluation, although you may find it useful to discuss some of the likely stakeholders, outcomes etc. that you think will be important in the evaluation. The paper should include a background on the organisation and its programmes, a plan for measuring its social impact that one could actually execute in the real world, and an analysis of how measurement is currently being taken up by other similar organisations.

A review of how the industry/sector that the social enterprise operates currently handles the reporting of social impact measurement. You must then recommend what could be considered best practice based on other related industries/sectors. Don’t forget to include recommendations on how to engage with stakeholders and share learning.

2) Responsible management

Here is one of the instructors’ responses on the current content employed towards enhancing responsible S E

We look at ethical capital. We talk favourably about the much broader initiative sponsored by the United Nation called principles of responsible management education. We use some of the materials from that initiative in the teaching and in addition about values, ethics and politics, which are all intermingling are address quite extensively. We look at the differences and similarities between social
enterprises, benefit cooperation which is the US benefit cooperation and then CSR.Gi1

The emerging situation of educating and promoting S E pays very little attention to governance, which determines how the organisation will be governed and so you have a paradoxical situation where you might find a company which is claiming to be a social enterprise and not paying its workers very well or having poor industrial relations.Gi1

3) Criticism of CSR

Here is one of the instructors’ opinion on teaching content that might enhance responsible S E.

Teach about community interest companies. Teach the criticism of CSR. There are two things that are needed to try and open students’ eyes to the possibilities of social enterprises 1. The opportunities that are available in the different types of organisation, 2. The dark side and critical awareness of traditional businesses. GI1

4) Network with ethical mentors

As for teaching methods that might enhance responsible S E the syllabus report shows that inviting ethical speakers that are willing to network with students and mentor them beyond the class room level might enhance responsible S E. Here is the syllabus description of one of the guest speakers

John O’Shea is one of Ireland’s most celebrated humanitarians. Described by the former Irish President Mary Robinson as a man of ‘unique qualities’ and acknowledged by the musician and humanitarian Bob Geldof as ‘a great hero of mine,’ John has spent 35 years working to alleviate suffering in the developing world. Through the aid agency he founded, GOAL, he has helped raise over a billion dollars. Since his retirement from GOAL in 2012, John has set himself the challenge of inspiring other people to become social entrepreneurs. GS

Categories of SE

This teaching content may not enhance innovative thinking or responsible S E but the interview response from one of the instructors shows this is important as students may want to engage in different types of social organisations on completion. Here is what this instructor said during the interview.

Some students are intent to start a social enterprise or work in a social enterprise and others want to work in a policy or government environment or to be working for
intermediary structures. So one of the core issues of the program is the importance of different intermediaries or support organisations. In terms of social enterprise, you have the traditional business support but in addition they need the different types of support infrastructures directed for instance demonstrating social impact.

We try to invite people who have experienced a variety of different types of social enterprises. Part of the purpose of this program is to demonstrate a wide variety of different social programs and we include employee owned companies and workers, consumers, agriculture co-hubs. So the purpose of speakers is to introduce students to a wide variety.

Case 4: Northampton

Four preliminary codes related to teaching content and methods that might enhance responsible S E emerged.

1) Personal attitude

The syllabus reports that:

Innovation is central. This course looks at how to develop a business from a practical perspective. Success comes not only from business knowledge but also from personal attitude. We actively encourage students to develop an entrepreneurial spirit and attitude in their lives.

2) Measuring outcome

Here is the instructor’s response when asked if measuring social outcome is part of the teaching content currently employed.

Yes we do. Measuring social outcome is a fundamental part of it. We look particularly at the social impact of social organisations.

3) Ethical branding/dark side of CSR

Here is the instructor’s response when asked about the teaching content currently employed to enhance responsible S E.

Social enterprises operate in so many different ways. There is not just one format of S E. There is a lot of discussion. Sometimes people need funding for their social activities. And people need to figure out if is just a business that happens to be benefiting people or is actually a social enterprise and we have to be social ourselves. In our teaching, when looking at the education side of it, we very much have to identify where the ethics are, we have to be realistic.

4) Comparative analysis
As for teaching methods, the instructor mentioned during the interview that:

They have a module that looks at social impact. Still under development. We look at the characteristics of social entrepreneurs. Students compare and contrast social entrepreneurs and traditional entrepreneurs. Look at some of the similarities and differences. Some areas where you need to have particular skills and competences that differentiate a social from a commercial entrepreneur. NI1

*Categories of S E*

This teaching content may not enhance innovative thinking or responsible S E but the interview response from the instructor shows this is important as students may want to engage in different types of social organisation on completion. Here is what this instructor said during the interview.

We also spent a lot of time explaining to students what social enterprises are all about because they are lots of forms of social enterprises. We use a lot of examples and video footage, a lot of ideas to try and encourage them. It is difficult for an 18 year old who just came straight out of school to understand this whole concept of S E. it takes them some time to distinguish it from charity and CSR activities. So we have to spend a lot of time explaining to them how social enterprises operate within different sectors because they are lots of different forms of social enterprises. It is quite a growing area in terms of what social enterprises are and students need to spend a bit of time to understand. So we do assessments to make sure they understand the concepts that we are trying to deal with. NI1

*Case 5: Lancaster*

Three preliminary codes related to teaching content and methods that might enhance responsible S E emerged.

1) *Sustainability*

Here is the instructor’s opinion on teaching content that might enhance responsible S E.

If we are to have these social enterprises, then they have to build that social and economic foundation which can be used to sustain the social value so there has to be a balance. LI1

2) *Identity*

When asked about current teaching methods employed to enhance responsible S E one of the instructors mentioned that, the presentation method is used to map and identify what makes an organisation social
Yes we introduce students from the beginning to theories of management studies. We look at the adequacy of profit margins in relation to their ability to address social needs. LI1

We expect students to map the organisation they look in their presentation by showing what the organisations do and their benefits and we expect students to also critic the organisation’s approach.LI1

The instructor’s opinion also suggests that

Understanding of critical management studies and the expectation that all work that is presented is also a critic which I think is a good academic practice for students, as students get to present and critic their own knowledge. Moreover, giving students a theoretical frame within the management approach is helpful.LI1

3) Experience (learning by doing)

Here is one of the instructor’s responses on teaching methods that might enhance responsible S E.

For example we get them to think how the theories we study can be applied practically in social organisations. In a way it is somehow learning by doing as well. LI2 Theoretical knowledge with academic learning is very important. It guides students in decision making. We try to maintain a balance to make sure students do not just leave with practical skills but with a way of exploring and exploiting the world around them. So we need a balance. I am involved in social projects and help students with their projects. If I was involved in running a full course, I would involve students as experiential learning is very important. LI1

6.5 Part 2: Comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking and responsible S E.

In this section, a comparison of Cases group according to levels is discussed. These include: the Masters, undergraduate and the foundation levels. The purpose is to explore similarities and differences between instructor’s syllabi reports and interview responses with students’ interview feedback on teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking and responsible S E. The maximum variation criteria were used to select Cases as explained in Chapter 4. The inclusion criteria were: S E instructors with at least two years of teaching experience and teaching S E in a UK business school offering S E either as a module or a
course at the masters, undergraduate and the foundation levels. Students who have successfully passed through the S E module or course in any of the UK business schools under study. The grouping of Cases according to levels is provided in table 6 below.

Table 6: Grouping of cases according to levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 3: Goldsmith</td>
<td>Masters level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 1: Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4: Northampton</td>
<td>Undergraduate level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5: Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2: Oxford Brookes</td>
<td>Foundation level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two analyses are presented under the Masters and the foundation levels: Comparing instructor’s with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking and comparing instructor’s and students teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E. At the undergraduate level that involves three Cases, four analysis are presented: Comparing instructor’s with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking within each Case, comparing within each Case instructor’s and students teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E, between Cases comparison of instructors and students teaching content and method enhancing social innovative thinking and between Cases comparison of instructors and students teaching content and method enhancing responsible S E.

At each level, raw data was used to carry out the analysis. Also, the analysis is supported by the analysis carried out in part 1 of this Chapter. The purpose is to understand emergent themes related to teaching content and methods that can or have enhanced social innovative thinking in students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs. It should be noted that, this section used the following words to describe the number of students’ responses related to teaching content and methods that have/can
enhance their social thinking innovatively and their motivation of becoming responsible social entrepreneurs. All (implies all the students interviewed in each Case), Majority (more than half of the students interviewed in each Case), Half (half of the students interviewed in each Case) and Few (Less than half of the students interviewed in each Case). Common themes that emerge are presented and discussed at each level (Masters, undergraduate and foundation levels).

6.6 Master`s level (Case 3: Goldsmith)

This section compares S E instructors with students at the Master`s level. Firstly, instructor`s teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking are analysed and compared with student`s teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking. The aim here is to explore similarities and differences related to social innovative thinking. Secondly, instructor`s teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E are analysed and compared with student`s teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E. The aim here is to explore similarities and differences related to responsible S E.

6.6.1 Comparing instructor`s with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking

The instructor teaching at the Master`s level (GI1) said during the interview that, encouraging critical thinking that can lead to the identification of new social change opportunities should be an important component of S E education. This instructor also made it clear that, there are many dimensions to innovation and critical thinking which is what they try to encourage within students at this level. GI1 employs the mapping technique through the use of case studies as a way of trying to encourage innovative thinking among students. According to him, students imaginatively make new combination of capabilities. For example, mapping to identify and reflect on the market value and a correct legal structure. The resource base theory is used by GI1 to illustrate how students can think on how to access resources.

The syllabus expects students at this level to be well knowledgeable about the activities and the history of social enterprises. Also, the syllabus expects students to understand how S E operates in different countries and how social impact affects governmental policies. Similarly, the majority of the students mentioned that, looking at social enterprises that
already exist to understand what worked and what did not has enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. Also, few students at this level said that, the resource base theory and reviewing the biography of famous social entrepreneurs is what has made them think innovatively. Some identified teaching content common themes that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs include:

1) The history and contemporary issues of S E and the biography of current social enterprises/entrepreneurs

During the interview, GI1 said that, critical thinking is what they are trying to encourage. The syllabus expects students to be knowledgeable about the history of S E which is similar to majority of students feedback on teaching content that has enhance their thinking innovatively. This may be due to the fact that, knowing the history enable students to critically think and analysed how far S E has gone in terms of what has been done, what needs to be done to better what has been done. It may also enable students to think new social change opportunities and how to address them. Majority of the students at this level are international students from different countries. This might have enabled them to identify new ideas and think on how it can work best in their various countries of origin. The following quotes are from some of the international student at this level.

As I said, in my country, we do not have many social enterprises reviewing books from different parts of the world gives me ideas. GS3

Looking at the enterprises that already exist and how far they have gone is what makes the difference. Understanding what worked and what did not. GS1

2) Resource base theory

This theory enabled students to access the resources they have in order to achieve their goals. This resource could be knowledge. As international students, students are expected to see this as a resource and use it for their advantage. All of the students were very pleased with the new ideas and knowledge acquired. GI1 mentioned that there are many dimensions to innovation. It is not just about creating something new. It could be designing a new approach towards solving a particular social problem that has already been identified. Few students think they have been exposed to new ideas that can be replicated in different context. This may be due to the fact that, most of the students at this level are international
Some students believe they might make a difference if they modify the new approaches and ideas they have acquired towards solving already identified social issues in their own countries of origin. The following quotes are from one of the students and GI1.

For me what I have learned is to take the knowledge I have and implement it within my own country. I will be different because the existing social entrepreneurs in my country lack some basic knowledge and undertaking this course will enable me to tackle social issues within my country differently. I will focus on the legal framework. That is the biggest issue of social enterprise in Jamaica. There are no structures that can help define social enterprises. Right now our local organisations have to register as companies. There is no legal structure that they can really locate into. So I think a formal legal structure is what is needed in this sector in Jamaica. I think I will use the information I have and see if they can have a similar type of organisational structure. I could have been more specific in looking at a business idea but the absence of a legal structure is stopping most social enterprises from flourishing. GS3

Critical innovation is something we try to encourage. In the sense that, we encourage students to be sceptical about established theories in social enterprise. We hope to provide students not just with the tools and techniques required for entrepreneurship or social entrepreneurship but for supporting S E. This includes the ability to think about new legal structures. Legal frameworks in terms of new types of financial support for instance.GI1

As for teaching methods, the syllabus report and GI1 interview response shows that up to 20 guest speakers from different social backgrounds are invited to talk to students on their social engagements. The belief is that, students will be exposed to a variety of social enterprises. People who have helped establish social enterprises, people who support social activities and S E practitioners are invited throughout the course at this level. GI1 also uses case studies for illustrative purposes. GI1 suggested and would love to use action research within internship as a method to enhance innovative thinking among students. The syllabus report shows that, students are taken out on field work to visit social enterprises within London. On the other hand, the majority of the students mentioned that, interviewing social entrepreneurs during their visit to social enterprises enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. Also most students mentioned that, studying cases in groups also helped. Few students indicated that guest speakers enhanced their thinking innovatively. As opposed to GI1 who suggests and thinks that action research internship is what might enhance innovative thinking, the majority of the students at this level think the learning by doing teaching
method is what will work for them. Some common identified teaching methods themes that might enhance social innovative thinking include:

3) Interviewing social entrepreneurs, guest speaking, learning by doing

The majority of students at this level are not satisfied. Most of them expected to acquire more hands on experience in a real life social enterprise whilst studying. During the interview, GI1 suggested and would love to use action research within internship to enhance innovative thinking. Few students said the learning by doing teaching method is what will work for them. This may be due to the fact that, action research internships, in comparison to learning by doing, will not encourage students to draw on class room knowledge for example theories and thinking outside the box. Action research encourages the replication in a different context, what has worked in different context. Interviewing social entrepreneurs during a visit paid to a social enterprise was the only teaching method that really exposed students to a real life working environment. The majority of the students indicated that, interviewing social entrepreneurs during their visit enhanced their thinking innovatively. This may be due to the fact that, students at this level need to employ the knowledge they have acquired in a real life social organisation. Up to 20 guest speakers from different S E backgrounds are invited to talk to students throughout the course during class room seminars. As anybody might expect, this method could have enhanced the thinking of majority of the students innovatively but it did just to a few. This may be due to the fact that, students at this level are in need of a real life social entrepreneurial working environment that will give them the opportunity to think and employ the knowledge acquired while studying. Though guest speakers expose students to different ideas, students might have seen this as an advanced form of lecturing since often guest speakers talk to students during class room seminar as lecturers do. The following quotes are from some of the students.

I was looking forward to something more practical but it is more theory based. And I do not think it offers much in terms of the inspiration to be innovative. The new ideas and how social enterprises operate in different countries have been very helpful. GS4

The idea of experiential learning is something that really needs to be incorporated in this field. Learning by doing. Incorporating the practical component into the program
4) Interactive group discussion on real life cases.

During the interview, GI1 mentioned that, the mapping technique, through the use of case studies is used to encourage innovative thinking within students. Similarly, the majority of the students mentioned that this teaching method has enhanced their thinking innovatively. GI1 mentioned that, both imaginary and real life social enterprise cases are used. Most students indicated that real life social enterprise cases are what have helped. This might be due to the fact that, real life cases on social organisations that students are familiar with makes the learning process more realistic. Also students can easily research on these organisations to map and identify for example the social value created, the legal structure and model use. These enable students to think critically on what might be done to better what is currently used. In addition, GI1 and some students also mentioned that, most of the groups are made up of students from different countries who share and discuss real cases from their countries of origin. This might enable students to learn from what is working in other countries and think on how it might work in their own or how to modify it to suite them.

6.6.2 Comparing instructor’s and students teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E

The social return on investment (SROI) is a whole module at this level and GI1 use social enterprise cases to illustratively identify the social impact created by organisations. Also, the syllabus expects students to write a social impact evaluation proposal for a social organisation. GI1 uses the United Nations responsible management initiative to enhance responsible S E at this level. Ethical politics is also addressed extensively. GI1 suggested that one way to enhance responsible S E is to get students to understand the dark side of traditional businesses. On the other hand, the majority of students at this level think measuring the SROI and their core values is what has made them want to carry out social change activities in a responsible way. Some common identified teaching content themes that might enhance responsible S E include:
1) Core values of integrity/the dark side of CSR

The United Nations responsible management principles are used to enhance responsible S E by GI1. Whilst majority of the students said the core value of integrity is what has motivated them to be responsible, GI1 on the other hand suggested getting students to see that the dark side of CSR can help. This may be due to the fact that, CSR is seen by many as an old way to address social issues. Social value creation is not the original intention of main stream entrepreneurs who respect CSR and often they do it as a strategy to attract more customers. Also, majority of mainstream organisation have been noted not to be transparent with their reports on CSR. Students might have chosen core values because it takes the integrity of an individual to be truly responsible by doing things in an ethical way and for the right reasons.

It has been noticed that when intentions are genuine, individuals will do everything to maintain it which in this case is creating social value. The following quotes are from some of the students.

   For me, it is a more personal thing. Core values of integrity like having a list of things that remind you of what is expected from a social entrepreneur. As I said is more personal because if you are in an enterprise of such nature, you will not recruit any type of person but someone with good ethics. GS1

2) Measuring outcomes

Measuring SROI is a whole module at this level and most students confirmed during the interview that this has made them think of carrying out social change activities in a more responsible way. This might be due to the fact that, measuring enables the quantification of the value created. People can actually see in a more realistic way and judge the level of social impact created. This enables and pushes social entrepreneurs to be more transparent, responsible and to work harder towards achieving their social change target if it is not met.

The following quotes are from GI1 and one of the students.

   We have a whole module on evaluating social outcomes. This covers a wide variety of different techniques and methodologies. It focuses in particular on the SROI technique. It also looks at social auditing and social accounting. It also looks briefly at methodologies for participatory monetary evaluation. A lot of interesting work has been done on evaluating social impact in the development program is not just measuring social outcomes but evaluating them in a more qualitative way. GI1
Measuring SROI really helps. We look at organisations and really identify the social impact created and the outcome. When we examine outcomes, we can improve our expertise on our genuineness. GS2

As for teaching methods, the syllabus reports that, famous respected social entrepreneurs with integrity who are willing to interact with students beyond the class room level are invited as guest speakers. Students’ feedback shows that, comparative analysis of real cases and listening to guest speakers is what has helped so far. Some common identified teaching methods themes that might enhance responsible S E include:

3) **Comparative analysis of real cases**

The majority of the students mentioned that comparing and analysing real social enterprise cases is what has enhanced their motivation to be more responsible. This might be due to the fact that comparing gives students the opportunity to identify genuine social enterprises and the social value created. It might have also enabled students to identify the sacrifices some social organisations make to maintain their original social value creation intention. This might act as a guide to students and a point of reference when they potentially start their own social enterprises or work for an existing one. The following quote is from one of the students.

> What has been helpful is the Comparative analysis on real cases. It is helpful to extract the advantages and disadvantages of various legal structures and various ways of choosing financing and comparing what actually leads to what. GS4

4) **Interact with Guest speakers beyond the class room**

The syllabus report shows that, guest speakers with a good ethical background are invited to boost student’s morals and share their experiences. Similarly, the majority of the students indicated that, listening to some guest speakers is what has also encouraged them to be responsible. This might be due to the fact that, some guest speakers really try to convey to students how far they went towards creating value. Also some quest speakers interact beyond the class room and act as mentors to students who potentially want to engage deeply in S E. The following quote is extracted from the syllabus.

> John O’Shea is one of Ireland’s most celebrated humanitarians. Described by the former Irish President Mary Robinson as a man of ‘unique qualities’. Since his
6.7 Undergraduate level (case 1: Westminster, case 4: Northampton, case 5: Lancaster)

In this section, S E instructors and students are compared at the undergraduate level. The first part analyses and compares instructor’s teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking with student’s teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking within each case. The second part analyses and compares instructors teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E with student’s teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E within each case. The final part compares instructors with students between all the 3 cases at this level to identify teaching content and method enhancing social innovative thinking and responsible S E. The aim in all the 3 parts is to explore similarities and differences in teaching content and methods related to social innovative thinking and responsible S E.

6.7.1 Case 1: Westminster

A) Comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking

From the syllabus report, students are exposed to a range of business theories that could be applied to micro and small businesses. WI1 expect students to read and apply practically the concept of bricolage and effectuation in the context of S E. According to this instructor, these concepts can offer cost effective and innovative solutions to many social problems. Also, students are exposed to a variety of business concepts and ideas. Similarly, interview responses from all of the students’ shows that the concept of bricolage and effectuation has greatly influence their thinking in an innovative way. Majority also mentioned the resource base theory and few students said that, book review and the business generation canvas model helped. Common identified teaching content themes that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs include:

1) The concept of bricolage and effectuation and the resource base theory.
Bricolage and effectuation has to do with the notion of making do. That is using what you have to get what you want. The resource base theory encourages the careful examination of the resources needed to successfully achieve a particular objective. As part of the task and with zero income and resources, students were expected to generate and successfully implement a social business idea in groups. The concept of bricolage and effectuation might have enhanced students’ thinking in an innovative way because collectively in groups, student had to think a business idea that will create social value and yield profit. The majority of the students’ might have mentioned the resource base theory because, it might have led them to analyse and think on how to get all the resources needed to be successful. The following quotes are from some of the students.

First of all we did not have money. We actually had to think of a way to get money without the money. This pushed us to think of a lot of different ways. This was the main part actually. We thought about the people who can give us this money. We also thought of how to give something different to the charity. This enabled us to innovate. WS3

It creates an impact because when you are directly involved in organising an event, you need to be careful in selecting an event that will create a social impact and be profitable. What type of people to be involved, what type of activities should be included? This really motivates when real.WS1

It can be noticed from the above quotes that the financial resource was not available and students were forced to think collectively in groups on how to get this resource in order to successfully execute their social business idea. Also, the students were interested in doing something different. According to the syllabus report, students are encouraged to have an open mind and be creative. The quote below is extracted from the syllabus.

Entrepreneurship requires the ability to see what others do not. If opportunities were clear to everyone, they would not be opportunities. To succeed, you must engage your creative side, and remain open to challenging your current assumptions and beliefs. WS

As for teaching methods, WI1 believes and employs teaching methods that expose students to real business people and situations to enhance innovative thinking. According to this instructor, the best way to teach S E is to practice it and is not just a theoretical class room kind of module. This instructor employs the experiential learning by doing teaching methods.
As a way of exposing students to new business concepts and ideas, WI1 uses real case studies and invites a social enterprise owner as a guest to talk to students. WI1 encourages and expects students to work in groups throughout the entire module. This instructor employs the group presentation methods as a way to get students to demonstrate their capabilities to work positively in groups and communicate effectively. Similarly, all of the students mentioned that collaborating as a team to generate a social business idea and successfully implement it is what has greatly influenced their thinking innovatively. Few students said that interactive group discussions and presentations help. Also, few students mentioned that, having a personal connection to the business idea is what made them to engage more and to think outside the box. Common identified teaching methods themes that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs include:

2) Group social business planning, implementation and presentation

The learning by doing teaching method is employed and students are expected to plan and implement a social business idea in groups. Also, after implementation, groups are expected to present and share their experience. All the students might mention collaborating with classmates to execute a social business idea because they might have shared ideas, analyse the resources needed and then come up with the best idea that will create social value and yield profit. Successfully implementing this business idea might enable students to learn by doing. Furthermore some students might have chosen interactive group discussions and presentation because, collective efforts were used to generate a business idea and a plan. Some students might have learnt from other groups experiences through group presentations. The quote below is from WI1

We spent a lot of time teaching creativity. Creativity through bricolage and effectuation this two and team work for they cannot work alone. So they have to work with different models we teach them all this. WI

From the above quote, we can deduce that WI employs and believes in working in teams towards identifying or achieving a social entrepreneurial opportunity. This may actually enhance a collaborative effort to think in an innovative way toward developing new social entrepreneurial insights and individuals who are willing to be agent of change. The quote below is from one of the student.
Raising money for the charity made me see how it is important to do things differently through innovation. From the beginning, we brain storm the type of event we want to do that will create value as well as generate money. The idea to create some sort of a global restaurant came up and this is something that has never been done before because our university is quite multinational. The next step was to come up with ideas on how to meet our goal and this forced us to innovate. Initially we did not know what to do but thinking collaboratively we figured out what to do step by step. WS2

B) Comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E.

To enhance responsible S E, WI1 get students to see themselves as part of the system and believe that, they can achieve whatever they want to. According to the interview response, this instructor employs the practice base theory to get students transformed and believe that they can be social entrepreneurs. The instructor educates students on the core values of integrity and encourages students to develop social enterprises that reflect the type of world they potentially want to create. WI1 suggested that, to ensure responsible S E, firm operational models needs to be put in place. According to this instructor, social entrepreneurs should include social value in the cost. Similarly, all of the students that were interviewed mentioned that, education on the core values of integrity is what has encouraged them to be more responsible in social business transaction. None of the student mentioned the practice base theory. Identified common teaching methods themes that might enhance responsible S E are:

1) Core values of integrity

Core values have to do with personal willingness. While some people are able to maintain their self-integrity when faced with challenges, others can easily deviate or be influenced. Education on core values might influence some students to realise the need to be engage in business that has as its main priority as creating social value and generating profit as a strategy to sustain the creation of social value. Naturally some students might have always had the desire to create social value. All the students might have chosen core values because maintaining the creation of social value takes the willingness and the determination of an individual. The quotes below is from some of the students
We wanted to generate money to support a charity and to us it was not more of a money thing. It was more of a social thing. It really gave the opportunity to learn on the job and reflect. WS2

I think everyone has values. If you are someone that cares for humanity, then you will always want to create value. I think everyone needs to be encouraged to help either through education or any other way. This really has to do with the companies. They need to be transparent in their reports on their activities. WS5

It can be deduced from the quotes above that, education can influence and encourage students to create social value. These students might have mentioned core values because their personal desire to care for humanity or education might have encouraged them to see the need to create social value. The quotes below is from WI1

It’s all about ethics and how integrity is involved in teaching SE. The students must believe and be transformed and become doers. It is not just a classroom kind of thing. What happens is that social enterprises create value but that does not mean they will run at a loss. They have to make sure that they meet the cost and satisfy the beneficiary. They have to make sure that the revenue generated exceeds the cost. Otherwise they cannot create value. There are two important things. One is to cover the economic cost and two is to create the social value. So we have to teach our students that if you become a social entrepreneur it does not mean you live on oxygen alone. They have to cover cost. What is happening is a lot of social enterprises depend on volunteers. They do not have their own source of income. They need to have income. Even their own pay. WI1

As for teaching methods, WI1 exposes students to real social entrepreneurs depending on the type of social enterprise they want to create. On an individual level, students are expected to interview a social entrepreneur they identify as a mentor and share their personal experience in groups. WI1 suggested that, to enhance responsible SE, a practice base integrated curriculum should be employed. Nearly half of the students mentioned that interactive group discussions and presentation and interacting and interviewing a social entrepreneur they identify as a mentor is what has helped. Identified common teaching methods themes that might enhance responsible SE are:

2) Interact and interview a social entrepreneur identified as a mentor.

WI1 mentioned during the interview that, students are expected to identify and interview their own mentors depending on the type of social enterprise they want to create. Few of the students might have chosen this because it offers the opportunity to interview and be
knowledgeable of what is actually going on, some of the challenges these social entrepreneurs might have overcome to maintain their real social value creation intention. The quote below is from one of the students.

I asked the person that I interviewed to get me some information to help me with my business. And because of this course, we had to find someone. It was a perfect time for me. Interviewing him opened my eyes up to everything he has done, what he has gone through and his future plans. It just makes me feel like, I can see where he is now, his brand and the way it is out there, it makes me feel like there is still hope for myself. Identifying the right mentor provides the encouragement to continue with what your intentions are.

3) Interactive group discussion and presentations.

WI1 mentioned that, group learning is encouraged throughout. Some students have mentioned that being in a group provides the opportunity for individuals to share information, strengthen and remind each other of the need to be responsible as social entrepreneurs.

6.7.2 Case 4: Northampton

A) Comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking

The syllabus expects students to be creative in their thinking and solve social issues in a distinctive way. Students are also expected to grow their own social business ideas or solve existing social issues in an innovative way. During the interview, NI1 mentioned that, innovative thinking is enhanced by introducing students to varieties of thinking tools and techniques. Similarly majority of the students’ interviewed indicated during the interview that, the divergent and convergent thinking tool and the business model canvas have enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. Few students indicated that what helped were the mapping technique, the triple bottom line concept and the resource base theory. Identified common teaching content themes that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs include:
1) Divergent and convergent thinking

NI1 introduces students to varieties of tools as a way to get them think in an innovative way. Few of the students mentioned that the divergent and convergent thinking tool has enabled them to think in an innovative way. This could have been because this thinking tool encourages a group discussion atmosphere where each individual idea counts. The divergent and convergent thinking tools can be helpful because, the divergent tool allows each individual to think as a person and the convergent tool allows the group to collectively agree and put into use those ideas that the group has agree on.

A lot of what we are doing is to encourage students to use a lot of different tools and techniques to enable them to think in a more creative way and to develop their thoughts and ideas. NI1

2) Business model canvas

Majority of the students mentioned that, the business model canvas helped them think deep in their group to develop their business idea. Students might have chosen it because, the layout of the business model canvas makes things easy for groups to put in place and show how key activities and elements interrelate. The quote below is from one of the students.

The business model canvas really helps to get everything written down and set up in a nice and logical way. Any one that looks at it can see what you are thinking. This really helps us in our group. NS1

As for teaching methods, during the interview NI1 mentioned that, past students who have started and are successfully running their own social businesses are invited to talk and motivate the students. Also, students visit on field work local social enterprises to interact, ask questions and improve their knowledge. NI1 also mentioned that, to get students to think outside the box, students generate in groups and present social business ideas with the help of the business generation canvas model. According to the syllabus reports, students can further pitch for real funding that will enable them to carry out their social business proposals. NI1 suggested that, innovative thinking can be enhanced if students are encouraged to carry out a social business project that they are personally connected to. In this way they will be more engaged and creative.
Most students mentioned that, collaborating with classmates to develop a social business idea helped. According to most students’ responses, anything that has to do with hands-on experience and interviewing local social entrepreneurs during their visit gave them the opportunity to learn from their experience and improve on their ideas. Also, few students mentioned that when they have a personal connection to a business idea, they tend to be more engaged. Some students also mentioned that interactive group discussion and presentation and comparative analysis of real cases in what has helped. Common identified teaching method themes that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs include:

3) *Group social business planning, presentation and potential implementation*

The majority of the students said that generating a social business idea in groups enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. This is similar to NI1 interview response on current methods employed towards enhancing innovative thinking. This may be due to the fact that, students share different business ideas when planning in groups. Also, this might have enhanced collaborative thinking with the help of the business canvas model towards coming up with innovative strategies that will yield a successful business. In addition, the experience groups had during their visit to local social enterprises might have enabled them to think collaboratively and develop their business ideas better. Furthermore, the fact that students can actually pitch for real funding in their institution to implement their business ideas might have push them to be more creative and think more. The following quote is from one of the students.

The case where we visited the social enterprise, we actually interviewed them on how they operate and it was a good experience. It gives the opportunity to be able to think and learn from other people’s experiences towards improving your ideas. NS4

4) *Personal connection*

When people are connected to something, they tend to be more engaged in terms of their thinking on what is needed to succeed. NI1 thinks when students are involved in a social business project that they are connected to, they will be more engaged. Similarily, few students mentioned that having a personal connection is helpful. This may be due to the fact
that, S E is quite challenging. Unlike commercial entrepreneurs whose main focus is on profit, social entrepreneurs focus both on profit and social value creation. This demands commitment to being successful and having a personal connection to this type of business might be a driving force. The following quotes are from NI1 and one of the students.

I think that you have to encourage students to think about their own perspectives and what their personal values are. I think if students have a personal connection with the subject, they are going to be much more open to ideas to be creative. NI1

Personal connection with the social idea has been helpful because that is what makes you commit and be a real social entrepreneur. NS1

B) Comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E.

Northampton tries to encourage personal altitude and according to the syllabus report, business knowledge is not all that is needed to be successful but also personal altitude. NI1 mentioned that to enhance responsible S E, they try to be realistic in their teaching to identify where the ethics are. NI1 spent a lot of time to get students to understand the different forms of S E, how they operate and how they are different from charities and CSR. Similarly, majority of the students mentioned that what has made them want to be more responsible is being knowledgeable about the need to be ethical and the dark side of CSR. Few students mentioned that what have encouraged them are the core values of integrity.

Identified common teaching content themes that might enhance responsible S E are:

1) Ethical social enterprise branding/ dark side of CSR.

NI1 gets students to see the dark side of CSR as a way to encourage them to be responsible and maintain the original intention of social value creation as social entrepreneurs. Similarly, majority of the students mentioned that being knowledgeable about the dark side of CSR has encouraged them to carry out social activities in a more responsible way. This may be due to the fact that, the prime objective of a social entrepreneur is to create social value. Social entrepreneurs run profit making businesses as a strategy to sustain the creation of social value. Indicating no matter what value must be created as proof that the social enterprise is succeeding. The prime objective of a commercial entrepreneur is profit making.
Commercial entrepreneurs create social value in the form of CSR only when profit is made. Indicating that without profit, a commercial entrepreneur will not create social value. Whilst social entrepreneurs are expected to re-invest their profit into their social change businesses and create more social value, commercial entrepreneurs re-invest their profit for more profit and often respect CSR if a certain level of profit is attained. Ethical social enterprise branding and transparency in the reporting of the social value created is very important for social enterprises. This might generate customers’ confidence and clearly differentiate them from commercial entrepreneurs that respect CSR. The following quotes are from NI1 and two of the students.

Sometimes people need funding for their social activities. And people need to figure out if it is just a business that happens to be benefiting people or is it actually a social enterprise and we have to be social ourselves. NI1

I have been more aware about how companies do things not actually because they really want to help but because they want to use that to get more customers. NS2

In one of the enterprises I studied, I looked at how one lady set up a social enterprise and was not really ethical but she later realised and went back to ethics. So I think learning about other people’s experiences really helps me. NS1

As for teaching methods, NI1 mentioned that, comparing and contrasting real social enterprises from mainstream businesses is what is currently used to get students to acquire competencies that differentiate a social from a commercial business. On the other hand, majority of students’ responses show that collaborating as a team on a real life social business project is what has helped. Few students mentioned that, studying real cases in groups to identify the social value created has encouraged them. Identified common teaching methods themes that might enhance responsible S E are:

2) Comparative analysis of real social enterprise cases and commercial business.

NI1 gets students to compare real life social enterprises from commercial ones as a method to encourage responsible S E. Few students mentioned that this method did encourage them. Comparing might have enabled students to see the social value created and how different social enterprises are from commercial ones. Few students might have chosen this because they are more interested in group work.
3) Team work on a real social project.

Majority of the students mentioned that, collaborating on a real life social project has encouraged them to be responsible. This might be due to the fact that, working in teams towards achieving a real social project, strengthens students by encouraging each other to remain focused and overcome any challenge that might hinder them from achieving their goals. The following quote is from one of the students.

Discussing in group helps share relevant ideas and always remind each other about our purpose whereas working alone, you may ignore a relevant thing that really makes you responsible. NS4

6.7.3 Case 5: Lancaster

A) Comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking

Instructors draw on a number of theories, tools and models from both S E and the general management field to get students to understand the social context of entrepreneurship. L11 mentioned that drawing on theories from other management disciplines and applying them in the context of S E is used to enhance social innovative thinking. According to him, students question the social impact of these theories and this enables them to be innovative and think on how these theories can possibly be applied to achieve social objectives. Majority of the students mentioned that, the resource base theory enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. Few students also mentioned the business model canvas. Common identified teaching content themes that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs include:

1) Resource base theory

Many theories are used to get students to better understand the social context of entrepreneurship. Similarly the majority of the students indicated that, the resource base theory enhanced their thinking innovatively. This may be due to the fact that, this particular theory offers the opportunity to examine the available resources and think on how to use them towards achieving the desired goal.

2) Business model canvas
Similar to LI1 interview response, few students mentioned that the business model canvas enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. This may be due to the fact that, students are exposed to social enterprises that have both commercial and social objectives. The business model canvas might have enabled them to identify strategies commercial enterprise employed to succeed and think on how it can be employed towards the sustainability of a social enterprise that have both commercial and social objectives. The Quote below is from LI1

> We use the osterwalder business model canvas to map the organisations. This is an academic exercise. By looking at an organisation run by a charity, we assume that, the capabilities used in running a commercial business can strengthen the business run by a charity within the charity objectives.LI1

From the above quote, it can be deduced that, students are expected to think on how social enterprises can be sustainable by employing some of the capabilities used in running a commercial business.

As for teaching methods, Majority of the students are not satisfied with the current methods employed. Students expected a balance between practice and theory but the module was more of theory. LI1 enhance innovative and critical thinking by encouraging students to get involved in social enterprise leaders’ network. Also, with the use of S E theories and theories from different management disciplines, students from different management disciplines reflect and present in groups. LI1 mentioned that, looking at real life organisations as cases is used to get students think outside the box. This instructor also mentioned that, at the middle of the module, students visit a local social organisation that combines both commercial and social objectives. Half of the students interviewed mentioned that, what helped were group discussion and presentation and the visit to a local social enterprise. Common identified teaching methods themes that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs include:

3) **Group discussions and presentations on general management theories in the context of S E**

Students from different management fields are mixed in groups. Similar to LI2 interview response, nearly half of the students mentioned that discussing and presenting in groups enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. This might be due to the fact that, coming
from different management discipline offered the opportunity for the sharing of theories from different management fields and discussion on how they could be employed in the context of S E towards achieving social objectives. The quote below is from LI1 and LI2.

We ask students to combine business and social objectives and reflect in teams. We ask them to include different perspectives. This is a course that involves students from all the business areas. We ask them to bring in aspects such as Marketing, finance etc. in to S E. LI2

We ask students to present to us by looking at all the management modules and ask them to apply all that has been learned in the widest context of the social context of entrepreneurship. This could be about marketing, or about the triple bottom line etc.LI1

4) Visiting social enterprises that combine commercial and social objectives.

Students visit a local social enterprise and make a report on what has been learned. Nearly half of the students mentioned that, this enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. This may be due to the fact that this was the only teaching method that exposed students to a real working environment. Visiting might have enabled them to engage with social entrepreneurs and learn from their experience. The following quote is from LI1

Theoretical knowledge with academic learning is very important. It guides students in decision making. We try to maintain a balance to make sure students do not just leave with practical skills but with a way of exploring and exploiting the world around them. So we need a balance. If I was involved in running a full course, I will involve students in an experiential learning. This is very important. LI1

From the above quote it can be noticed that, even the instructor values the importance of a real experiential learning but could not employ this method because of time. The quotes below are from two of the students.

The module was more theoretical. So it does not really offer the opportunity to be innovative. I think to be innovative or think in an innovative way, demands more practice rather than just class room knowledge. LS3

I think theoretical knowledge yes. I expected to achieve skills that could be transferred into work place. Really to improve my credibility. I want to work within a social enterprise. Some sort of social business. My background is nursing in the public sector and I want to reform the public sector into a social business sector. There is no
point in learning things in theory if you cannot put them into practice. It is very important to me to be able to put what I learn in theory into practice in an easy and understandable way. LS2

It can be noticed from the responses above that, though theory was well exploited, students were not satisfied with the fact that the module did not balance theory and practice.

B) Comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E

LI2 mentioned that, enhancing responsible S E is done by getting students to question in groups the CSR of organisations and reflect on how to create something that can really create social value. Majority of the students mentioned that, examining the CSR of mainstream enterprises really encouraged and opened their eyes to the need to create something that can realistically create social value and be responsible. Common identified teaching content themes that might enhance responsible S E include:

1) Criticism and the dark side of CSR.

Similar to LI2, majority of the students mentioned that examining the CSR of mainstream entrepreneurs enhanced responsible S E. This exercise might have opened students’ eyes to see what is going on and reflect on what to do in order to remain responsible as a social entrepreneur and create real value. The quote below is from LI2.

For example, the concept of CSR is an old concept. We get students to find out how it emerged. Is it a fact, is it actually working. We let students to look at organisations that claim that they respect their CSR. We ask students to go more beyond that and research on it themselves and see if these organisations really create social value as they say. We expect them to take the criticism of CSR and create something new that will actually create value in different contexts. For example in developing nation the concept of CSR is not really realistic as compared to developed nations so we expect students to take this and come up with something that can really be applied globally towards creating social value and how it can work better. We make them aware and they can look at it from different perspectives. LI2

It can be deduced from the above quote that students are not just expected to criticise CSR but to be responsible when engaging in something new that can create real social value in different context. The quotes below is from some of the students.
From my perspective, I will put in my knowledge and experience. I have been working in this sector for 10 years. So I can now use the theoretical knowledge and help communities in my locality. I will be working in the economic sector to help start-ups and SMEs to start their business and operate better, by applying my experience and knowledge. LS3

This is a very important part of social enterprises because, a social enterprise is a business engaged in directing the profit back into the business so it is for the benefit of the public. I will make sure the profit I make is redirected back for more social change activities. LS1

As for teaching methods, Li2 get students to pair in groups to examine and question if the CSR of non-social organisations is real. Also, students are expected to map and discuss in groups whether the profit margin of the social organisation they examine, really matches with the social value created. Similarly, majority of the students mentioned that, highly interactive group discussions and presentation on social and non-social organisations enable them to see things clearly and encourage them to be responsible social entrepreneurs. Common identified teaching methods themes that might enhance responsible S E include:

2) Group comparative analysis and presentation on real social enterprise cases and commercial businesses

Mapping social value with the profit of social organisations and examining the CSR of mainstream businesses in groups might have enabled students to share ideas on how to maintain the original social value creation intention. The quote below is from some of the students.

We do a lot of presenting of ideas, concepts, and historical things in the form of practice. That is important to me. I get a lot out of that as it promotes the values and shares them with others. Presentation part is important. LS2

But nowadays, it is hard to identify who really is a social entrepreneur because a lot of the mainstream entrepreneurs also invest their profit to create social impact and the so-called social entrepreneurs also do business towards generating profit to maintain their social organisation. So it is really difficult to tell who is a social entrepreneur. LS3

It can be deduced from the quotes above that some students might have found it difficult to differentiate between a social entrepreneur and a mainstream entrepreneur who respects its CSR. Discussing in groups might have promoted the values of what really makes a responsible social entrepreneur.
6.7.4 Between case comparison of instructors and students teaching content and method enhancing social innovative thinking.

Northampton expects students to grow their own business ideas in an innovative way. Similar to Westminster, Lancaster exposes students to a variety of business and S E theories and concepts. However, while Westminster focuses and practically implements the concept of bricolage and effectuation, Lancaster examines these theories and concepts just at the classroom level. According to the interview responses, current teaching content employ to enhance social innovative thinking within these three cases were different. NI1 apply and introduce students to a variety of thinking tools and techniques within the classroom. WI1 get students to read within the classroom and practically implement the concept of bricolage and effectuation in a working environment. LI1 gets students to draw on varieties of theories from other management disciplines and apply them in the context of S E within the classroom. In terms of current content that might have enhanced social innovative thinking within students, majority of the students from Northampton mentioned the divergence and convergent thinking tools and the business generation canvas model. All of the students in Westminster mentioned the concept of bricolage and effectuation. Similar to Lancaster, majority of the students at Westminster mentioned the resource base theory. Few students in Northampton mentioned the resource base theory and few students in Lancaster mentioned the business generation canvas model. The table below details the portion of students’ responses on similar teaching content emerging themes that might enhance social innovative thinking at the undergraduate level.
Table 7: Undergraduate level students’ response on content that might enhance social innovative thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Westminster</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divergent and convergent thinking tool</td>
<td>majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business canvas model</td>
<td>majority</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource base theory</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>majority</td>
<td>majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept of bricolage and effectuation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the teaching methods were similar between all the cases at this level. However, the way instructors employ these teaching methods towards enhancing social innovative thinking is different. Northampton enhances social innovative thinking by getting students to think and present a social business idea in groups. This instructor believes students will be more engaged and creative if they are personally connected to the business ideas they generate. Northampton students can pitch for funds to potentially carry out their business ideas. Westminster enhances social innovative thinking by getting students to develop, execute and present in groups a social business idea as part of their task while undertaking the module with zero funding. On the other hand, Lancaster is more of theory and social innovative thinking is enhanced by getting students to draw in groups on theories from the general management discipline. Students are expected to reflect and think on how these theories can be applied within a real social organisation towards achieving social objectives. While Northampton students visit local social enterprises for more knowledge, Lancaster students visit a social organisation that combine both commercial and social objective.

Majority of the students at this level mentioned that group work and presentations has enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. All of the students in Westminster mentioned collaborating with class mates to develop and carry out a social business idea. Similarly,
majority of the students in Northampton also mention this teaching method. Few of the students in Lancaster mention group discussion and presentation. Few students in Northampton and Westminster mentioned personal connection to a business idea. Few of Lancaster students mentioned visiting a local social enterprise. The table below details the portion of students’ responses on similar teaching method emerging themes that might enhance social innovative thinking at the undergraduate level.

**Table 8: Undergraduate level students’ response on teaching methods that might enhance social innovative thinking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Westminster</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group social business planning, presentation and potential implementation</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connection</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group social business planning, implementation and presentation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussions and presentations on general management theories in the context of SE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting social enterprises that combine commercial and social objectives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7.5 Between case comparison of instructors and students teaching content and method enhancing responsible S E.

Northampton and Lancaster educate students on the dark side of CSR to enhance responsible S E. Northampton also emphasises ethical social enterprise branding. Students are expected to reflect on this and create something new that can create realistic value. On the other hand, Westminster draws on the practice base theory to transform and instil in students the core values of integrity. As for the current content that has enhanced the need to be responsible social entrepreneurs in students, majority of the students in Northampton and Lancaster mentioned the dark side of CSR. Few students in Northampton mentioned core values of integrity and majority mentioned ethical branding. All of the students in Westminster mentioned the core values of integrity. The table below details the portion of students’ responses on similar teaching content emerging themes that might enhance responsible S E at the undergraduate level.

**Table 9: Undergraduate level students’ response on content that might enhance responsible S E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Westminster</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical social enterprise branding</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism and the dark side of CSR.</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core values of integrity</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for teaching method, both Northampton and Lancaster employ the comparative analysis of real cases method to differentiate social enterprises from commercial enterprises and to map whether the social value created matches with the profit. Lancaster pairs students in groups to carry out this exercise. On the other hand, Westminster students identify and
interview their own mentors individually and share their experiences in groups. In terms of teaching methods that have enhanced responsible S E in students at this level, majority of the students in Northampton mentioned collaborating as a team on a real social enterprise project. Few students mentioned the comparative analysis of real cases. While majority of students in Lancaster mentioned the interactive group discussion and presentation on real cases, few of the students in Westminster also mentioned interactive group discussion and presentation. Few of the students in Westminster mentioned interviewing mentors. The table below details the portion of students’ responses on similar teaching method emerging themes that might enhance responsible S E at the undergraduate level.

**Table 10: Undergraduate level students’ response on methods that might enhance responsible S E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Westminster</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team work on a real social project.</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group comparative analysis and presentation on real social enterprise cases and commercial businesses</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion and presentation on mentor’s interviews feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.8 Foundational level (Case 2: Oxford Brookes)**

**6.8.1 Comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking**

Students are expected to examine the leadership and the management style of famous social entrepreneurs. According to the syllabus report, students review and make a report on the books of famous social entrepreneurs. During the interview, OBI2 mentioned that, contemporary and historical issues are examined as way to enhance critical and social
innovative thinking in the context of S E. On the other hand, though few students mentioned that looking at historical and contemporary issue helped, majority of the student said that the triple bottom line theory is what has enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. Common identified teaching content themes that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs include.

1) Historical and contemporary issues.

Few students mentioned that, historical and contemporary issues have enhanced their thinking in an innovative way which is similar to the response of OBI1. This might be due to the fact that, knowing the history of S E and current issues surrounding it, gives the chance to know what has been done and to think on what needs to be done to improve it. It might have also helped in recognising new opportunities or to generate new ideas and strategies towards solving existing social issues. The quote below is from OBI2.

We ask them to look at co-operative movements and their history and then ask questions when it was socially innovative or how innovative they are at the moment. OBI2

From the above quote it can be noticed that students are expected to know how socially innovative social enterprises are. This might have push them to challenge their thinking on issues surrounding it growth and what needs to be done for social enterprises to flourish better. The quote below is from one of the students.

Concerning the legal structure, I will be writing up a plan in my research project to revise the existing legal structure and to put in place an entirely different system. I think the existing systems are inefficient. There are some frictions in the fact that there are about 8 different legal structures for social enterprises and I believe that it could be streamline and change in a particular way. It will protect the social enterprise activities and differentiate it from a regular business enterprise. OBS1

2) The triple bottom line theory

Majority of the students said the triple bottom line has enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. This is quite different because neither the syllabus nor any of instructors mentioned this theory. However, students might have mentioned it because the triple bottom line gives the opportunity to constantly reflect and think on how to address profit,
people and the environment in order to succeed as a social entrepreneur. The quote below is from one of the students.

The triple bottom line makes you think on how to do business differently. It is not just about making money. It makes you question the impact and the environment. OBS2.

As for teaching methods, students visit local social enterprises. A speaker who owns a social enterprise is invited to talk to students in their final year. During the interview OBI1 mentioned that, to get students to think outside the box, students engage with a real social enterprise for their final year projects. They also study real social enterprises cases in groups. Similarly, all of the students mentioned that, group discussions and presentations on real social organisations is what helped. None of the students mentioned engaging with the real world. Identified teaching content themes that might enhance innovative thinking social entrepreneurs include

3) Interactive group discussion and presentations on real social organisation.

Group discussion and presentation on real cases is what students are expected to do throughout the course. Also, not all the students might have chosen a project that allows them to engage with the real world. In addition, some of the students are S E practitioners and engaging with the real world might not have helped them think in an innovative way. Discussing in groups with classmates from different social enterprise background and reflecting on theories and class room knowledge might have enabled some students’ to see things differently and think collaboratively on how to address social issues differently. The following quote is from one of the students.

Personally, I think the working environment going into organisations to carry out projects, if I go into organisations, it will detach me from my focus because you have to step in and you will see dysfunction.

It can be deduced from the above quotes that not all the students engage with a real social enterprise in their final year project as it might detach them from their individual focus. The following quote is from OBI1.

The huge part of the current curriculum particularly case studies gets them to think outside the box and not to restrict them to what textbooks say. Sometimes you might need to do something differently and that relationship with real life organisations is
very important. OBI1

It can be deduced from the above quote that the current curriculum focuses particularly on case studies where students are expected to study and present in groups.

6.8.2 Comparing instructors with students teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E

The syllabus reports that, students are expected to be well knowledgeable of the difference between CSR and S E and the advantages of ethical branding in the context of S E. OBI1 mentioned during the interview that, the success of social organizations very much depend on ethical issues. As a way to get students to understand and to eventually maintain the core mission of S E. A lot of work is done on leadership. OBI2 suggested and said during the interview that, to enhance responsible S E, students carry out a book review on the biography of social entrepreneurs. On the other hand, students’ responses were mixed. Nearly half of the students mentioned that, their core values are what make them want to carry out social activities responsibly. Other said that, measuring the social impact created is what has helped. Common identified teaching content themes that might enhance responsible SE include

1) Book review on the biography of social entrepreneurs and core values of integrity

The syllabus report and the interview responses show that, a lot of work is done on leadership. Similar to OBI2, some students mentioned also that reviewing books on famous social entrepreneurs has inspired them to carry out social activities responsibly. This may be due to the fact that, reviewing books enables students to understand how far some social entrepreneurs go to maintain their core values and social mission, the challenges encountered and how they overcome them. The following quote is from OBI2.

We do a lot of work on leadership. We do look at some famous entrepreneurs for example Mohammed Yunus. We do a lot of work on him. We get students to read his biography and his book review of his life. We look at the social background of famous social entrepreneurs to see their philosophy and the values that they hold. OBI2
As for teaching methods, both instructors mentioned during the interview that, case studies are used to compare between mainstream business organization and social enterprises. These instructors also mentioned that as a way to enhance responsible S E, a guest speaker is invited to talk to students. Similarly majority of the students mentioned that, interactive group discussions on real cases helped. Common identified teaching method themes that might enhance responsible S E include:

2) Comparative analysis of real cases in groups.

Similar to OBI2 responds, majority of the students said analysing and comparing real cases in groups did make them see the need to carry out social activities in a responsible way. This may be due to the fact that, this teaching method allow students to see the social value created and the effort social enterprises might have put in to remain true. The quote below is from OBI1.

We look at case studies. We will look at a multinational company and ask whether their co-operate social responsibilities is achieve and we look at a social enterprise and ask when you stay in a social enterprise. Can you remain true to your social mission? We look at case studies of social enterprises that have grown and make a judgement as to whether they think they remain true to their social mission.OBI2

6.9. Summary

This chapter provides a detailed analysis Case by Case on emerging themes that might enhance social innovative thinking and responsible S E. The first part of this chapter analyses instructors/syllabi reports separately from students’ responses. This analysis is carried out with a view toward identifying key similarities and differences. Furthermore, the second part of the analysis groups the Cases into Masters, undergraduate and foundation teaching levels and compares between instructors/syllabi reports with students interview feedbacks.
CHAPTER 7
ACROSS CASE ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This section compares all the cases including data from interview transcripts and syllabi. The findings are framed using the objectives and the main research question to explore emerging themes. The objectives and primary research question guiding this study were:

objectives

1. Assess the current content of the S E curriculum in UK business schools in order to identify best teaching content that can enhance social innovative thinking and the development of potential responsible social entrepreneurs.

2. Analyze the teaching methods currently used by S E educators in UK business schools in order to identify the best teaching methods that enhance social innovative thinking and the development of potential responsible social entrepreneurs.

Research question

Which teaching content and methods enhance social innovative thinking and student motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs?

To meet up with the research objectives and question, this chapter is organised under four major headings: Teaching content of S E curriculum in UK business schools, teaching methods of S E curriculum in UK business schools, identifying teaching content and methods enhancing potential social innovative thinking social entrepreneurs and identifying teaching content and methods enhancing potential responsible social entrepreneurs

7.1 Teaching content of S E curriculum in UK business schools

This section will be discussed under two themes: Measuring outcome and theories/concepts employed with objectives

A) Measuring outcome

In Westminster and Lancaster, measuring social outcome is not part of the teaching content. Similar to Northampton, Oxford Brookes examines social impact in a very limited way, and is
looking forward to developing more in this area for example; the social return on investment (SROI), the balance score card and cost benefit analysis. Here, students compare and contrast between a social and a non-social organisation and bring out particular skills and competences differentiating a social from a non-social organisation. On the other hand, Goldsmith has a whole module on measuring social outcome which covers varieties of different techniques and methodology to measure social outcomes. For example the SROI, social auditing, social accounting and participatory monetary evaluation. The quotes below is from GI1, NI1 and OBI2

We have a whole module on evaluating social outcomes which covers a wide variety of different techniques and methodologies. It focuses in particular on the SROI technique. It also looks at social auditing and social accounting. Also, it looks briefly at methodologies for participatory monetary evaluation. A lot of interesting work has been done on evaluating social impact in the development program and it is not just measuring social outcomes but evaluating them in a more qualitative way. GI1

Yes we do. Measuring social outcome is a fundamental part of it. We look particularly at the social impact of social organisations. They have a module that looks at social impact. Still under development. We look at the characteristics of social entrepreneurs. Students compare and contrast social entrepreneurs and traditional entrepreneurs. Look at some of the similarities and differences. Some areas where you need to have particular skills and competences that differentiate a social from a commercial entrepreneur. NI1

We do look at social outcome. But we want to develop this a bit more. Thinking about social impact of a social entrepreneur. For example we might look at the social return on investment, we have not done a lot about this. We will look at the financial aspect and we might look at some other broader concept like the balance score card. We might talk a bit about cost benefit analysis. OBI2

B) Theories/conceptual issues employed with objectives

Westminster focuses particularly on bricolage and effectuation theories. It also looks at the practice base theory, competence, learning contract and team building theories. Oxford Brookes use the leadership and motivational theories to teach students on how to get the best out of workers. The change management theory is use to look at how relationships can be managed with stakeholders which could be volunteers. Also, the leadership style of Mohammed Yunus and Milton Friedman is examined. Goldsmith looks at the theory of
individual psychological motivation, institutional theory, and economist theory of Carl cololair. The structuralist theory is used to enable critical examination of discussions around social enterprise. To identify the level of needs, Northampton looks at the tribunal model analysis. Lancaster looks at Pears (2003) to provide an accounting diagram that maps all types of organisations, Alan (2006) uses a venn diagram to map where the social value is, in organisation that may either be social or commercial with social objectives. The institutional theory of organisational legitimacy, Nichol (2006) social origin theory is used to compare and contrast organisations in different countries and how they have come up with different forms of social enterprises. The theories of trust, responsibility, altruism and stewardship are also applied. The following quotes are from NI1, GI1, LI1 and WI1

To give students something to work with and some sort of a structure for their discussion. For example the cove-tribunal analysis we look at last week, we gave them the problem of re-offending so students come up with reasons why people go back and re-offend. This enables them to work in groups and to come up with facts that could have led to it. One of the organisations we are going to visit next week has been created purely to work with ex-offenders and try to give them skills and training to stop re-offending. So this is related to the visit we are about to make.NI1

I am very particular about the theory of individual psychological motivation. I do not think theories are that relevant. I think that what are relevant are the various theories for example political economy and organisational studies which look at the factors that encourage or discourage the emergence of social enterprises. One example is the Neo institutional theory. Quite a lot of research has been conducted using this theory in SE. We use the post economist perspective of Karl colanier for instance looking at the broad perspectives of changes in the balance between the private and public sector. We also use the structuralist theory to enable a critical examination of the discuss around social enterprises. GI1

We use a lot of theories. We use market failure, stewardship theory, social capital theory, institutional theory, resource base theory. We use this to give students different lenses to analyse why for example the social objectives emerged at same time understands different cultures and values. LI2

We employ new theories like bricolage and effectuation. We also use the theory that we have discovered and this can be found in my paper that is students do not only have to learn in the class room so the theory of competence, learning contract and team building. We teach them practice base theory that means, they need to think that they are social entrepreneurs. This is something quite new that we have discovered. They have to believe. So this practice base theory is in 6 levels. The first
level is embodiment the theory of embodiment. They have to believe first if they do not believe what they are, they cannot do the job. WI1

### 7.2 Teaching methods of S E curriculum in UK business schools

Some of the teaching methods were similar for all the Cases but the objectives in employing these methods were different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Westminster</th>
<th>Oxford Brookes</th>
<th>Goldsmith</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guest speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Come from different social enterprise background e.g.: practising social entrepreneurs, people who have set up social enterprises, people who support social work, people who help in establishing social enterprises' people who have experience different varieties of social enterprises. The purpose is to introduce students to a wide variety.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Give students some ideas about the concept of SE mid-way into the module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male things more real on what is going on in the social enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Get student experience real life problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Illustrate techniques and issues in identifying social impact in different enterprises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Illustrate issues around choosing the correct legal structure around the appropriate mix around grant, donation, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Illustrate issues entrepreneurs need to address when in business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish relationship with social enterprises and engage with the real world. This helps students identify a social enterprise in which they will carry out their final year research project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visit social organisation to get students to ask questions and improve on their understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visit and interview social enterprises in London and make a report. This also helps students identify a social enterprise in which they will carry out their final year research project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team/Group work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enable students to work together and be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enable students who come from different countries and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work together to generate a business ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Embed in student entrepreneurial team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with skills needed to interact with stakeholders the community, investors, partners, suppliers and employees. able to lead a team. It is also a good way of getting weak and strong students together background to work together and see the different context in different countries and how SE operates in different enterprises.

Presentations
Show how students have critically review practically in groups a range of marketing and business concepts and theories, show how they can offer solutions to a number of problems in a cost effective and innovative way for a specific organisation and give feedback on the fieldwork to students. Done individually or in groups to build individual communication skills and team work capabilities.

With the help of a theoretical model, students present their social enterprise idea in groups. Get students to look at the whole of the management course and apply all that has been learnt in the social context of entrepreneurship, use management and SE theories and the business model canvas as a presentation structure to offer solutions in the social context.

Interviewing mentors
To understand the social entrepreneurial experience of the mentor, to acquire information and build relationship for their future businesses and to build research skills.

Social business plan
To identify new opportunities.

To identify new opportunities.

To identify new opportunities.

Social enterprise leaders network
Engage with the change maker hub and learn from their experience.

To encourage critical thinking.

7.3. Identifying teaching content and methods enhancing potential social innovative thinking social entrepreneurs

This section uses chapter 6 parts 2 as a guide to further compare and identify similarities and differences in emerging themes across all the Cases irrespective of the levels.

Goldsmith encourages critical thinking. Students are expected to have a good knowledge of SE historical and contemporary issues and how governmental policies are affected by social impact in different countries. Oxford Brookes looks at famous social entrepreneur’s leadership and management styles. Northampton encourages students to grow their own business ideas in an innovative way. Lancaster exposes students to a variety of business theories at the classroom level. Westminster gets students to practically implement the
theory of bricolage and effectuation. Current teaching methods employed to enhance social innovative thinking were different for majority of the Cases. Goldsmith uses the resource base theory to get students to think on how to access resources. Similar to Northampton, Goldsmith uses the case studies mapping technique to enhance innovative thinking within the class room. Similar to Oxford Brooks, Goldsmith also examines S E historical and contemporary issues. Westminster explores within the class room and practically implements in a working environment the concept of bricolage and effectuation. Lancaster draws on varieties of business theories and applies them in the context of S E within the classroom.

In terms of teaching content that might have enhanced social innovative thinking, majority of the students in Goldsmith mentioned historical and contemporary issues. Majority of students in Oxford Brookes mentioned the triple bottom line theory and few students mentioned historical and contemporary issues. Similar to Goldsmith, few students in Northampton mentioned the resource base theory. Similar to Westminster, majority of the students at Lancaster mentioned the resource base theory. Few students in Lancaster mentioned the business generation canvas model. Majority of the students from Northampton mentioned the divergence and convergent thinking tool and the business generation canvas model. All of the students in Westminster mentioned the concept of bricolage and effectuation. The table below details the portion of students’ responses on similar teaching content emerging themes that might enhance social innovative thinking.
Table 12: portion of students responses: teaching content emerging themes that might enhance social innovative thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Westminster</th>
<th>Oxford Brookes</th>
<th>Goldsmith</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical and contemporary issues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple bottom line theory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource base theory</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business canvas model</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent and divergent thinking tool</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept of bricolage and effectuation</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the teaching methods were similar between all the Cases. However, the way these teaching methods are employed towards enhancing social innovative thinking is different (see part 1 and 2 chapter 6). Similar to Northampton and Lancaster, Goldsmiths get students to visit local social enterprises as a way to enhance social innovative thinking. However, Lancaster students visit specifically social enterprises that combine social and commercial objectives. Lancaster is more of theory and students draw in groups on theories from the general management discipline. Students are expected to reflect and think on how these theories can be applied within a real social organisation towards achieving social objectives. Goldsmith also invites guest speakers from varieties of social enterprise backgrounds. Northampton gets students to generate and present in groups a social
business idea. Northampton encourages business ideas that students are personally connected to and students can potentially pitch for funding required. As part of the task while undertaking the module, Westminster students develop, execute and present in groups a social business idea with zero funding. Oxford Brookes gets students to engage with a real social enterprise for their final year project and students study real social enterprise cases in groups.

As for currently employed teaching methods that might have enhanced social innovative thinking in students, few Lancaster students mentioned visiting a local social enterprise and group discussion and presentation. Similarly, majority of the students from Goldsmith mentioned that, interviewing social entrepreneurs during their visit to social enterprises enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. Majority of the students from Goldsmith mentioned that, studying real cases in groups also helped. Few students mentioned guest speakers. The majority proposed that, the learning by doing teaching method is what will work for them. All the students in Oxford Brookes mentioned that, group discussions and presentations on real social organisations enhanced their thinking in an innovative way. All of the students in Westminster mentioned collaborating with class mates to develop and carry out a social business idea. Similarly, majority of the students in Northampton also mentioned this teaching method. Few students in Northampton and Westminster mentioned personal connection to a business idea. The table below details the portion of students’ responses on similar teaching method emerging themes that might enhance social innovative thinking.
Table 13: portion of Students’ responses: teaching methods emerging themes that might enhance social innovative thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westminster</th>
<th>Oxford Brooke</th>
<th>Goldsmith</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group social business planning, presentation and potential implementation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal connection</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group social business planning, implementation and presentation</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting and interviewing social enterprises</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussions and presentations on real social organisations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speakers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 Identifying teaching content and methods enhancing potential responsible social entrepreneurs.

Also, this section uses chapter 6 part 2 as a guide to further compare and identify similarities and differences in emerging themes across all the Cases irrespective of the levels.

Goldsmith gets students to understand how to measure social outcome by employing the SROI technique. The United Nation Responsible management principles are used to enhance responsible SE. Similar to Lancaster and Northampton, Goldsmith suggested that, exposing students to the dark side of the CSR of mainstream businesses can enhance responsible SE. Similar to Northampton,
Oxford Brookes stresses more on ethical social enterprise branding and how core values can be maintained. To enhance responsible SE, Oxford Brookes enhances core values by getting students to carry out a book review on the biography of social entrepreneurs. Westminster instils core values in students by using the practice base theory as a guide. As for currently employed content that has enhance the need to potentially carry out social change activities in a responsible way, few students from Oxford Brookes and majority of the students from Goldsmith mentioned measuring social outcome and the core values of integrity. All of the students from Westminster mentioned core values. Majority from Northampton mentioned ethical branding. Majority of the students in Northampton and Lancaster mentioned the dark side of CSR. The table below details the portion of students’ responses on similar teaching content emerging themes that might enhance responsible SE

**Table 14: portion of students responses: teaching content emerging themes that might enhance responsible SE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Westminster</th>
<th>Oxford Brooke</th>
<th>Goldsmith</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical branding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism and the dark side of CSR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core values of integrity (Book review/Practice base theory)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring outcomes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for teaching methods, similar to Oxford Brookes, Goldsmith employs the guest speaking method to enhance responsible SE. However, Goldsmith invites a social entrepreneur that can interact with students beyond the classroom. Oxford Brookes, Northampton and Lancaster get students to compare in groups between social and non-social organisations. Both Lancaster and Oxford Brooks pair students in groups to carry out this exercise.
Westminster students share in groups after identifying and interviewing mentors individually. In terms of teaching methods that have enhanced responsible S E in students, majority of the students from Goldsmith and few students from Northampton mentioned comparative analysis of real cases in groups. Majority from Goldsmith mentioned listening to guest speakers. Majority of the students from Oxford Brookes and Lancaster mentioned interactive group discussion and presentation on real cases. Few of the students from Westminster mentioned interactive group discussion and presentations and interviewing mentors. Majority of the students in Northampton mentioned collaborating as a team on a real social enterprise projects. The table below details the portion of students’ responses on similar teaching method emerging themes that might enhance responsible S E.

**Table 15: portion of students’ responses: teaching methods emerging themes that might enhance responsible S E.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Westminster</th>
<th>Oxford Brookes</th>
<th>Goldsmith</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team work on a real social project</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group comparative analysis and presentation on real social enterprise cases and commercial businesses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion and presentation on mentor’s interviews feedback</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speaking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5: Summary

This chapter compares all the Cases across and presents answers to the main research questions. The chapter compares across and use the data analysed in Chapter 6 and presents emerging themes on which teaching content and methods might enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. Lastly, this chapter uses the data in chapter 6 and present 2 tables that details selected quotes and emerging first and second order codes on teaching content and methods that might enhance social innovative thinking and responsible S E (see Appendixes I and J).
The first part of this chapter discusses the manner in which certain aspects of the analysed data are associated with the social identity theory. To meet up with the aim of this study, the second part draws on this theory and the findings of this study and presents a curriculum content/teaching method model in educating potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. The last part discusses the implication of this study, summary and conclusion.

There is increasing need to reflect on the process of teaching S E content and methods that allow students to identify and categorize themselves as part of a group of social entrepreneurs that are innovative and responsible. Based on the social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979) the extent to which S E education can develop social innovative thinking and responsible social entrepreneurs depends to some extent on whether the S E teaching content and methods develop in students a deep-seated social identity that relates to S E. Thus, if responsible and social innovative thinking can be presented as a distinct social category to which students can aspire to and to which students can identify with and become active members, S E instructors can help facilitate this developmental process provided the right teaching content and methods are employed.

8.1 The social identity theory.

Drawing on the social identity theory is based on the assumption that, by employing the right teaching content and methods, S E instructors can act as a catalyst in enhancing students desires to make a difference. Helping them categorise and identify with the group of social entrepreneurs that are innovative and responsible and develop beliefs that, they have all it takes to come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems and remain true to the original intention of creating social value and re-investing profit for more social change activities.

The goal is to leave students who have successfully passed through the S E course/module with reflective statements such as “I want to help tackle social issues in a different way,” “I want to create a social enterprise that combines both commercial and social objectives and
still remain true to the original intention of creating social value and re-investing profit for more social change activities,” (Tracey and Phillips, 2007; Porter and Kramer, 2011; Ashoka and Brock, 2011), “I am confident to begin right now and truly make a difference.” The social identity theory encourages the presentation of social innovative thinking, responsible, S E as a social group in which students can identify with and become active members. S E instructors can help facilitate this process if the right teaching content and methods are employed (See the proposed model, figure 4).

The process of matching parts of the analysed data to the social identity theoretical criteria is based on perceived fit. The fit between the data and how quotes are associated with each of the social identity mental process will provide evidence to show how students can actually categorize and identify as social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs if the right teaching content and methods are employed. This section draws on the analysed data and discusses students’ responses that match with teaching content and methods that have or can enable students to categorise and identify as social innovative thinkers and responsible social entrepreneurs.

As discussed in Chapter 3 section 3.1, Tajfel and Turner (1979) proposed that, a group is an important source of pride and self-esteem. It also gives us the sense of social identity and a sense of belonging to the social world. Individuals in the course of thriving to better their image, enhance the status of the group in which they belong to. The social identity theory involves three mental processes which take place in a particular order.

*Categorisation.*

Our perceived value, the sense of who we are, our self-confidence, esteem and emotions are affected when we categorise ourselves as a member of a particular group. By knowing what categories we belong to, we find out things about ourselves and while making references to the norms of the groups we belong to, appropriate behaviours are defined and we develop a self-perception and start acting and seeing ourselves as more similar to other members of the group. We find out things about ourselves when we know what category we belong to. Appropriate behaviours are defined in the course of making references to our group norms.

*Identity*
Individuals adopt the group identity after categorizing and identifying as part of the group. This connects individuals’ self-esteem with other members of the group. Thus, giving individuals the confidence to believe in their ability to mobilize cognitive resources and the power to have control over life events (Wood and Bandura, 1989).

Comparison

Individuals tend to thrive for positive distinctiveness after categorising and identifying with a group. To maintain self-esteem, individuals compare their groups with others. Groups will do everything to compete and maintain their status and members self-esteem once they identify or see themselves as rivals or better off than other groups.

As can be seen in chapter 5, the majority of students’ responses fit with the social identity theory. Students responses across all the Cases when asked if undertaking the module/course has made them identify and see their selves as potential social innovative thinkers and responsible social entrepreneurs shows that, majority of the students feel categorized and identified. The few quotes below are example of students’ responses (see appendixes F)

I learned how to be innovative and build a business proposal. How to be successful in business. How to generate the resources needed to run a business. That experience was very important to me as a young person as it gave me the opportunity to practically organise an event. It gave me the opportunity to meet real people and learn how to communicate with them and give the right responses as a professional. WS1

I think social change and responsibility really brings values and moral. This has actually enabled me to see the value of being ethical in any business I am involved in. To see the positive impact it will bring not just to me but to the society. WS4

I have actually learnt new things that I can apply now. Now I am able to have a free talk about it. As I said, this module has been practical and is the only we had so far. I will like more modules to be practical. NS2

It makes me see myself doing something in this field and now, each time I do something or get involved in something I always think of how that particular thing can help someone. NS2

Alignment between the theory and students interview feedback illustrates the extent to which, by employing the right teaching content and methods, S E instructors can act as a
catalyst to transform and make students believe that they have all it takes to potentially become social innovative thinkers and responsible social entrepreneurs. It can also be noticed from the quote below that, some students did not feel categorized and identified due to the methods employed in teaching.

The module was more theoretical. So it does not really offer the opportunity to be innovative. I think to be innovative or think in an innovative way, to me it demands more practice rather than just class room knowledge. LS3

The next section draws on the social identity theory and the analysed data (see appendixes I and J) and presents a proposed curriculum content/teaching method model in educating potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

8.2 The proposed model

This study proposes that, by employing the pedagogical devices address below, S E instructors can facilitate the process of producing social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. The key defining characteristics of this social group is the ability to come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems and the ability to remain true to the original intention of creating social value and re-investing profit for more social change activities.
Figure 4: A proposed curriculum content/teaching method model in educating potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.
Social innovative thinking social entrepreneurs

*History and contemporary issues of SE*

S E is a fast emerging field that has grabbed much attention. Knowing the history and contemporary issues surrounding it can facilitate critical thinking by knowing what has been done so far in terms of how social issues have been addressed innovatively. The findings of this study show that, employing this concept has enhanced innovatively the thinking of majority of the students in some of the business schools this study examined (Goldsmith and Oxford Brookes). As a proposal, S E instructors can use this to get students to identify amongst the category of social innovative thinkers. Instructors can use this as a platform and get students to discuss in groups and think of new approaches towards tackling existing social issues or identify new ones and how to address them. In the context of UK, majority of the students are international students. Mixing students from different nations in groups and encouraging the sharing of some strategies that have been used in tackling social issues in their country of origin. This can facilitate the exchange of ideas and act as a starting point for students to think on how strategies that worked in different contexts can be adopted or modified and employed in their context.

One of the key contemporary issues surrounding social organisations globally which few students and instructors brought up is the absence of a legal framework which is stopping many social organisations globally from flourishing. A typical example is that of legal structures adopted in some European countries which have provided a conducive environment for social enterprises to flourish as welfare actors. In Europe, the cooperative and association legal forms has been use to set up must social enterprises and this has continued to be the case in most European countries. Europe can be compared to Africa and Asia which have no legal frameworks or the USA where the current legal structures have not been updated in the last 50 years and therefore fail effectively to regulate the growing business activities of service-producing non-profit organizations (see Galera and Borzaga, 2009). Discussing this issue in groups has encouraged few students to look deeper and think on how legal structures that worked in different contexts can be modified and employed in their country of origin. Thus, this has made them potentially view themselves as part of the group of people that seek to provide innovative solutions towards tackling social issues.
Resource base, bricolage and effectuation theories

Both general management and S E theories are employed in the teaching of S E. Findings from this study show that out of all these theories, the resource base theory and the theories of bricolage and effectuation can re-enhance social innovative thinking to a greater extent. However the methods employed to pass across these theories to students’ matters. Similar to this study, evidence from most entrepreneurship research shows that teams are significantly more likely to achieve success than individual entrepreneurs. However, to create unique advantages, individual capabilities must be transferred into the venture and the organizational strengths by entrepreneurial team (Brush, Green and Hart, 2001).

The resource base theory enables the examination of the available resources towards achieving the expected outcome. According to this theory, the survival of a business idea depends on the resources choices made. New ventures can only create wealth in the long run if early strategies are based on resources that are combined in an innovative way (Brush, Green and Hart, 2001). Bricolage is associated with the notion of “making do” and the combination of available resources to create solutions. Bricolage expects social entrepreneurs to use the resources at hand and create something out of it. It’s also expect social entrepreneurs to avoid environmental limitations which could be institutional as excuses for not exploiting and creating something with what is at hand (Fisher, 2012). Effectuation is associated with individuals willingness to use what they can afford and experiment within their constrain boundaries. It also demands flexibility and the ability to establish relationships with partners who could be sponsors, suppliers and customers (Chang and Chalcraft, 2014).

As a proposal, S E instructors can draw on these theories and help students to identify as social innovative thinkers during their studies and after graduating. This can be done by forming students groups with “no fund” and challenging them to use the ideas behind these theories. Collectively, students can generate a social business idea, implement it and share their experiences through presenting to the rest of the class. This is very important in the context of S E education as compared to CSR since most social problems occur in environments with limited financial resources and social entrepreneurs are expected to solve these problems (Konda, Starc and Rodica, 2015). According to Brush, Green and Hart
the existence of abundant financial resources can hinder the thinking process. To build a resource base, groups should also draw on individual’s human resources. Students should be encouraged to exploit the first resource that exists in them as social entrepreneurs which could be education or their experiences. With no funding, students are compelled to use what is available which in this case, is their human resource as a group. This encourages collective thinking and creativity towards generating the resources needed to achieve their social business idea. According to social categorisation, a group is an important source of self-esteem and pride (Tajfel and Turner, 1979).

Findings from this study show that, as opposed to students from business schools that took a more theoretical angle who felt dissatisfied, all of the students in the business school that employed a practice base incorporated curriculum (group social business planning, implementation and presentation) were satisfied. According to Dowey (1934, p.45) nothing takes roots in the mind when there is no balance between receiving and doing. Besides enhancing social innovative thinking, collective dimensions continue to be a key feature of European social enterprises which reduce the probability of opportunistic behaviours by single individuals (Galera and Borzaga, 2009). The quote below is from one of the students in a business school that employed this method.

First of all we did not have money. We actually had to think of a way to get money without money. This pushed us to think of a lot of different ways. This was the main part actually. We thought about the people who can give us this money. We also thought of how to gives something different to the charity. This enabled us to innovate. WS3

There is no doubt as can be deduced from the above quote that, the teaching content and methods S E instructors employ, can help students to categorise and identify as social innovative thinking social entrepreneurs. Students groups spent more time sharing and implementing their business ideas. This study proposes that, Instead of the traditional way of presenting these business models and plans as a group to classmates who often do not form part of the resource building process, groups should be challenged with the help of instructors to build external networks and present these plans to resource providers. After successfully executing their business ideas, groups can then present to the rest of the class to share and learn from their experiences.
Divergent and convergent tool /business model canvas

Most S E instructors use thinking tools to get students to think outside the box. The findings of this study show that, amongst these tools, the business model canvas/divergent and convergent tools are outstanding. Turning a business idea into a full venture can be very complex (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010). The business model canvas layout allows collective discussions to set out the activities, key elements and how they interrelate towards achieving a business idea Paul (2013). Divergent and convergent thinking is a way of building a few ideas that an individual has to a few ideas that the group has agree on (Whiteboard, 2015).

As a proposal, S E instructors should encourage students groups to draw on these tools when generating their social business ideas. Some instructors do encourage the old traditional business planning method. According to Osterwalder (2012), no business plan survives the first contact with customers. Also, according to Paul (2013), while the business model canvas evolves as the business owner experience the world around them, business plans are static documents. The findings from this study show that, the business model canvas combined with the divergent and convergent thinking tools helped students to think outside the box. The business model canvas allows the setting up on one posture the different activities required. To encourage the transfer of individual’s capabilities into the social venture (Brush, Green and Hart, 2001), the divergent and convergent thinking tool can be useful. Divergent thinking encourages the collection of different ideas from each individual in the group and convergent thinking has to do with thinking as a group on those ideas the team has agreed on (Whiteboard, 2015). Thus, enhancing the thinking of each individual as a person as well as collective thinking. S E instructors can draw on this and help students to identify and categorise as social innovative thinkers. Instructors can encourage students groups to advance their social business ideas by thinking through as a team and putting on one posture each of the 9 building blocks of the business canvas model. Groups can make more informed decisions based on their social business model prediction power (Trim and Berbegal-Mirabent, 2012). Also, groups should be aware of the fact that, Innovative social business models unlock potential and opportunities that were not available with existing social business models before. Key video footages can help students to

**Responsible social entrepreneurs.**

*Core values of integrity*

Given the challenging nature of social activities, individual integrity is essential for success. Roper and Cheney (2005) noted that, an individual exceptional characteristic though manifested sometimes by a group is essential for the success of social enterprises. Personal values are more deeply rooted. According to Rokeach (1973), while trying to reinforce our self-image, the moral nature of value pushes us to act in the interests of society. Values could be individualistic or group oriented (England, 1975), and could be personal or group focused. As compared to mainstream entrepreneurship education, it is very important to emphasize, in the context of S E education, the need to solve social problems as a group since the majority of S E initiatives are design to serve a collective interest. Core values have to do with personal willingness (Hemingway, 2005). While some people are able to maintain their self-integrity when faced with challenges, others can easily deviate or be influenced. Findings show that the integrity of an individual and the values that this individual holds is what has pushed the majority of the students across the five business schools to be interested in carrying out social activities responsibly. However, some students were encouraged through the group teaching method some S E instructors employed in presenting the concept. Thus, student groups can be an important source of influence and encouragement towards enhancing responsible S E.

Given the fact that S E already relates to being responsible, some instructors believe teaching S E automatically means addressing responsible entrepreneurship. This confirms Chell et al’s (2014) argument that being a social entrepreneur does not mean you are automatically a moral being who enacts goodness. Though a few S E instructors address values, more still needs to done in the context of S E education (see Hemingway, 2005). This study act as a starting point towards pointing out core values of integrity as a teaching content that can enhance responsible S E. More research needs to look deeper into key
social values that need to be addressed in S E education that can lead to responsible S E (maintaining the original social value creation intention).

Measuring outcomes
Outcome measurement can push social enterprises to be responsible. Majority of social organizations depends on funding, tax exemptions or low tax rates. Outcome measurement is a way to get social enterprises to prove with figures the level of social impact created on each pound invested. Outcome measurement can enhance a change in behavior, performance and resource allocation (Lawlor, Nicholls and Nietzert, 2008). Findings show that, the extent to which outcome measurement can enhance responsible S E depends on the measurement technique employed. Some business schools (Northampton and Lancaster) are still trying to develop this teaching content. Business schools that employed this content used different measurement techniques and methods. Goldsmith uses an advanced quantitative measurement technique (SROI). Findings show that, this teaching content and the SROI measurement technique has encouraged the desire of majority of the students’ to potentially carry out social activities responsibly. Oxford Brooks employs the old traditional commonly used comparative analysis of social enterprise real cases to compare social organisation and qualitatively identify the social value created.

SROI is a form of cost-benefit analysis that considers triple-bottom-line benefits and investments (economic, social, and environmental) and can be forecasted or evaluative. SROI allows the quantification of the value of benefits. It measures both economic and fiscal benefits. This measurement technique measures: What the social organisation spends (investment), what it does (activities), how much the social organisation does (outputs), what changes the social organisation brings (outcome) and the worth of these changes (value) (Ógáin, Lumley and Pritchard, 2012).

As a proposal, S E instructors can encourage responsible S E and help students to categorise and identify as responsible social entrepreneurs by using the SROI measurement technique. This technique enables the quantification of the social value created. Mainstream entrepreneurs show only the economic wealth (Profit) created on their financial statements and CSR is not part of the financial statement. With the SROI measuring technique, social entrepreneurs who deploy money made through doing business for social change have to
show both the social value and economic wealth created. Findings show that, comparing in
groups the social impact created by different social and non-social enterprises, has
encouraged responsible S E. People can actually see in a more realistic way and judge the
level of social impact created. This can push students who are looking forward to be social
entrepreneurs to be more transparent, responsible and to work harder towards achieving
their social change target. Key reading that instructors can help students to understand the
SROI (see Fujiwara, 2013, Fujiwara, 2014 and Lawlor, Nicholls and Nietzert, 2008). For real
case studies of social enterprises that used the SROI measurement technique (See NPC:
impact measurement and Craft café, 2011).

**Ethical social enterprise branding/ Dark side of CSR**

Ethical issues are very pertinent for the success of social enterprises and for the social status
of social organisations in general. CSR is an old concept of creating social value and has not
been realistic for example in developing nations as compared to developed nations. As
compared to S E, CSR is a side activity of a mainstream entrepreneur whose main goal is
creating economic wealth. Social entrepreneurs develop social enterprises to create social
value as their main objective and economic wealth creation is secondary. While social
entrepreneurs are expected to create social value whether profit is made or not, mainstreet owners respect their CSR only when profit is made. Often, reports on CSR
are not transparent and it is viewed as a strategy to attract more customers. To clearly
differentiate the social value created by social enterprises and the CSR of mainstream
businesses, social organisation needs to be transparent in the marketing of their social
organisations and the measurement and reports of their activities. Due to deceptive social
impact claims, responsible social entrepreneurs have to market and ensure that, their
organization is genuine and trustworthy in representation and delivery (Hibbert, Hogg and
Quinn, 2002).

Ethics and values in the context of S E education should be addressed hand in hand. As
mentioned above, some instructors still believe teaching S E automatically means addressing
ethics as could be deduced in the quote below.

I do not really understand because if you are teaching S E, the ethics is within the
concept itself. NI1
The above quote confirms Chell et al (2014) argument that, in the context of S E education there is the lack of problematization regarding the relationship between ethics and S E. According to Cornelius et al (2008), it does not necessarily means because something is socially oriented, then the motivation is ethically responsible. Findings from this study show that, majority of business schools offering S E education spend time criticizing the dark side of CSR. As a proposal, this study suggests that, while criticizing CSR as a way to enhance responsible S E, there is also the urgent need to address ethics in the context of S E education. Students should be made to understand that, being a social entrepreneur or working for a social organization does not automatically makes them responsible or ethical. Students should be encouraged to take this criticism and create something new that can produce realistic social value globally (Austin, Stevenson and Wei-skillern, 2006; Dacin, Decin and Matear, 2010). However, findings also show that, some business schools are beginning to emphasize ethical issues in the teaching of S E. The majority of students from this business school (Oxford Brookes) confirmed that, emphasizing and teaching ethical issues while pointing out the dark side of CSR has enhanced their desire to be responsible by doing everything possible to create realistic social value and re-invest profit for social change activities.

Students need to be aware that they are different types of social issues in different social contexts because every context has different social issues. In some contexts, it may be more about corruption, for some it may be racism and for others underdevelopment. So examining the key issues in that context and how S E education can really help. For example in Africa, it will be more of unemployment and corruption. S E education can address this by encouraging students to examine new social ideas towards addressing these issues in this context or modifying and implementing approaches or tools that successfully work in different context. Findings show that, students come from different management background for example marketing, finance in business schools offering S E as a module. It is important to mix and make them work as a group on different social issues and question how it can be solve. Groups can enable the learning of different experiences and how problems are solve in different context.

This study draws on the social identity theory and argues that, to enhance responsible S E, students have to feel identified and categorized as responsible social entrepreneurs. They
also have to be confident that, they have all it takes to be successful. Automatically, students will clearly see and start comparing S E with the CSR practices of mainstream entrepreneurs. By knowing their responsibilities and what make them unique as responsible social entrepreneurs, they will thrive for positive distinctiveness in order to see themselves as better off. In so doing, they will do everything possible to maintain what makes them unique which in this case is creating social value and re-investing profit for more social change activities. Thus, maintaining their self-esteem and the social status of social enterprises.

Book review on the biography of social entrepreneurs

Reviewing books that detail the social activities of famous social entrepreneurs to know their philosophies and the values they hold, has enhanced students’ desire to carry out social change activities responsibly. Mission drift is common within social enterprises that mix both economic and social objectives (Tracey and Phillips, 2007). To remain ethical and maintain our core values can be challenging. Reviewing books that details how famous social entrepreneurs overcome these challenges and remain true can be an effective tool for social entrepreneurs when faced with challenges.

S E instructors can help students identify and categorise as responsible social entrepreneurs. They can expose students to famous social entrepreneurs that have a proven record of being capable of maintaining their core values and remaining true. Outlining the qualities of what makes them unique may help students to see them as mentors and do everything possible to be identified as being amongst the group of social entrepreneurs that uphold these qualities (Hogg, Terry and White, 1995). This group of social entrepreneurs have characteristics and features that distinguish them which in this case are features related to maintaining the original intention of creating social value and re-investing profit for more social change activities. A good example is Mohammed Yunus. This social entrepreneur has a proven record of: (1) generating and implementing a sustainable social mission (2) recognizing and pursuing opportunities consistent with this mission; (3) learning and innovating continuously (4) being determined to create value and act boldly even when faced with resource limitations; and (5) being accountable to those that are served. While familiarising students with features exhibited by social entrepreneurs like Mohamed Yunus, students should note that, they can in their own unique way exhibit similar features. These
features are to be emulated and not to be followed with exactness (Hogg, Terry and White, 1995). Students can begin to understand how their individuals abilities can help promote responsible S E and how it can be utilized within the community of responsible social entrepreneurs.

*Guest speaking, interviewing, personal connection, learning by doing.*

Guest speaking is a commonly used teaching method in S E education. The findings show that some instructors see guest speaking as important and invite many guest speakers throughout the course as a way of exposing students to varieties of social enterprises. Some, invite and see guest speaking as a form of experiential learning. Often in S E seminars, guest speakers are expected to talk to students about the activities of their social enterprises, what makes their enterprise “social” and some of the challenges they face as social enterprises. The quote below is from one of the instructors.

Guest speakers who came in and say this is why we are a social enterprises and this is what we do, why we feel that we tick those boxes that add social value. OBI1

This study proposes that, S E instructors should see guest speaking as a way of exposing students to different varieties of social enterprise (see chapter 3, table 2 for the different types of S E). In this way, students will be familiar with the reality of the different categories of social enterprises and decide if it is something they potentially want to engage with. Also instructors should invite speakers who are willing to network more with interested students beyond the classroom. In this way, students can see them as mentors and build networks for their potential social enterprises. Findings from this study show that, in business schools that invite varieties of guest speakers, majority of the students were encouraged to engage responsibly in S E after listening to some guest speakers. This gives students the opportunity to identify and interview their own mentors, learn from their experiences and improve their knowledge. Speakers can be an important source of knowledge transfer.

Personal connection to a social business idea can be a source of inspiration. Findings from this study show that, students engage more both innovatively and responsibly when they are personally connected to a social business idea. Taking into account the challenging nature of S E, instructors should encourage students to be involved in social change activities they are connected to. This can be a source of motivation when faced with challenges.
Instructors can help students identify and categorise as social innovative and responsible social entrepreneurs by exposing students to opportunities that students can learn by doing. Education has more meaning if teaching methods that allow students to simultaneously learn and employ knowledge acquire from the classroom in a working environment are employed. Findings from this study show that, students thinking were enhanced in an innovative way to a greater extent in business schools that employ the learning by doing teaching methods.

S E instructors are encouraged to help students engage in social change initiatives that reinforce the solving of social problems in an innovative and a responsible way. As students actively engage in creating realistic social value in an innovative way, they will start developing their own identities as social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. They will also develop a strong desire towards implementing solutions to social problems in an innovative and responsible way.

8.3 Contribution

Contribution to Literature and theory.

Several scholars have emphasized the need for social entrepreneurs to create realistic social value in an innovative way and pointed out that, thinking entrepreneurially by creating economic wealth towards creating social value is innovation (Porter and Kramer, 2011; Tracey and Philips, 2007). Still Drayton (2006) thinks social innovation can came in different ways. In addition, Chell et al. (2014) pointed the need for S E education to problematize the relationship between S E and ethics and clearly differentiate S E and the CSR practices of mainstream entrepreneurs. However, the theoretical question of which teaching content and methods can actually enhance the potential creation of realistic social value in an innovative and a responsible way has not been investigated. To my knowledge, this study presents the first study that draws on the social identity theory and analysed data collected from both S E instructors and students and proposes a model that instructors can draw on to enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. Previous work that employ this theory in the context of S E education (Smith and Woodworth, 2012) explains how the social identity theory can be employed to help students identify as social entrepreneurs in general. Their study was conceptual and did not
analyse precise teaching content and methods that instructors can draw on and help students identify as social entrepreneurs that are innovative and responsible.

This study thus contributes in advancing the utilisation of the social identity theory in the S E education context by explaining how instructors can draw on this theory and help students categorise and identify themselves amongst the group of social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. Findings from this study confirm the social identity theory contention that, a group is an important source of self-esteem and pride and that, some individuals are easily influenced which also changes their psychology and this affects the way they think and act in order to feel part of the group. As part of a student group, students were able to think collectively towards developing new ways to create social value. Thus, making each student within the group feel identified and categorise as part of a group that think in an innovative way towards solving social issues. In addition, students groups can be an important source of influence and encouragement towards enhancing responsible S E given the fact that some people can easily be influenced. The findings show that, students groups encouraged each other to stay focused.

As part of a group some students were encouraged and influenced to create social value and do good. Thus, student groups can act as a source of encouragement to students who can easily be influenced to feel categorised and identify as part of a group that keeps to the original idea of creating social value. The findings of this study are also in line with Umble, Umble and Artz (2008) research findings which revealed that, students’ performance and thinking increases through cooperative learning and through the sharing of ideas. Also pressure from members of a group forces individuals to think and contribute to the performance of the group.

In addition, the majority of the students feel better off in creating social value as responsible social entrepreneurs when compared to the CSR practices of mainstream entrepreneurs. Innovation in the S E context implies applying new ways towards addressing social issues. Students from institutions that employ the group social business planning, implementation and presentation approach feel they were able to think and contribute in solving social issues in an innovative way to a greater extend. Thus, making them to categorise and identify as social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs and feel better off in
terms of creating social value in a responsible and innovative way when compared to the CSR practices of mainstream entrepreneurs or existing social entrepreneurs who are not socially innovative in creating social value. This confirms the social identity theory contention that, to be categorised and identified as part of a group, individuals tend to adapt the norms of the group and strive for positive distinctiveness in order to be better off, and maintain their self-esteem and the status of the group.

This study also contributes to the growing literature emphasizing the need to employ the experiential learning teaching methods to teach entrepreneurship in general (Kuratko, 2005; Minniti and Bygrave, 2001; Sherman, Sebora and Digman, 2008) and S E in particular (Brock and Steiner, 2009; Steyaert and Dey, 2014). However, there is a diverse range of teaching methods that are considered to be experiential. Findings from this study suggest that the experiential teaching method that allows students to generate, implement and present in groups (group social business planning, implementation and presentation) while at school can to a greater extent provide students with the skills needed and also help them identify and categorise as potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

**Practical contribution and contribution to S E education**

This study further presented the recent discussions around the need to problematized and emphasize the relationship between ethics and S E (Chell et al., 2014). It is believed that, this can encourage social entrepreneurs to remain true to the original intention of creating social value and re-investing profit for more social activities. Also, in order to sustain the social value created, there is the need to be innovative in the way social issues are addressed (Porter and Kramer, 2011). There is growing need for social entrepreneurs to create realistic social value in an innovative way and business schools have a role to play in the quality of the graduates that they produce. This study interviewed S E instructors and examined their syllabi to identify how and which teaching content and methods are employed with the goal of enhancing responsible S E and social innovative thinking. The study also investigated S E instructor opinions on teaching content and methods they think if employed can enhance social innovative thinking and responsible S E. In addition, these study further interviewed students who have successfully pass through the S E module/course and drew their opinion and feedback to confirm those teaching content and methods that have actually enhanced
their thinking innovatively and their motivation to carry out social change activities in a responsible way. In so doing, this study found several teaching contents and methods (see figure 4) that may help produce potential social entrepreneurs that are socially innovative and responsible. Thus, this study should increase the quality of S E education by showing S E instructors with precision how and what is needed to produce graduate with the capabilities needed to be responsible and socially innovative. Thus, contributes in maintaining the “Social” status of social enterprises.

Furthermore, this study gives an insight into the teaching content and methods S E instructors from five UK business schools offering S E as either a course or a module employ in teaching S E at different levels of education (masters, undergraduate and foundation). This study may benefit S E educators because this study outlines what educators who spent quality time teaching S E either as module or a course are teaching. Though the proposed model can be applied at all levels of education, the findings of this study also illuminate the content and methods employed at the Maters, undergraduate and foundation levels (see appendixes I and J). This can help S E instructors to make more informed coursework decisions with more knowledge about the education levels. It is anticipated that, this study can promote instructional design consistency in S E education. The proposed model is believed to enhance S E education in the following way: first, it provides precise teaching content and methods that educators can employ and help students categorise and identify as potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. Secondly, it enables potential social entrepreneurs to value the importance of creating social value as a group. For example, the cooperative and association legal framework has allowed social enterprises to flourish in the European context. Discussing this in groups encouraged few students to look deeper and think on how legal structures that worked in different context can be modified and employed in their country of origin. Thus, this has enabled students to potentially value the importance of cooperating as a group to create social value. The model also provides aspiring social entrepreneurs with tools needed to think innovatively and be responsible in carrying out social change activities. The model may also help governments, academic institutions and aid agencies that seek to establish S E education programs with the aim of graduating potential social entrepreneurs that are capable of creating realistic social value in a social innovative and responsible way.
8.4 Limitations

This study was conducted in the UK with a focus on 5 business schools that offer S E as a module/course in England. The sampling strategy employed to select these business schools was based on whether each business school was amongst the top 50 UK university/business schools ranking according to eduniversal ranking in 2014 and offers S E as a module/course. Though with a very selective sampling strategy, the question is whether all key findings can be generalise in different context. For example mixing students in groups from different nations to share ideas and strategies from their context may not be possible in all countries as compared to the UK where the majority of the students are international students. Also, it may be difficult to have S E practitioners in some nations to invite as guest speakers as compared to the UK where the field is growing rapidly with many S E practitioners who are always willing to encourage students and share their experience.

Also, unfortunately negotiating access to data and the data collection for this study was done when some of the business schools under study were already midway into the course. This made it impossible for the researcher to interview and gets students views before undertaking the S E course/module. However, the researcher was able to interview only students who successfully passed through the S E course/module in the 2015/2016 academic year. Interviewing students before and after might have yielded more accuracy in discussing students’ feedback with respect to the social identity theory. It might have allowed the researcher to compare students responses before and after undertaking the course/module and confirm whether or not passing through the S E course/module has actually made them to identify and categorise as social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

8.5 Further research

While this study identified and explained how core values of integrity can enhance responsible S E, the study did not examine which values are key to social entrepreneurs and techniques that can be employ in a working environment to maintain these values in the long run. Based on this, the further research question below was generated.

The “social” status of S E is pending. Sometimes it is hard for social entrepreneurs who deploy money made through doing business for social change to maintain the original
In light of the increasing interest in SE education, several scholars have emphasized the need for SE education to produce social entrepreneurs who create realistic social value in an innovative way and pointed out that, thinking entrepreneurially to achieve social outcome is essential. In addition, Chell et al. (2014) pointed out the need to emphasise the “social” aspect of SE education in order to clearly differentiate SE from the CSR practices of mainstream entrepreneurs. Little or no empirical research exists to address this problem. This study defines a responsible social entrepreneur as a social entrepreneur who remains true to the original idea of creating social value and reinvesting profit for more social change activities (Cornelius et al. 2008). Also, social innovative thinking is defined as the ability to come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems (Drayton, 2006; Porter and Kramer, 2011). Examples of social innovative thinking may include how to generate the financial resources needed to achieve social value creation objectives and creating new legal structures. This study further drew on these definitions and posed the main research question: Which teaching content further research should examine? 1. The key values of social entrepreneurs and 2. What techniques can be employed in a working environment to maintain these values in the long run?

8.6 Conclusion

In light of the increasing interest in social entrepreneurship education, several scholars have emphasized the need for SE education to produce social entrepreneurs who create realistic social value in an innovative way and pointed out that, thinking entrepreneurially to achieve social outcome is essential. In addition, Chell et al. (2014) pointed out the need to emphasise the “social” aspect of SE education in order to clearly differentiate SE from the CSR practices of mainstream entrepreneurs. Little or no empirical research exists to address this problem. This study defines a responsible social entrepreneur as a social entrepreneur who remains true to the original idea of creating social value and reinvesting profit for more social change activities (Cornelius et al. 2008). Also, social innovative thinking is defined as the ability to come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems (Drayton, 2006; Porter and Kramer, 2011). Examples of social innovative thinking may include how to generate the financial resources needed to achieve social value creation objectives and creating new legal structures. This study further drew on these definitions and posed the main research question: Which teaching content further research should examine? 1. The key values of social entrepreneurs and 2. What techniques can be employed in a working environment to maintain these values in the long run?
and methods enhance social innovative thinking and student motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs? To answer this question, this study examines the syllabi of 5 UK business schools offering S E as a course or a module. The study also interviewed 8 S E instructors and 30 students who successfully passed through the S E course/module across these five business schools.

Based on the analysed data and the social identity theory, this study proposed a model. This study helps translate the social identity theory into behavioural actions that S E instructors can identify. The proposed model draws on the social identity theory and precisely which teaching content and methods S E instructors can focus on. Not just to help build their confidence but also to provide students with the capabilities needed to identify and categorise themselves amongst the group of social innovative thinking and responsible social entrepreneurs. In addition, the social identity theory encourages group work. According to this theory, when an individual identifies and categorises as part of a group, something happens in their psychology. They start to respect the norms of the group. In the context of Europe, creating social value through the cooperatives and association legal framework is encouraged. This approach of tackling social problems as a team is increasingly being recognised. Thus, drawing on the social identity theory and encouraging students to team up towards solving social issues is important as this kills the egoism of opportunistic individuals (Galera and Borzaga, 2009).

The proposed model is novel in two ways: first, the study administered semi-structures interview questions to S E instructors who spent time teaching S E either as a module/course. The study also examines the S E syllabi these instructors currently employ. Furthermore, the study administered semi-structured interview questions to students who successfully passed through the S E module/course to confirm and identify teaching methods and content that has enhanced their thinking in an innovative way and to be responsible when carrying out social change activities. This model to the best of my knowledge is the first to draw on empirical primary data and propose with precision teaching content and methods that can enhance the formation of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs. By identifying the content and methods that have or can enhance social innovative thinking and responsible S E, this study has added to
the body of literature in S E education. The study hopes these findings will help inform S E researchers, instructors and practitioners.
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Appendixes A: A letter of request to instructors.

Dear xxx,

Accept greetings from Doreen Nyaa Amundam a 2nd year PhD student in Cardiff Metropolitan University carrying out a research study title: The Role of Business Schools in Educating Social Entrepreneurs: An Exploratory Study of UK Business Schools.

After going through UK universities and business schools according to eduniversal ranking by PALMES LEAGUE in 2014, I realized that your institution is amongst the few UK business schools/universities offering social entrepreneurship as a module/course and you are one of those academicians enhancing the growth of this rapidly emerging field.

As any other emerging field, what should be taught and how has always been problematic and given the nature of social entrepreneurship, what should be taught and how is the worry and demand of majority of business schools and course instructors in the UK and all over the world in general.

However, I believe that your institution and academicians like you who took the initiative few years ago to teach social entrepreneurship within your institution will be of great value to my current research as it seeks to develop a model incorporating curriculum content and teaching methods that will enhance social innovative thinking and student motivation towards becoming responsible social entrepreneurs.

I strongly believe a 30 minutes informational talk with you will be of great help and I would appreciate the opportunity to spend 30 minutes with you for an informational talk on my research study and for you to help guide me on how to collect data through semi-structure interview questions from social entrepreneurship course instructors as well as few post social entrepreneurship module/course students within your institution and any other suggestions you think will be helpful.

I understand you are a very busy person but I can be very flexible with my schedule to match your availability. In case you need more information before meeting me in person, you can reach me at 07466971741 or at nyaadoreen@yahoo.co.uk  Skype: nyaadoreen1

Thank you very much for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Doreen Nyaa Amundam
Appendix B: Participant consent form.

Reference Number:
Participant name or Study ID Number:
Title of Project: The role of business schools in educating social entrepreneurs: An exploratory study of UK business schools.
Name of Researcher: Doreen Nyaa Amundam

Please sign and print your name if you agree with the information below.

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason.

3. I agree to take part in the above study.

4. I agree to the interview being audio recorded such that it can be replayed to better understand my views in case the interviewer omits something when taking down notes during the interview.

5. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications

__________________________  ______________________
Signature of Participant
Date

__________________________  ______________________
Name of person taking consent
Date
Appendix C: Participant information sheet

Title of project: The role of business schools in educating social entrepreneurs: An exploratory study of UK business schools.

Background.

This exploratory study, attempts to find a solution to the problem of equipping educators with the required material needed to teach social entrepreneurship (S E). Education on S E is increasing and business schools have a role to play. UK business schools offering entrepreneurship modules needs to support learning not just about entrepreneurship but also, implement the notion of “responsible” entrepreneurship. In addition, it has been noted that, though S E education can provide a frame of reference for responsible entrepreneurship education and learning, the S E field is gradually losing its social status since most social enterprises just adapt the word “social” and do not maintain the original idea of creating value and re-investing profit for social change activities. To contribute in solving this problem, S E education needs to emphasize “responsible entrepreneurship” and “Value creation”. This study seeks to explore qualitatively and identify best curriculum content and teaching methods in the existing S E pedagogy in UK business schools in order to develop a model incorporating teaching methods and curriculum content that can enhance the development of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

This project is interested in three areas:

2) Access the current content of S E curriculum.
3) Analyse the teaching methods currently employed in teaching S E
4) Identify best curriculum content and teaching methods that can enhance the development of potential social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs.

Your participation in the research project.

Why you have been chosen to be interviewed:

It should be noted that, accepting to be interviewed implies consent. Your participation is voluntary and you are totally free to withdraw your participation at any time should you choose to.

You have been chosen either because:

5) You are currently a S E course instructor in either Goldsmith University, Westminster university business school, Lancaster university management school, Northampton university business school; Oxford brooks university business school and University of Oxford Said business school. You have at least 2 years of experience in teaching entrepreneurship or S E.
6) You are a student undertaking or has successfully passed through the S E module/course in either Goldsmith University, Westminster university business school, Lancaster university business school, Northampton university business school, Oxford brooks university business school and University of Oxford Said business school.
Your acceptance for interviewing will be of great help to this project. Each interview will take between 45 minutes to an hour and though I will very much appreciate a face to face interview, a Skype or a phone interview could still be arranged.

What happens next if you accept to be interviewed?

I would request and appreciate if course instructors share with me their documents on the current S E syllabus before the interview. I would also appreciate and request that, both course instructors and students should glance through the interview guide before the interview. Please, let me know when you will be available for interviewing.

Are there any benefits in taking part?

Yes. Your participation will be of great help to the S E education field. You will be contributing towards producing educational materials that will enhance the development of social innovative thinking, responsible, social entrepreneurs, thus making the world a better place.

Are there any risks:

No risks are foreseen in taking part. If you are feeling unwell on the interview schedule date, a re-schedule will be made.

What happens to the result:

The results will be presented in S E and entrepreneurship conferences, seminars and workshops. Also the results will greatly contribute in designing and proposing a S E curriculum for the Cameroon states universities in particular and business schools in general.

How your privacy would be protected:

Your privacy will be protected. Careful measures have been taken to make sure that you cannot be identified from the information you will share during the interview. Also, the documents course instructors will share and the information you will provide during the interview will not be use for any other purpose outside this project without your approval.

Further information:

If you have any questions about the research or how the study will be conducted, Please contact.

Doreen Nyaa Amundam
PhD student, Cardiff metropolitan university
Mobile: +44 7459712247
e-mail: nyaadoreen@yahoo.co.uk
Appendix D: Social entrepreneurship (SE) course instructors interview guide.

Research Title: The role of business schools in educating social entrepreneurs: An exploratory study of UK business schools.

Purpose of interviewing: To identify best teaching methods and curriculum content that can enhance social innovative thinking within students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs.

N.B. A responsible social entrepreneur for this study is a social entrepreneur who remains true to the original idea of creating social value and reinvesting profit for more social change activities.

N.B. Social innovative thinking for this study is the ability to come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems. For example, how to generate the financial resources needed to achieve social value creation objectives and creating new legal.

Questions:
Section A: Curriculum content and teaching methods

Which teaching method(s) in the table below if any are employed and with what objective(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching methods</th>
<th>objective(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>case studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social enterprise business plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involving students in social enterprise leaders network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inviting guest speakers in SE classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting students involved in fieldwork, projects and interactive seminars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting students to deliver presentations on specific topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) It has been noticed that, common conceptual issues/aspects/components/competences taught in SE include and not limited to:

i) Measuring social outcomes

ii) Explain and analyse the motivation drivers and issues for a range of context within SE (E.g. social entrepreneurship definition issues, challenges faced by social entrepreneurs, categories of social entrepreneurship etc.)

iii) Take theories outside SE and apply them to SE.

2a) Do you employ i) and ii)? Please explain.
2b) which theory or theories do you currently employ?
2c) what is your goal of employing these theories or theory?

Section B: Curriculum content and teaching methods enhancing innovative thinking

3) Do you think teaching SE students to think innovatively is important? Please explain if yes

3a) Is there or are there any components/aspects/competences within the current curriculum which is employed with the goal of enhancing innovative thinking within students? Please explain if yes.

3b) what teaching method(s) are employed in teaching these components/aspects/competences?

Section C: Curriculum content and teaching methods enhancing responsible SE

4) It has been noticed that, social enterprises are gradually losing their “social status” due to the fact that most existing social enterprises are making deceptive claims and do not really maintain the role of the game by creating value.

Also, it has been noticed that little attention is paid by SE education towards employing conceptual or ethical conceptual issues/aspects/components/competences and teaching methods that will enable students to identify as responsible social entrepreneurs and to potentially carry out social change activities responsibly

4a) Are there any conceptual issues/aspects/components/competences within your currently employed curriculum that tackle or attempt to tackle this issue? Please explain if yes.

4b) What teaching method(s) do you currently employ in teaching these Issues/aspects/components/competences towards tackling this problem?

4c) In your opinion, which are some of the components/aspects/competences you suggest when employ in SE will enable students to identify as responsible social entrepreneurs and to potentially carry out social change activities responsibly?
4d) In your opinion, what teaching method(s) do you suggest should be employ in teaching these components/aspects/competences?
Appendix E: Post social entrepreneurship (SE) Students interview guide.

Research Title: The role of business schools in educating social entrepreneurs: An exploratory study of UK business schools.

Purpose of interviewing: To identify the best teaching methods and curriculum content that can enhance social innovative thinking in students and their motivation to potentially become responsible social entrepreneurs.

N.B. A responsible social entrepreneur for this study is a social entrepreneur who remains true to the original idea of creating social value and reinvesting profit for more social change activities.

N.B. Social innovative thinking for this study is the ability to come up with new ideas or ways to resolve social problems. For example, how to generate the financial resources needed to achieve social value creation objectives and creating new legal.

Section A: General Feedback

1. After attaining all the classes and getting involved in all the tasks that were required from students:

a) Did you acquire the expected skills? Please explain if yes.

b) Are you motivated and equipped with the skills needed to start your own or contribute towards the growth of an existing social enterprise? Please explain if yes.

If no, did what was taught or the method(s) used in teaching not meet your expectation? Please explain. Any other reason, please explain.

c) How do you intend to carry out social change activities responsibly?

d) Do you think undertaking this module has actually enable you to identify and see yourself as a responsible social entrepreneur? Please explain if yes.

e) Do you think undertaking this module has actually enable you to think in an innovative way towards tackling social issues? Please explain if yes.

f) What new ideas have you achieved and how has it or will it contribute towards successfully starting and running your own social enterprise or to the growth of an existing social enterprise?

Section B: Curriculum content and teaching methods enhancing innovative thinking
2 Which of the content below enhances your thinking innovatively? Please chose and explain why if any

a) The business generation canvas model

b) Divergent and convergent thinking tools

c) Triple bottom line theory

d) The theories of effectuation and bricolage

e) Competence, learning contract and team building theories

f) Practice base theory

g) Book review on the social engagements of well known social entrepreneurs.

h) Historical and contemporary issues

i) Mapping technique( using Alan(2006) venn diagram with 3 circles of social, commercial and economics to map where social activities are taking place, mapping and identifying marketing values in which a business is going to operate, imaginatively making new combinations of capabilities from case studies)-G, L

j) Resource base theory and techniques of thinking about the resources that one has or how to get access to resources for e.g. grants, donations etc.

Any other, please explain

3) Which of the teaching methods below enable you to understand and employ better the selected content? Please explain

a) Getting involved in social enterprise network

b) Case study (i.e. studying in a working environment a particular social organisation)

c) Case study (i.e. studying in the classroom or in a non working environment a particular social organisation).

d) Learning by doing in teams.

e) Collaborating as a team (with classmates) on a particular social project)

f) Field work (visiting as a team a social organisation)

g) Highly interactive classroom seminars
h) Interactive group discussions and presentation

i) Interact and interview a social entrepreneur you identified as a mentor.

j) Listening to guest speakers during classroom seminars.

k) Lectures

l) Social business plan

m) Having a personal connection to a business idea

n) Comparative analysis on real cases

Any other, please explain

Section C: Curriculum content and teaching methods enhancing responsible S E

4) Did any of the content below motivate you to be more ethical and responsible when carrying out social business transactions? Please chose and explain why

a) Core values of integrity

b) Practice base theory

c) Measuring social outcome (social impact, SROI)

d) Reviewing the biography of well known social entrepreneurs

e) Ethical branding

f) Responsible management principles

g) Criticism and the dark side of CSR

h) Identities and legalities.

Any other, please explain

4) Which of the teaching methods below enable you to understand and employ better the selected content? Please explain

a) Network with ethical mentors and practitioners

b) Comparative analysis on real cases
c) Collaborating as a team (with classmates) on a particular social project.

d) Case study (i.e. studying in a working environment a particular social organisation)

e) Case study (i.e. studying in the classroom or in a non working environment a particular social organisation).

f) Studying cases to identify the social value created.

g) Interacting with a social entrepreneur you identified as a mentor.

h) Listening to guest speakers during classroom seminars.

i) Interactive group discussions and presentation
Appendix F: examples of student’s responses on the skills acquired, whether they are motivated and have identified themselves as responsible social entrepreneurs and social innovative thinkers and new ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Example of students responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td>I learn how to be innovative and build a business proposal. How to be successful in business. How to generate the resources needed to run a business. That experience was very important to me as a young person as it gave me the opportunity to practically organise an event. It gives the opportunity to meet real people and how to communicate with them and have the right response as a professional. WS1 I developed skills to talk to people. I was not really good in talking. Trying to convince people to help. We did a global food fare. We had to talk to restaurants and tell them why we are doing that. What they could gain. This was the main skill I developed. I learned a lot on how to work in a group with people with different skills. Every one worked in different areas. I am studying design but I worked with people studying other areas. WS3 What I learnt is that, most people are willing to help. I think people should try more. If people try a good initiative, others will joint and help. If we have a good project and present it, people will help. WS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>I want to start one. But I will first contribute to one. I will contribute in designing in the context of SE. I think they needed help. For instance the charity we raised fund for, need help on how to raise fund in order to meet their social needs. So I am thinking of doing something that has to do with design in order to meet social needs. WS3 Well academic and real life is different. The exercise we undertake was one time exercise. They did not show us how to sustain it. It was really interesting because it was actually generating revenue from Zero and I think looking into how that particular business idea can be sustain will be great. WS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social innovative thinking</strong></td>
<td>I came up with a new idea to race money for the Cancer research which was to sell popcorn. I never saw some body using this idea to raise fund for a charity. It just came naturally. WS1 We collaborated and came up with an idea on something that can make a difference and create value. We work in teams to build this idea. One of our team members was involve in a food fare when she was in high school. So it was the matter of how to link this idea with something that has to do with it and create value. Westminster is multicultural with students from different nations. In many of these countries, there is lack of food quality. So our idea was to promote the presence of food from a variety of countries and continent. WS4 To actually get the movie itself from the company you have to pay a fee. We were unable to provide the money. So it made us think of ways on how to get and create value. I was actually able to find a friend of mind and explain to her the situation and if she could ask her manager if he would be able to donate for us and he donated 75% of it and we started calling around local businesses to help. It made me think about several ways to get things done. It is not about thinking inside the box, it made us think outside the box. We have to put a very good analytical approach to ways of thinking to actually get things done. WS6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
<td>I have a personal connection with the event I organised and it made me involve in a more responsible way because my father passed away as a result of Cancer. WS1 The event we did was really great. I had never done something like that before. I learned a lot. I have also start thinking on other ways to do business in a more sustainable way. Business is not all about trading things with people is more than that. WS3 I think social change and responsibility really brings values and moral. This has actually enabled me to see the value of being ethical in any business I am involve in. To see the positive impact it will bring not just to me but to the society. WS4 I will like to visit social foundations and help. I work for micro soft and it has some social projects where they visit charities and donate presents to kids particularly during Christmas and Easter. But I think that is not enough and I will like to help more. WS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td>In a way yes. What I have found is that ethics and values are high priority to me. I think everything should be done morally. My interest has become more focus in the way business is done in social enterprise. For me the biggest issue in social enterprises is that it is not legally define. To me social enterprise is the best solution to charity. Because is like keep asking for help or money more and more. OBS2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Motivation**             | I would say no because before taking this course I was already involved in SE for 25 years. What I have learnt is not new to
Concerning the legal structure, I will be writing up a plan in my research project to revise the existing legal structure and to put in place an entirely different system. I think the existing systems are inefficient. There are some frictions in the fact that there are about 8 different legal structures for social enterprises and I believe that could be streamlined and change in a particular way. It will protect the social enterprise activities and differentiate it from a regular business enterprise. OBS1

But it has to do with the legal structure and the finance side of it. Actually it has enabled me just to start thinking on how to address these issues differently but I have not practically carried any out. Everything has been more theoretical. OBS2

I am a mature student. I am personally engaged in a social enterprise which I will continue with. I have always done things in a transparent way but now, I will very much document everything. OBS1

For me, my strength is in the management side of things. Working with other people to make things happen and making it easier for them to get on with their jobs. The concept makes you to constantly question your decision making and what business is for. I am not happy with the current mainstream system of business. The whole system of economics. It makes you address your values constantly. What I am willing to compromise and what I am not willing to and it is a very difficult question to answer but yes. It has. OBS2

The course itself introduces you to a lot of information about how social enterprise operates in different context. The course also enables you to understand the social mission and how it works in different organisation. From that perspective, it gives you the knowledge even when you have to start a business on your own. It gives you the foundation and contested issues for instance how social enterprises operate within different jurisdiction in the UK. So is a platform. GS3

I partly was expecting to get may be some more practical but is more theoretical. I was hoping to get more international opening but they are quite a lot of interesting things we are learning. Especially on entrepreneurial modelling. They are so many things that interest me like how people approach their social enterprise. However I was really looking for more practical skills. GS4

At first I had just some idea about SE. After this I have more knowledge. Like the foundation to SE class introduced us to some theories for example the growth theory will be very helpful. I want to help small scale farmers in my country. GS4

Looking at the environment of Thailand the growth theory has made me think of how to help them expand. GS2

I am actually motivated. It has been my dream for a very long time and that is why I am happy to have made with people who share the same dream and most students are international students with a lot of different ideas of what the sector is in their own country and it has been very motivating. GS4

Some of the ways entrepreneurs tackled social problems. How you conceptualise the problem give you a platform of how you are going to address the problem. A lot of the information that we have been given shows you how different people look at social problems. How they use their own experiences to apply it to the social problem. GS3

I think it has helped in some ways on what kind of structure to be and how you can measure finances and your outcomes. GS4

Understanding the need of the beneficiaries is important. From the information I have obtained, is that commercial enterprise is different from social enterprise. It is understanding the need of the beneficiaries as well as the environment so, the idea of the triple bottom line concept is important and your own sustainability. How you shape your social mission is important. What do you want to achieve. My understanding is that, the fact that you are using your own input and ideas to tackle a social problem is what makes the difference. GS3

One of the idea I have achieve is how to help small scale farmers in my country grow. How to increase their income. So more of the community interest company since we do not have more of them. Now I want to organise a community where it will not only be about earning income but we can look at the social value it will create. At first is just about earning income but now there is need in addition a social angle to it. GS2
skills

I did not actually know what SE was. It has made me think of business in not just profit making terms but what this business can offer to people and not just making profit. NS1

Before taking this module, I did not even know what social enterprise is about. The fact that is different from charity, like actually coming up with a traditional business model but with the aim of achieving a social objective. Also the fact that, you can actually get different allowances from the government while doing this. NS4

motivation

Yes I am. I have more knowledge about what SE is all about now as compared to when I just began the module. This has actually help encourage me and currently we are looking into a project aim towards setting up a social enterprise. But think there is still a lot to learn. NS1

I have actually learnt new things that I can apply now. Now I am able to have a free talk about it. As I said, this module has been practical and is the only we had so far. I will like more modules to be practical. NS2

This module has given me a good experience. The way it is being taught and how is all about doing something for the general community. NS3

Case 4: Social innovative thinking

Northampton

We have been given the opportunity to think and present a business proposal. So I can say it has provided me that thinking atmosphere. NS2

Yes of course. We have the opportunity to come up with a social enterprise idea and make a presentation. NS3

responsible

I think remembering the social problem that you are trying to solve is really important and carry out every activity towards solving that problem. Remembering and keeping in mind the social problem is important. NS1

I think I will be good in SE. I did not know anything about it at the beginning. I have always wanted to help other people. Maybe charity work but this gives me the opportunity to apply business skills while doing good at the same time and to make it a sustainable enterprise rather than a charity enterprise which just depend on donations. NS1

From what has been gathered so far, I am really encouraged to carry out business in a more responsible way. NS3

It makes me see myself doing something in this direction and now, each time I do something or get involved in something I always think of how that particular thing can help someone. NS2

New ideas

I came up with the youth hospital idea to be based here in Northampton. A lot of the ideas I have, was inspired by other existing ideas. I spent time in the hospital and experience a youth group in the hospital. So I thought why not team with class mate and adapt this idea for this area. NS1

I have thought of doing something that will enable immigrant improve their English. I have also thought of creating a restaurant that will employ immigrants. NS2

We have been considering ugly food. That is food that has been parcelled to be thrown away. We have been thinking of approaching restaurant and how they can consider giving this food to those in need in their local community or even companies that normally throw food we can actually get this food when not expired and help those in need. NS4

skills

Well, I know more about the concept of entrepreneurship, more about personal wealth creation. I came to realise that there are two types of entrepreneurship. One is for value creation and the other is people who just create wealth for themselves. There are too many theories than practical, which was slightly not compatible with my expectation. LS3

I have increased my knowledge on the work that is done in the field and best practices for achieving those outcomes. LS1

motivation

Before undertaking this module I did not have any social entrepreneurship knowledge. Yes I can say I am motivated towards creating a business not just to make profit but also create a social impact. LS3

I do think that it is good to have the skills and knowledge and have a broader awareness of SE to promote social values in any existing business in the social context. That is very important to me. The methods and what we have been taught in
the course about those social values and why they are there, gives a pathway to work more effectively in the SE sector. LS2

You need to be knowledgeable about the purpose of the work. The objectives that have to be achieved and the methods and style teachers teach them. I believe that it has enhanced my thinking and creating innovative ideas to help solve problems. This is very important in the social enterprise sector. LS1

The module was more theoretical. So it has not very much offer that opportunity to be innovative. I think to be innovative or think in an innovative way, to me it demands more practice rather than just classroom knowledge. LS3

I do really think it has. The course has opened the door to other thinking that I was not aware of. This has encouraged me to study and carrying out activities of this sort. It has encouraged me to think of following a research interest in this and had not been the case if I did not do this module. It encourages me to ask more questions make more enquiries. I think teaching content and methods can be very helpful. LS1

From my perspective, I will put in my knowledge and experience. I have been working in this sector for 10 years. So I can now use the theoretical knowledge and help communities in my locality on how to better up. I will be working in the economic sector to help start-ups and SMEs to start the business and operate better, by applying my experience and Knowledge. LS3

That is a very important. I think this is what all this is about in the social context that is creating value and I really believe in that because value cannot be measured just in terms of money or profit. Adding value is really important to me. LS2: Yes. I believe in those values and I work in a sector where I will be using better the values. Covering an analysis of the values will be important and good for me. I can actually give more back when in work place. LS2

this is a very important part of social enterprises because, a social enterprise is a business engage in business and direct the profit back in to the business so is for the benefit of the public. I will make sure the profit I make is redirected back for more social change activities. LS1

I am thinking of how to create international link between UK and China in the ethnic minority sector. LS3
### Appendix G: Teaching content and methods enhancing social innovative thinking: case by case emerging codes from students

**Content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Example of students responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource base theory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>This component is one of the most important to me. You need to know what you have and to use it in different ways that can be applied to the situation to get resources. WS3 Resource base theory. Its enable you to analyse your resources and think on how to use them and achieve your goal. WS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case 1: Westminster</strong></td>
<td>Bricolage and effectuation</td>
<td>We use what we had at hand and make something out of it. We examine our resources and then figure out how we can use it to achieve our goals. It was very much problem solving. WS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business canvas model</td>
<td>Business model canvas: Using this is quite nice and it is really an easy way to understand and put down what you need to succeed in a business. It helps see what is happening. WS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book review</td>
<td>Reviewing books really enable you to understand what has been done and how to better it up. Mapping helps to identify what social values have been created. This enable you to think also on new ways towards solving particular social issues or even think on new ones. WS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case 2: Oxford Brookes</strong></td>
<td>Triple bottom line</td>
<td>The triple bottom line. The idea behind this. OBS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical and contemporary</td>
<td>Obviously, you need to know the history of why things are the way they are. How we got here. Thinking about cooperative and see how to re-emphasise value and not only about profit. OBS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case 3: Goldsmith</strong></td>
<td>Historical and contemporary</td>
<td>Historical and contemporary issues are one of the most interesting. Bringing to us how people have gone about their innovation. Identifying a social problem. GS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issues</td>
<td>Book review on the social engagements of well known social entrepreneur. As I said, in my country, we do not have many social enterprises reviewing books from different part of the world gives me ideas. GS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource base theory</td>
<td>We have come by Resource base theory and techniques of thinking about the resources that one has or how to get access to resources for e.g. grants, donations etc. briefly but not really deep. GS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case 4: Northampton</strong></td>
<td>Business model canvas</td>
<td>The business model canvas. It really helps to get everything written down and set up in a nice and logical way. Any one that looks at it can see what you are thinking. This really helps us in our group. NS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divergence and convergence</td>
<td>Divergence and convergence thinking make you think on how you can develop yourself and think like a social entrepreneur which is divergence and convergence thinking. NS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thinking tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triple bottom line</td>
<td>Triple bottom line theory. This will help me. I can have an idea and think of a market after which, come up with something that will build that idea. So like my restaurant idea, the triple bottom line will always remind me to meet all my goals as a social entrepreneur. NS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case 5: Lancaster</strong></td>
<td>Resource base theory</td>
<td>Resource base theory and techniques of thinking about the resources that one has or how to get access to resources for e.g. grants, donations. LS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business canvas model</td>
<td>Business canvas model. LS3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historical and contemporary issues

Methods

Case 1: Westminster
Interactive group discussions and presentation
Anything interactive where you brainstorm ideas in groups. This gives you the opportunity to get different options towards finding solutions. WS1

Team work on a real social project
I really prefer team work on a real life project and interactive group discussions. Interactive class rooms are a way of putting people under pressure. WS4

Personal connection
If you are personally connected to something, you will work harder to achieve it. WS3

Case 2: Oxford Brookes
Interactive group discussion and presentations
Interactive group discussion and presentations. OBS2

Comparative analysis on real cases
Comparative analysis on real cases. OBS1

Case 3: Goldsmith
Experience (intererviewing social entrepreneurs)
Interact and interview a social entrepreneur you identified as a mentor. We actually interviewed social entrepreneurs on how they have structured their organisation. This really opened my mind. GS2

Experience (learning by doing)
The idea of experiential learning by doing is something that really needs to be incorporated in this field. Learning by doing. Incorporating the practical component into the program is important. GS4.

Case studies
For me it will be discussing cases in group and interviewing social entrepreneurs. We went out and have a chart with social entrepreneurs. GS1

Guests speaking
We had speakers who come in and talk about their own businesses so it gives you ideas. We did field work which incorporate interviewing social entrepreneurs. The interaction and interviewing was important. The practical aspects works for me. GS3

Interactive group discussions and presentation
Interactive group discussions and Presentation. We have groups and we come from different countries so is important to share ideas. GS2

Case 4: Northampton
Personal connection
Personal connection with the social idea has been helpful because that is what makes you commit and be a real social entrepreneur. NS1

Experience (learning by doing, field work on real projects as a team)
To me anything that has to with firsthand experience. Like the case where we visited the social enterprise, we actually interview them on how they operate and it was a good experience. It gives the opportunity to be able to think and learn from other people experience towards improving your ideas. The least will be the case where a lecturer will just come in, lecture and leave. NS4
A combination of theory and practical helps you think in order to get everything right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 5: Lancaster</th>
<th>Group discussion and presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think I do that the entire course. We do a lot of presenting of ideas, concepts, and historical things in the form of practice. That is important to me. I get a lot out of that as it's promotes the values and share them with others. Presentation part is important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field work</th>
<th>Field work (visiting as a team, a social organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Appendix H: Teaching content and methods enhancing responsible S E: case by case emerging codes from students

### Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Example of students responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1: Westminster</td>
<td>Core values of integrity</td>
<td>I think having moral values that keeps reminding of the need to be responsible while doing business is important. Aspects that will keep reminding of how to be compassionate, kind is something I am really developing and I think SE is a good foundation. WS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2: Oxford Brookes</td>
<td>Ethical branding, Measuring outcomes</td>
<td>This really has to do with the companies. They need to be transparent in their reports on their activities. WS5 Measuring outcomes. It is important to measure and know the level of impact created. It also helps determine how effective what has been put in works. OBS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3: Goldsmith</td>
<td>Core values of integrity, Measuring outcome</td>
<td>Core values of integrity. I think it is hard to remind dignified and maintaining integrity. I really applaud people who have tried to maintain integrity and really communicate transparently for example when it has to do with funding. This is where I think people turn to fall down. I think as far as individuals can communicate effectively what they have done and why, I am ok with it because sometimes we have to do what we have to do to sustain a business. OBS2 For me is a more personal thing. Core values of integrity like having a list of things that remind you of what is expected from a social entrepreneur. As I said is more personal because if you are in an enterprise of such nature, you will not recruit any type of person but someone with good ethics. GS1 The SROI component really kind of gives at each stage the impact the organisation have created. How it affects the beneficiaries in the whole process. The idea of social investment I really think is the core. GS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4: Northampton</td>
<td>Ethical branding, Criticism and the dark side of CSR, Identities and legalities</td>
<td>One of the enterprise I studied, look at how one lady set up a social enterprise and was really unethical but she later realise and went back to ethics. So I think learning about other people experience really helps me. NS1 Criticism and the dark side of CSR. I have been more aware about how companies do things not actually because they really want to help but because they want to use that to get more customers. NS2 Identities and legalities help identify the pending needs and doing everything possible to meet these needs. NS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5: Lancaster</td>
<td>Criticism and the dark side of CSR</td>
<td>Criticism and the dark side of CSR. LS1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methods

| Case 1: | Interactive group discussions and | I think group work works better. WS5 |
| Case 2: | Interactive group discussions | Interactive group discussions. To me, I learn more when discussing in groups. OBS1 |
| Case 3: | Guestspeakers | Listening to guest speakers during classroom seminars where they outline what social value their organisation create. GS2 |
| Case 3: | Comparative analysis of real case study | Case study where we examine the social impact of particular social organisations. Looking at the pros and cons. GS2 |
| Case 4: | Collaborating as a team on a real project | You can have ideas but working together enable you get other people point of views. NS1 |
| Case 5: | Group discussion and presentation | Group discussion and presentation. LS3 |
## Appendix I: content and teaching methods that might enhance potential social innovative thinking social entrepreneurs: selected quotes

### Social innovative thinking: Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st order code</th>
<th>Selected quotes on preliminary codes (See chapter 6: sections 6.3 and appendix G)</th>
<th>2nd order Codes</th>
<th>Selected quotes on 1st order codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors/syllabus</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Masters level: Goldsmith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity recognition</td>
<td>Historical and contemporary issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The history and contemporary issues of SE and the biography of current social enterprises/entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book review and the historical issues understand the context of SE in different countries and how social impact affects governmental policies. GS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book review on the social engagements of well known social entrepreneur. As I said, in my country, we do not have many social enterprises. Re viewing books from different part of the world gives me ideas. GS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at the enterprises that already exist and how far they have gone is what makes the difference. Understanding what worked and what did not. GS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking tools (mapping and case studies illustrative techniques)</td>
<td>Resource identification</td>
<td>Identification of resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book review</td>
<td>Resource base theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We use the resource base theory and techniques of thinking about the resources that one has or how to get access to resources. GI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hope to provide students not just with the tools and techniques required for entrepreneurship or SE but for supporting SE. This includes the ability to think about new legal structures. Legal framework in terms of new type of financial support for instance. GI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will focus on the legal framework. That is the biggest issue of social enterprise in Jamaica. GS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Undergraduate level: Westminster, Northampton, Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricolage and effectuation</td>
<td>Bricolage and effectuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concept of bricolage and effectuation</td>
<td>Bricolage and effectuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First of all we did not have money. We actually had to think a way to get money without the money. This pushed us to think a lot of different ways. WS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising money for the charity made me see how it is important to do things different through innovation. The idea to create some sort of a global restaurant came up and this is something that has never been done before because our university is quite multinational. WS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will be exposed to a variety of new business ideas and concepts. WI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource base theory</td>
<td>Identification of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was the main part actually. We thought about the people who can give us this money. We also thought of how to give something different to the charity. This enabled us to innovate. WS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The point of applying theories from other disciplines into the social context of entrepreneurship really gets students to think outside the box. LI1
We ask students to present to us and the second seminars involve using a particular theory from SE or from other management courses and apply them in the social context of entrepreneurship. LI1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business canvas model</th>
<th>Divergent and convergent thinking</th>
<th>Thinking tool (mapping technique)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A lot of what we are doing is to encourage students to use a lot of different tools and techniques to enable them to think in a more creative way and to develop their thoughts and ideas. NI1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book review</td>
<td>Business model canvas</td>
<td>Thinking tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We use case studies and social enterprise business plan is what they do in the second term where they use the business model canvas to set up that. NI1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northampton

Thinking tools
- Divergence and convergence thinking tool
- Business model canvas
- Triple bottom line

Lancaster

Thinking tools
- Resource base theory
- Business canvas model
- Historical and contemporary issues

Oxford Brookes

Thinking tools
- Book review, historical and contemporary issues
- Historical and contemporary issues

Foundation level: Oxford Brookes

- Thinking tool (book review/history)
  - Looking at historical and contemporary issues looking at what has already been innovated at the moment and then possibly developing it in the future. OBI2
  - Obviously, you need to know the history of why things are the way there are. How we got here. Thinking about cooperative and see how to re-emphasise value and not only about profit. OBS2
  - Concerning the legal structure, I will be writing up a plan in my research project to revise the existing legal structure and to put in place an entirely different system. OBS1
## Social Innovative thinking: Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st order code</th>
<th>Selected quotes on preliminary codes (See chapter 6: sections 6.3 and appendix G)</th>
<th>2nd order Codes</th>
<th>Selected quotes on 1st order codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructors, syllabi</strong></td>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td>Masters level: Goldsmith</td>
<td><strong>Goldsmith</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure (guest speakers from different social background)</td>
<td>Experience (interviewing social entrepreneurs)</td>
<td>Interviewing social entrepreneurs, guest speaking</td>
<td>Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We did fieldwork which incorporate interviewing social entrepreneurs. The interaction and interviewing was important. The practical aspects works for me.</td>
<td>GS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a lot of guest speakers. We have over 20 guest speakers from different social enterprise background.</td>
<td>GI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (Learning by doing)</td>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>Interactive group discussion on real life cases.</td>
<td>Interactive group discussions and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have groups and we come from different countries so is important to share ideas.</td>
<td>GS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques for imaginatively making new combinations of capabilities. We use case studies to illustrate the issues in choosing the correct legal structure.</td>
<td>GI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive group discussions and presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group presentations</td>
<td>Interactive group discussions and presentation</td>
<td>Group social business planning, implementation and presentation</td>
<td>Experiential learning (Learning by doing in teams) /presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most effective way to understand entrepreneurship is to practice it. WS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity through bricolage and effectuation this two and team work for they cannot work alone. WI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initially we did not know what to do but thinking collaboratively we figured out what to do step by step. WS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experiential learning (Learning by doing in teams)

Team work on a real social project

Personal connection

Develop personal attitude and entrepreneurial spirit to successfully grow their own business ideas in an innovative way. NS. I think if students have a personal connection with the subject, they are going to be much more open to ideas to be creative. For example challenging students to come up with a social enterprise idea. And find out whether students have personal connection with those particular issues. NI1

Personal connection with the social idea has been helpful because that is what makes you commit and be a real social entrepreneur. NS1

Experiential learning (real case studies, guest speaking, and interviewing mentors)

Personal connection

Group social business planning, presentation and potential implementation

The business model canvas really helps to get everything written down and set up in a nice and logical way. Any one that looks at it can see what you are thinking. This really helps us in our group. NS1

Students visit these social entrepreneurs and get to hear from them and ask them questions to improve their understanding. Students have to present on their social enterprise idea in groups. NI1

Develop skills needed to identify social problems and pitch for funding needed to practically operate their social business proposals. NS

Northampton

Explore and present business ideas in teams

Pitching for funds

Social business plan

Experience (Hubs, alumni guest speaking, teams)

Personal connection

Group discussions and presentations on general management theories in the context of SE

Northampton

Personal connection

Experience (learning by doing, field work on real project as a team)

Group work/knowledge transfer via presentation/

We ask students to present to us and the second seminars involve using a particular theory from SE or from other management courses and apply them in the social context of entrepreneurship. L1

We ask students to combine business and social objectives and reflect in teams. L12

We do a lot of presenting of ideas, concepts, and historical things in the form of practice. That is important to me. I get a lot out of that as it’s promotes the values and share them with others. Presentation part is important. LS2

Lancaster

Experience (field work, network)

Transferring knowledge via presentation

Comparative analysis on real cases

Field work

Group discussion and presentation

Comparative analysis on real cases
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford Brookes</th>
<th>Oxford Brookes</th>
<th>Foundation level: Oxford Brookes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning (real case studies, field work approach)</td>
<td>Interactive group discussion and presentations</td>
<td>Experiential learning (real case studies, field work approach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The huge part of the current curriculum particularly case studies gets them think outside the box and not to restrict them with what textbooks say. OB1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think the best will be the engagement with the real world. This could be done through real case studies. OB1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative analysis on real cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: content and teaching methods that might enhance potential responsible social entrepreneurs: selected quotes

### Responsible SE: Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st order codes</th>
<th>Selected quotes on preliminary codes (See chapter 6: sections 6.4 and appendix H)</th>
<th>2nd order Codes</th>
<th>Selected quotes on 1st order codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors/ syllabi</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>Masters level: Goldsmith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td>Measuring social outcome</td>
<td>Core values of integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core values of integrity/the dark side of CSR</td>
<td>Teach about the dark side and critical awareness of traditional businesses. GS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible management</td>
<td>Measuring outcome</td>
<td>Measuring outcomes</td>
<td>Have a good knowledge on how to evaluate social impact using a variety of different techniques. GS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The SROI component it really kind of gives at each stage the impact the organisation have created. How it affects the beneficiaries in the whole process. GS3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criticism of CSR

| Undergraduate level: Westminster, Northampton, Lancaster | |
|-----------------------------------------------||
| Westminster | Westminster | Practice base theory/identity | Core values of integrity |
|              |              | Core values of integrity | We teach students about the core values of integrity. WI1. It's all about ethics and how integrity is involve in teaching SE. the students most believe and be transform and become does. It is not just class room kind of thing. WI1 |
|              |              | Core values of integrity | If you are someone that cares for humanity, then you will always want to create value. Everyone needs to be encouraged to help either through education or any other way. WS5 |
|              |              | Core values of integrity | Aspect that will keep reminding of how to be compassionate, kind is something I am really developing and I think SE is a good foundation. WS4 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core values of integrity</th>
<th>Ethical branding</th>
<th>Ethical social enterprise branding/ dark side of CSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes people need funding for their social activities. And people need to figure out if is just a business that happens to be benefiting people or is actually a social enterprise. NI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We ask students to research themselves and see if organisations really create social value as they say. We expect them to take the criticism of CSR and create something new that will actually create value in different context. NI2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will make sure the profit I make is redirected back for more social change activities. LS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One lady set up a social enterprise and was really un ethical but she later realise and went back to ethics. NS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been more aware about how companies do things not actually because they really want to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
help but because they want to use that to get more customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring outcomes</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal attitude</td>
<td>Ethical branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring outcome</td>
<td>Criticism and the dark side of CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical branding/dark side of CSR</td>
<td>Identities and legalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Criticism and the dark side of CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford Brookes</th>
<th>Foundation level: Oxford Brookes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>biography of well known social entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical branding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core values of integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book review on the biography of social entrepreneurs and core values of integrity</td>
<td>For example, Mohammed Yunus, we do a lot of work on him. We get students to read his biography and his book review of his life. I really applaud people who have tried to maintain integrity and really communicate transparently for example when it has to do with funding. I have always done things in a transparent way but now, I will very much document everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBS1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBS2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Responsible SE: Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st order codes</th>
<th>Selected quotes on preliminary codes (See chapter 6: sections 6.4 and appendix H)</th>
<th>2nd order Codes</th>
<th>Selected quotes on 1st order codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Instructors/yllabi students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goldsmith</th>
<th>Goldsmith</th>
<th>Masters level: Goldsmith</th>
<th>Goldsmith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network with ethical mentors</td>
<td>Guest speakers</td>
<td>Interact with Guest speakers beyond the classroom</td>
<td>Listening to guest speakers during classroom seminars where they outline what social value their organisation create. GS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since his retirement from GOAL in 2012, John has set himself the challenge of inspiring other people to become social entrepreneurs. GS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative analysis of real case study</td>
<td>Compararative analysis of real cases</td>
<td>Case study where we examine the social impact of particular social organisations. GS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network with ethical mentors and practitioners</td>
<td>Interactive group discussions and presentation</td>
<td>Group comparative analysis of real social enterprise cases and commercial business.</td>
<td>We look particularly at the social impact of social organisations. NI1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looking at social impact, students compare and contrast social entrepreneurs and traditional entrepreneurs. NI1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We do a lot of presenting of ideas I get a lot out of that as it promote the values LS2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice base integrated curriculum</th>
<th>Network with mentors</th>
<th>Team work on a real social project</th>
<th>Working together enable you get other people point of views. NS1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Group discussion and presentation on mentor`s interviews feedback</th>
<th>Students will have to find their own mentor. They work with their own mentors and have their own networks with social entrepreneurs. WI1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying the right mentor gives the encouragement to continue with what your intentions are. WS6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think you need to be interactive. People need to interact and learn how others are successful. WS3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Comparative analysis              | Collaborating as a team on a real project | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lancaster</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Experience (learning by doing)**
- Group discussion and presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford Brookes</th>
<th>Oxford Brookes</th>
<th>Foundation level: Oxford Brookes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparative analysis on real cases</td>
<td>Interactive group discussions</td>
<td>Have a good knowledge of what makes a social enterprises “ethical” and what makes it different from corporate social responsibilities and the advantages of ethical branding.OBS They do that by comparing and contrasting between multinational.OBI1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speaking</td>
<td>Network with ethical mentors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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