

Social Entrepreneurship: The Power to Remake Post-Covid-19 Nigeria for the Better

Ugbomhe O. Ugbomhe and Akhator Akhere Peter

(PhD) Department of Business Administration, Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria

Abstract: Social entrepreneurs are agents for social change on account of their ability to recognize and pursue opportunities to create social change for improved quality of life. The role of social entrepreneurship in society is important in the era of pandemics. Thus, the world health pandemic caused by the Covid-19 outbreak has increased the need for social entrepreneurs in post-pandemic Nigeria. In spite of the relevance of social entrepreneurship in the creation of social change, the research concerning recognition and pursuing of opportunities in times of post-pandemic are uncommon. The purpose of the study is to reveal the role of social entrepreneurship in remaking post-Covid-19 Nigeria for the better. The paper adopted secondary research where recent literature on present topic is explored to explain the role of social entrepreneurship in post-Covid-19 Nigeria for innovation. The findings from the conceptual analysis revealed that social entrepreneurship holds a promising future for post-Covid-19 Nigeria, so long as social entrepreneurship pays attention to social integration and technology to bridge the gap in education, employment, quality metal, health and manufacturing services in low resource sectors which are more chronically impacted by the crisis. The paper recommended that significant improvement in the relevant skills and expertise among the present and future social entrepreneurs through widening the scope of social entrepreneurial training. The research on social entrepreneurship in post-pandemic is not limited and convergent and needs deeper investigations and concrete evidence which can help in its practical implementation.

Keywords: Social entrepreneurship, covid-19, pandemic, innovation, social integration, technology.

INTRODUCTION

One of the key economic development strategies to grow economic development of a country and to sustain its competitiveness in facing the increasing challenges of globalization is entrepreneurship (Shamsudin, Mamun, Nawi, Nasir, & Zakaria, 2017). Entrepreneurship is regarded as the solution to unemployment and unemployment rate. It provides a veritable platform on which new innovation rests and better ways of doing things. The importance of entrepreneurship is general across all developed countries where economic development and infrastructure are facilitated via the advancement of entrepreneurship (Kick & Lyons, 2016). Many countries have achieved this improvement by fostering and advocating the increase of entrepreneurship through initiatives, growth strategies and foresight of resources to the entrepreneurs and small business (Agarwal & Mulunga, 2022). The economic growth of advanced countries can be linked to the recognition of entrepreneurship which is the driving energy for the development of these countries (Arjum, Ranzan, Farrukh, Nazara Shahzad, 2018). Upon realizing the importance of entrepreneurship, the development of entrepreneurship in both concept and activity is attracting more recognition in Nigeria on account of recent realisation of its importance. What has attested to this fact is the number and variety of supporting mechanisms and policies packaged by the government for entrepreneurs to provide this.

Entrepreneurship is neither a *science* or an *art*. It is practice (Drucker, 1984).

Entrepreneurship means many things to many people, but generally, it focuses on profit making, independence, creativity, initiative, innovativeness and risk-taking.

The characteristic of every entrepreneur is identification of opportunities and making efforts to turn these opportunities into profit. Entrepreneurship is of different types which include scalable startup, small business, large company and social entrepreneurship. However, the type that is unique and less examined is social entrepreneurship. What makes social entrepreneurship differ from the other types is not only differences in its aims and objectives as it stresses on not only business development/enterprise but also the development of people, society and environment (Chou, 2018). Social entrepreneurship is concerned with the non-commercial and non-economic aspects of entrepreneurship goes before entrepreneurial inventions and it is the process of recognising and pursuing opportunities to create systemic social change, question the status quo by changing it to a fairer and a just society. Social entrepreneurship is to a great extent frequently connected with social work. Acquisition of profit is what differentiates social entrepreneurship from Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs). As stated by (Dey & Steyaert, 2010), social entrepreneurship gains

revenue for a giving enterprise, change society with a specific direction, start business or programmes that can assist profit sector or the oppressed organisation. It is an entry with a high impact that concentrates on its assessment to modify the world (Thompson, Mawson, Martin, 2017). Social innovation and profit cannot be ruled out as an impulse to challenge post-covid-19 crisis. Hence, facilitating post covid-19 challenges and nakba is completely reliant on social entrepreneurship. Today, social entrepreneurship is a fluid and contested phenomenon. In a sense, it is a practical or moral judgment of action searching for an established institutional narratives and conception.

Covid-19 pandemic was a huge danger that has endangered the social-economic system to the extent of bordering the brittle health systems across the world. After Covid-19 has subsided, the world is striving to respond to massive challenges and nakba caused by the crisis and this has led to a public health emergency (WHO Director- General, 2020). Hence in an attempt to make policies and programmes designed to be suitable for the advancement of social entrepreneurship in post Covid-19 nations such as Nigeria, there is the need to digup the underlying roles that have been summated to shaping desire of Nigeria to create new business within demesne of social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneur has been identified as being able to address social issues and earn an income for the fact that social entrepreneurs are motivated by purpose over profit. People who thought they could not do that because they needed to make a living for themselves might have just worked in a regular business and enter into any business or offer for any service of their own volition without pay at the reasonable time, but now it is known that they can make the two agreeable and linked.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Intractable social and environmental setbacks created by Covid-19 outbreak are everywhere and these have given rise to call for serious attention on social entrepreneurship in Nigeria. Thus, governments, businessmen, religion bodies and politicians are calling on efforts that focus on social and environmental objectives which governments, corporations and Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in post-pandemic Nigeria have gone after. There is no clear boundary regarding which social and environmental problems should be the responsibility of

governments in post-pandemic era and what problems may be left unimpeded for private sector, the market and Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) including social enterprises. In post-pandemic Nigeria, gap between the social demand for essential services and their supply through formal and informal institutions has provided the opportunity for social entrepreneurship to bridge the gap with social innovation and for common relief in post Covid-pandemic i.e. managing emergency business opportunities pivoting to meet the new needs for goods or services in post-pandemic Nigeria. These include training entrepreneurial skills to students and graduates of all disciplines could eliminate the unemployment problem of graduates, develop a variety of new entrepreneurship motivations and disciplines along with other subjects of existing disciplines. This implies that more graduates would establish businesses and create jobs for other unemployment youths (De Lange & Dodds, 2017). Even though enterprises are not required to work for the general good of the society, social entrepreneurs still have much to provide for the benefit of humanity and therefore should not be neglected in post-pandemic Nigeria because of their ingenuity and creativity in spinning up new firms.

Social entrepreneurship is important to economic growth, source of job creation and innovation and creativity. A return on investment and a return to society are sought. This forthcoming view is becoming globally accepted. However, the view has not yet resolved on the role of social entrepreneurship in post-pandemic Nigeria. However, it does agree that social entrepreneurs have been available for beneficial or practical use where others were not (Belts, Laud, Kretinin, 2018). In this paper, we review the present state of social entrepreneurship in light of post-pandemic Nigeria and how social entrepreneurship in post-pandemic Nigeria can create social value for the economic good of the country is very crucial. There are still limited studies on the issue even though social entrepreneurship has been viewed as essential to economic growth and development. The empirical studies have infrequently examined systematically social entrepreneurship as non-commercial aspect of growing a nation's economy. They are not concerned with examining the entrepreneurial processes in consideration of the emerging post-pandemic challenges. Many studies have not identified beckoning business opportunities for social entrepreneurship where social entrepreneurs can take advantages and

commence business. The few findings that exist are inconsistent. In relation to this, there is need to carry out a review of literature to effectively understand what social entrepreneurship can do effectively to rise again and remake or change post-pandemic Nigeria for the better and take advantage of the outbreak and more importantly where the government has placed greater emphasis on and to contribute to the development of understanding and promoting high-growth start-ups and individuals producing and selling personal protective equipment to those pivoting from local taxi driving into food and grocery delivery firms, liquor firms moving from brewery to making essential products like facemasks, etc in post-pandemic Nigeria.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The specific purpose of this study was on the following:

1. To examine the challenges of social entrepreneurship in post-pandemic Nigeria.
2. To identify skills and guidelines required for social entrepreneur in post-pandemic Nigeria.
3. To ascertain the roles of social entrepreneurs in combating social problems provoked by covid-19 pandemic, enhancing innovation and allocating government resources.

METHODOLOGY

The review employed descriptive methodology. Books, reports, research papers and articles regarded as secondary data were sought to meet the objectives of the study.

This secondary data source is advantageous in that it does not require access to respondents, thus it does not have a high cost. The study was expected to draw conclusion from examining the applicability of present literature as it is more of conceptual research of existing works available in other studies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship is an act of commencing a new firm or organisation in response to identified opportunities and culture that show the set of shared benefits, values and expected behavior (Onuoha, 2011). The concept is expected to bring out entrepreneurial skills such as a sense of responsibility, perseverance, risk-taking, practiviness (Basit, Sinq& Hassan, 2018).

Entrepreneurship is *the organizing and catalytic effort responsible for bringing about new economic activity (new goods or services) or the*

provisions of these products in some innovative way... Entrepreneurship requires the melding of ideas and opportunities with resources and overcoming whatever constraints lied between the conception and the successful implementation of a project (Young, 1987). In the literature of entrepreneurship, the conception of entrepreneurship by Schumpeter (1934) is characterized by taking advantage of untapped or idle markets, creating new organisational forms, experimenting with new combinations of products and services, survey raw materials from efficient or suitable channels, improve production and or delivery processes. Flowing from this definition, entrepreneurship energizes economic movement in society at different levels. Social entrepreneurship is regarded as a driver that creates innovation and creativity in different institutions be it public, private or third sector.

Social entrepreneurship is intrinsically difficult concept to pin down and describe. The emerging literature on entrepreneurship has not yet harmonized in opinion on a commonly accepted definition of social entrepreneurship. It is in a pre-examplinary state and theory is developing as the field is getting developed (Grandos, Hupic, Coakes& Mohammed, 2011). It is difficult if not impossible for social entrepreneurship to attract precisely agreed definition. Arising from this line of thinking, comprehensive range of possible interpretations of the concept exists. A clear definition of its domain do not exist and so it remains fragmerized in reaction to the different perspectives people have on social entrepreneurship (Bacq&Janseen, 2011). The fact that people come from different locations, differences in geographical and cultural backgrounds and differences in welfare and labour markets, influence how people understood social entrepreneurship.

Some people see it as “social business” (Barki, Comini, Cunlilffe, Hart & Rai, 2015), “civic entrepreneurship (Korosec& Berman, 2006) have been used by many to describe same feature.

The nature of social entrepreneurship calls for a combination of logics and activities typical for the social and public sectors and logic and activities associated with the business sector (Nicholis, 2006). On account of such hybridity, social entrepreneurship is context-oriented and expressed via different forms and combinations. There are two clear altruistic facts about entrepreneurship-profit and non-for-profit (Oberoi, Halsall &

Snowden, 2020). In some countries like United Kingdom and India, what has been a real stimulating factor in economic development is social entrepreneur. From the perspective of social sciences, a barrage of academic disclosure on the subject of social entrepreneurship/social enterprise exists (Oberoi, Halsall & Snowden, 2020; Oberoi, Halsall & Snowden, 2019b). There are many definitions of enterprise and social entrepreneurship. These definitions are major characteristics of social entrepreneurship and they are varied in innovativeness, creation of social change, diffused ownership and financial sustainability. Social enterprise is used to denote a variety of organisational and legal forms with different ownership structures, and motivation during their interaction with economic activities. For some, the political interest in the emergence of social enterprise is due to social enterprise is premised upon the fact that Western models of welfare provision are no longer fashionable and that welfare states are out of reach, they are bureaucratic and inefficient, and so to meet the social needs of people becomes a difficult task. Social enterprises are inevitable in the society because of functionalistic and managerial factors. Social entrepreneurship is the process of recognizing and resourcefully pursuing opportunities to create positive social change (centers.fugua.dike.edu). Social entrepreneurship is a business that shows various and innovative business models to attain the social and environmental objectives of the organization (Jilinskaya-pandey & Wade, 2019). It is a type of business that create social wealth and not economic wealth and its business goals. (Agaiwal & Mulungo, 2022) and utilize the thinking in both the business and nonprofit organisations to develop strategies that maximize their social impact. Social entrepreneurship is an entity which inculcates diverse and innovation business models with which social and environmental aims of the entrepreneurs can be achieved (Jilinskaya-Pandey & Wade, 2019). Social entrepreneurship is a young, knowledge demanding area and a social practice of interest to researchers and scholars (Granados, Hlupic, Coakes, Mohammed, 2011; Gras, Todd & Lumpkin, 2014; Brock & Kim 2011). It involves many different activities and processes that give rise to the creation and solidification of social value by individuals, groups of individuals and organizations. The activities of entrepreneurship which are carried out for social and/or public benefits are adjusted in relation to change and/or innovation which uses market-based

solution and tarry under the influence of their external environment (Brouard & Larivet, 2010).

Social entrepreneurship can be taken to mean the effectiveness of the turn of strategy as a key element through which knowledge about social value, changing the current state of affair, empowerment solution to government inability and I don't-care attitude to provide welfare programmes for citizenry to which achieving business success in post-covid-19 Nigeria is strictly tied to. The only common feature among these definitions is optimism, social change, and capable of mobilizing resources for the creation of positive social and environmental impact as it is believed that the primary motive of social entrepreneurship is social aim. The defining factors of social entrepreneurship include sociality innovation, market orientation and hybridity. Generally, three groups of definitions emanate from analysis of the discussions associated with social entrepreneurship. The first contextual view sees social entrepreneurship focusing on social organisations as business trading for a social aim. The second discussion focuses on social entrepreneurs which is seen as "hero" innovators and disordering aimed at changing the status quo of multiple sectors to fairer and egalitarian society. The third contextual view sees social entrepreneurship as realization of initiatives – either charity-like or business-like which are beneficial to the community where they are implementing, participation of marginalized groups or people in the society or local economy is facilitated. Social entrepreneurship comes up as a failure of either the private or public efforts.

Entrepreneurship and social entrepreneur use both discovery and creation strategies for acquiring opportunities (Gawell, 2013). The social entrepreneur brings value into existence and the traditional entrepreneur uncover opportunities (Korsgaard, 2011). The most important difference is that traditional entrepreneur is not interested in capturing value than in bringing value into existence and the reverse is the case for social entrepreneurs (Agafonow, 2014; Crisan & Borza, 2012). Social entrepreneur is also different from community organizers which bring attention to issues and situations which are not fully approached by local workers and others. Thus, they help to fit the opportunities and arouse interest in support for value creation by the social entrepreneur and social entrepreneur is also different from social workers are segment of the traditional governmental, non-profit landscape that

makes effort to look into social issues (Betts, Laud, Kretinin, 2018).

According to Bornstein (2007), what business entrepreneurs are to the economy are what social entrepreneurs are to social change. They are the creative individuals who challenge the existing norms, examine systematically new opportunities, refuse to give up and remake the world for the better through consistent innovation and adaptation. They are entrepreneurs with a set of tasks that fulfills a purpose (Dees, 2012) Social entrepreneurship are individuals that encourage transformation and someone who finds solution to social problems. While the term social entrepreneurship is new, its notion has been in place in the society since the 1980s (Pontus & Ulrika, 2010).

The Role of Entrepreneurship in Economic Growth and Development

The economy of today is experiencing rapid change. The ability to adapt to these changes is anchored on entrepreneurship. The development of industry and the growth in the economy of countries is tied to the whims and caprices of changing ideas and creating innovation. No country can achieve development without embracing science and innovation. This goal can be achieved through the development of entrepreneurship. In the developing countries, entrepreneurship is regarded as the main indicator of economic and social development because of its association with or have economic and social development. Many developing and developed countries have considered it imperative to involve individuals with entrepreneurial features in the direction of entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial activities. In the setting of growth and development, entrepreneurship would tackle problems of unemployment of tertiary institution graduates, poverty inequalities in social services of cultural and social irregularities.

Attaining social growth and development requires the development and practical use of enduring strategies and one of the practical way of these strategies is entrepreneurship. This gives rise to the development of individuals who can generate new business ideas in different sectors of the economy, develop existing capacities and apply innovative strategies to tackle the problems of community, government and public sectors. The potential capacity of the community would be diligently used and accompanied by justice and social welfare, renewable development, capacity to live

and develop, quality of life and life expectancy and employment creation if above important goal is accomplished.

Relationship between Social Entrepreneurship and Social Benefit

The benefits and measurement of social impact of entrepreneur are different from traditional entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneur deals with market failures which look like the function of entrepreneur as well (Ebrashi, 2013). Social entrepreneurship is about making a social mission in the context and impacts of the social component and this makes it different from any other forms of entrepreneurship. Both business and social entrepreneurship are socially worthy and admirable. But social value in social entrepreneurship context is the distinctly perceived and major stimulus. The traceable impacts flowing from the behavior of social entrepreneurs gives way and uphold social impacts. Social impact and social change are produced by social entrepreneurs in form of results that uphold social benefits.

Methods for measuring the value which business entrepreneurs make in the area of learning ratios and alike are in literature abound. The most important measure of value irrespective of different sorts of value created by business is financial profit. The creation of social value by social entrepreneurs depends on the extent to which benefits obtained by people whose urgent needs and desires are not being achieved by any known standard and measure. According to Zappala & Lyons (2009), the logic model is one of the means by which social entrepreneurs ascertain their social impact and this is the relationship among inputs, outputs, processes, outcomes and impact human or financial resources dedicated to certain programmes. The direct products of the activities of the programme are outcomes and results. The outcomes are the benefits for participating in the programme usually in short term as an immediate result of the programmes. The long-term change which takes place in the lives of beneficiaries and the community in general is impact. Even though Fowler (2000) contended that social entrepreneurship is not for profit and concerns with creating excess to back up organisational support, social purpose organisations, social entrepreneurs and social venture capital are other disruptive thinking in social entrepreneurship. These include for profit organisations creating financial, environmental and social returns as the environment and social

benefits are as crucially important as the financial returns.

The definition of social entrepreneurship by Robinson (2006) further throws more light on the social benefit of social entrepreneurship. It is a process that involves recognition of a particular social problem and a particular solution or set of solutions to tackle it. The assessment of the social impact, the bonus mode and the support of the venture and the creation of a social mission-oriented for profit are business oriented non-profit entities that capture the dual or triple bottom line.

Another name for social entrepreneurship is social entrepreneur with the aim of pursuing strategic efforts to assist their services taking advantage of profitable opportunities in the main activities of their non-profit organisations for profit ventures or by crossing partnership with commercial entities. On the other hand, it is not precise to use social entrepreneur as synonym for social entrepreneurship because there are ventures that are highly entrepreneurial without producing independent profit streams. Continuous value creation and innovation gives rise to this entrepreneurial factor. Earned income concept may not be a defining quality of social entrepreneurship but social entrepreneur must support that business (Anderson & Dees, 2006). It has been argued that social business entrepreneur emerges from the operations of social entrepreneur at full cost recovery or generating profits and then find itself in the business world. It is important to note that profit might be of interest to shareholders in social businesses. This could happen as profit is recycled back into the business. Even though profit is crucial to social entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs do not represent the force behind their undertaking. To support and maximize the planned social benefits are the main financial goals of social entrepreneur. Proportion of the profit generated are reinvested into the business in a manner that will further support enterprise. Infinitesimal proportion of the profits may be shared among the members of the social entrepreneurship, although, decision-making process are not tied to the apron strings of owners of capital. They make efforts to achieve an equilibrium between profitability and the fulfillment of a social mission. Social entrepreneurs create social benefits as a consequence of an operational process and through the process itself. They seek for opportunities to add social benefit along the whole value chain often engaging and training disillusioned,

suppressed, oppressed or classes that represent their social mission or revenging decayed resources of community (World Youth Report: Youth Social Entrepreneurship and the 2030 Agenda, 2003).

The primary social objectives are the concern of social ventures and they are able to achieve successfully a tripple bottom line for the achievement of environmental support, social benefits and profitability at the same time (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, 2006).

The Need for Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneur serves to fill the gap between the 'haves' and 'have nots' and societies. It is due to inability to provide social services by government at all levels. This is because funding of non-profit organisations by governments and philanthropists is increasing and difficult to maintain. It is a reaction to market frustrations characterized by simultaneous frustrations in governments and markets. It is ubiquitous but it is mostly common in areas of unstable situation that require both economic and social recovery (Thompson, Alvy & Lees, 2000). Social entrepreneur serves as the "bottom of the pyramid". Prahalad (2004) in Goyal, Sergi & Jausal (2016). It is therefore seen as offering the essential needs needed by the downtrodden of society (De Mirdjian, 2007). All enterprises that provide social services are domiciled in social entrepreneurship because the encouragement of social entrepreneur is the indefinitely contribution of problems in society related to beggary and individuals living in marginalized, suppressed and oppressed communities. Social entrepreneur has liking for many initiatives and establishment of a social entrepreneurship culture. Apart from a drive for economic benefits, social entrepreneur create and support corporate social responsibility. Social entrepreneurs have insight when they are passionately motivated to achieve goals. Social entrepreneurship is a reasonable and inevitable of prophetic leadership, the spiritually and morally-based purpose to search for general good and the stimulating requisite to create sustainability for both people and society (Muscat & Whilty, 2005). For government, social entrepreneurship is seen as a solution to government inability to provide welfare for its citizens. For civil society, it conceptualizes a space for new hybrid partnership, as a drive of systemic social change and a design of empowerment and political transformation. For business, social entrepreneurship connotes market opportunity, a natural socially responsible

investment and corporate social responsibility. However, there is no sufficient evidence to support that it brings social change and resolve social problems in society. Social entrepreneurship aback mendicancy and yet, social entrepreneurship has not shown positive impact on employment and entrepreneur capacity of the community (Diochon, 2013). Social entrepreneurs work on “messianic script” rather than phrases like “non-heroic practice of entrepreneurship” or “messianism without a messiah” which Steyaert & Dey (2010) carry an expression of social entrepreneurship that develop an idea of social change without regretful reference to the sovereign courageous entrepreneur.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The work is directed by Schumpeter (1934) theory of innovation. It asserts that the change in investment which go with monetary expansion are the key factors behind the business fluctuations. However, Schumpeter’s theory suggests that innovation in business is the major reason for increased investments and business fluctuations.

In Schumpeterian non nonsense, the cyclical process is almost alone the outcome of innovation in the organisation, both industrial and commercial. By innovation, he refers to the changes in the methods of production and transportation, production of a new product, change in the industrial organisation, opening up of a new market, etc. The innovation does not mean investment rather it means the present application of new technologies, new methods, new materials, and new sources of energy.

According to Schumpeter, the inventor is one who uncovers the new way of doing something or uncover a new product techniques/application of factors of production in new way. Innovator is concerned with economic and tangible products while inventor is concerned with the technicality of the product. In some instances, inventors might turn out to be an innovator. Innovator is more valuable as he does not only creates/uncovers something (inventor) but uses that innovation to derive commercial value from it. Concisely, investors are individuals who explore new ways and innovators are individuals who apply those new ways for the first time and yield first mover advantage from the market.

First Approximation: This stage start with the economic system in equilibrium in which there is no involuntary unemployment. Marginal cost is equal to marginal revenue of firm and price equals

to average cost. In the situation of complete equilibrium in the economy, if the firm declares to start on new method of production, then the same needs to be financed through bank credit. Since the economy is in equilibrium, there are no supplurs funds to finance the new venture with the additional funds from the banking system, the firm keeps on bidding higher prices for the inputs with a view to withdrawing them from the other less valuable uses with an increased expenditure in the economy when price starts to surge. This process further expands when other firms try to initiate the innovation and raise additional funds from the financial institutions (banks). As the innovation gets generally accepted the output begins to flow in the market. This marks the beginning of prosperity and expansion. But after a certain level, the price and profitability decrease with a surge in the level of output. This is because the further innovation does not come quickly and therefore, there will be no additional demand for the funds. Rather, the firms which borrowed the funds from the bank start paying it back. This result in the reduction in money supply and then the prices fall further. The process of recession starts and remains when the equilibrium in the economy is restored.

Second Approximation: the second stage deals with the waves caused by the first approximation. The speculation is the key element of the second stage. As the primary wave of expansion commences, the investor particularly in capital goods industries expect this increase to remain permanent and hence borrow heavily. Even the consumers expecting the prices to increase in future go into debt to acquire durable consumer goods. This heavy indebtedness turns out to be mayhem when prices begin to fall. Both the investors and consumers find it hard to meet their commitments and this situation gives rise to sudden fear and then pressing economy down.

The Schumpeter’s theory of innovation has been criticized on the ground that it only focused upon inventor function of entrepreneur and does not say anything about other valuables and equally critical aspects of entrepreneurs such as organisation and management skills. The theory leaves out other factors which cause fluctuation in the economic activities. Innovation is not the only factor rather is only one of the factors that causes fluctuation in economy. The theory does not put into account the concept of risk bearing as strictly as it does the idea of innovation. It looks as if innovation comes first before risk bearing but entrepreneurship is

about risk bearing, assessing uncertainties and designing strategies to forestall their impact. The theory believes that only innovators are true entrepreneurs but what about traditional business models and traditional approach towards wealth creation. So, it ignores the crucial traits of entrepreneurship. Despite these intense criticisms, the theory is relevant to the study in that it is the most valuable economic theory that deals with the organisations of entrepreneurship in countries like Nigeria where economy is heavily depended on agrarian sector and industrialization is in its developing stage. Innovation creates a resource and it endows it into economic value.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The conceptual research article, which is based on literature from entrepreneurship, social sciences, management, social entrepreneurship, economic development revealed the following.

1. Challenges of Social Entrepreneurship amidst Covid-9 Pandemic

The study found that COVID-19 pandemic has not only negatively affected physical health of people and wellbeing but it has also affected business management and the pandemic affected small and medium enterprises than big enterprises. Entrepreneurs suffered from the double impact of the disease as their health was harmed by the disease directly. Income of entrepreneurs decreases as their start-up firms were closed which further affected their wellbeing. A high level of uneasiness was exhibited by entrepreneurs during the pandemic. There was hasty discontinuity of economic activities owing to the COVID-19 outbreak and this affected many businesses and communities in United States of America. This finding was confirmed by Kuckertz, Brande, Gaudig, Hinderen, Reyes, Prochotta, Steinbrink & Berger (2020) who believe that COVID-19 did more harm than good. The findings also reveal that in most countries many businesses that were regarded "non-essential" businesses were closed for operations. In other countries, most businesses reopened but were restricted by the number of customers they received. Seed-stage financing opportunities and equity investment severely and rapidly reduced. This implies that there were limited investment opportunities and business owners experienced sudden and intense declines in sales in spite of having fixed costs. On the other hand, some businesses actually did better or performed similarly to their pre-pandemic performance. Businesses that applied crisis

management strategies before the pandemic were not affected in the early stage of the crisis. The importance of geographic location and entrepreneurial recovery from disasters has been noted (Gur, Bendickson, Madden & McDowell, 2020). Geographic locations which have a strong entrepreneurial culture seem to have strong level of entrepreneurial opportunity recognition in post-crisis. Kuckertz, Brande, Gaudig, Hinderen, Reyes, Prochota, Steinbrink & Berger (2020) suggest that location with high level of entrepreneurship in pre-crisis are well located to get over exogenous chaos. Geographical unequalness or differences had made some regions to have more political, human and financial resources than others and thrive over others as a result. Communities that recover faster from economic upsets than known for strong entrepreneurial culture along with human resources that often inspire it. Those are not known for strong entrepreneurial culture devoid of human capital are incapable to recover from economic upsets.

The challenge that social entrepreneur faced during the Covid-19 crisis is how social entrepreneurs may engage in institutional and partnership collaboration and cooperation for activities such as convening, funding, monitoring/evaluation, service delivery/implementation and non-financial acquisition. Institutional collaboration and partnership are essential ingredients for social entrepreneurs and they are more crucial during COVID-19 crisis. Institutional collaboration and cooperation determine methods that social entrepreneurs use to create social value and economic value on the strength of their ability to aid acquisition of resource (Shaw & Carter, 2007).

Another challenge as revealed by literature reviewed posits that social entrepreneurs have difficulties in regaining start-up and investment funding, setting prices and managing cash flow, scaling their organisation, live within their means and refuse to apply for loans because of the fear that such crisis may put them in continual financial crises. A non-profit social organisation allows its owners to chase philanthropic funding though it restricts the kind of commercial activities that a social organisation may engage in and also restricts distribution of profit while a profit social organisation not only enhances its owners to chase earned income but also decreases the chances of getting philanthropic funding.

2. Skills and Qualities Required of Social Entrepreneur in Post-pandemic Era

Literature that were reviewed revealed skills and qualities as one of the social requirements of social entrepreneur in post covid-19 pandemic. This is in agreement with Snowden & Halsall (2017) who see mentoring as an approach that aids individual with little or no experience and knowledge within any given circumstance in their personal, social and professional development and as human process that allows the mentee to access the innate knowledge that the mentor has developed over the years. Typically, the mentor is able to translate reality and assist the mentee to dwell their own patterns of reasoning, insight and the application of knowledge and skill (Snowden, 2019) for improved performance and development of organisations. It was found that what is key to social entrepreneur is the ability to mentor individuals.

The literature reviewed also found that social entrepreneur has the ability to attain incident or setting all the sub-components and these facets affecting the issue in its entirety. It is an approach that includes economic, political, social, spiritual, psychological, geographical and cultural factors in determining a response. What is key to success as social entrepreneur is the ability to view issues in holistic manner, i.e. the belief that the whole is greater than the sum of the different parts.

Another skill and quality required of entrepreneur as revealed by the study is the study of self-determined learning and a process symbiotic with mentoring and holism. It refers to process of not only sharing knowledge but also a process that is learned or practitioner-centric and relied on practical experiences. The social entrepreneur has to be well vast and really able to make meaning of the world he lives, conceives an idea for something better in to draw upon perceptions and intuitions, and shows the ability to conceptualize ever changing environment.

People are said to be solution focused when they look outwards towards solutions, rather than inward by reassessing problems (Mezirow, 2000). They have critical conscience, commitment, interact with individuals who are familiar with social injustice, irregularity, oppression, suppression, elimination and sensitive to community needs characterised solution focused individuals. These characteristics are the main drivers of the social entrepreneur (Snowden, Obero, Halsall, 2021).

Another skill and quality required of social entrepreneur in post-covid-19 is optimism which was revealed in review of literature. This is the confidence to create courageous dreams when other people are not sure. Persons with penchant to expect the best have a strong sense of self-efficacy and a belief that they have the control necessary to change their situations. The individual to expect the best via learned behaviour makes social entrepreneur to develop skills with which he can cope and the power to think optimistically will permit self-efficacy and emotional and social resilience which successfully will increase the probability of success when challenges arise. Ability to get back quickly from setback and respond appropriately or recover when life brings challenges and nakba is resilience which is interwoven with success.

3. Tackling social Problems

Findings from the literature that were reviewed also revealed that social entrepreneur is positively impacted by the degree of involvement in combating social problems rovoked by COVID-19 pandemic outbreak. In the light of the findings of the study, the improvement in social entrepreneurship development in the post-covid-19 Nigeria is related to the amount of effort placed on social entrepreneurial development.

4. Enhanced Innovations

From literature reviewed, it was found that investment in social entrepreneurship enhances innovativeness which is an impulse to challenge post-pandemic crisis. Social entrepreneurship leads to social change and that there are different approaches to social entrepreneurship which is evident in creating and managing new organisations while serving a social mission in post-pandemic Nigeria. The literature reviewed also shows that the post-covid-19 era is an opportunity for social entrepreneurs to make positive social impact since social entrepreneurs are alternative or complementary to government efforts in reducing poverty in the country.

5. Allocation of Government Resources

The literature reviewed also reveals that in post-covid-19 era social entrepreneurship influences allocation of government resources for public use in order to enhance a return to normal and rebuild the communities in post pandemic era. To this end, the literature reviewed indicates that they advise government to provide communities with basic necessities-food, water, shelter and essential

healthcare services. The study defend that social entrepreneurship should be seen beyond entrepreneurial invention. Social entrepreneurship covers all activities geared towards the creation of systemic social change in post-pandemic Nigeria.

CONCLUSIONS

Even though little is known about the truth behind social entrepreneurship, it has not been previously examined from vista of post-covid-19. On the aggregates from the influences it has on societies and organisations, our findings reveal that country like Nigeria with the capacity to acknowledge their existence of social entrepreneurship effectively is more incline to belief she can be successful in social entrepreneurship activities in post-covid era. Therefore, Nigeria feel more effective in starting a new business in post-covid era and fighting social problems provoked by the outbreak of covid-19. Social entrepreneur has been seen as agent that can improve on financial performance, challenges faced during covid-19 and take advantage of opportunities after the pandemic. It was observed from the focused country – Nigeria that the post-pandemic businesses are unsafe and unhealthy due to the covid-19 pandemic. Such businesses are prone to economic woes. Thus, businesses find it difficult to recover from post-Covid-19 woes and positively influence Nigeria economy. The businesses in post-pandemic Nigeria seem to have negative social impact because social entrepreneurship supplement government efforts to reduce state of being poor in Nigeria. However, businesses find it difficult to influence the allocation of government resources for public benefits to deconstruct communities presently predominant and fix post-pandemic Nigeria while business philosophy has turned to a situation where individual is serving himself rather than offering service to the nation. This is an obvious symptom that solving social and environmental difficulties in post-pandemic Nigeria may be altered. The difficulties become more vexing because deficiencies in attachment to positive social impact in business may add to the difficulty in creating and managing new business organisations amidst serving a social task in post-pandemic regime. It may also be accountable for the extreme lessening in the magnitude of involvement in putting social problems provoked by covid-19 pandemic outbreak in post-pandemic Nigeria to rest. The relationship between economic growth, business management, physical health of people and social entrepreneurship may have an effect on business in post-pandemic Nigeira.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the identified role of social entrepreneur in remaking Nigeria, the following measures are recommended as ways of encouraging social entrepreneurship in post covid-19 Nigeria:

1. The scope of social entrepreneurship should be widened to encourage important improvement in the relevant skills and expertise among the present and future social entrepreneurs.
2. Resilience strategies should be adopted by governments to address social issues caused by COVID-19 pandemic to make Nigeria stronger and more efficient.
3. Social objectives must be pursued by entrepreneurs whose surpluses should be reinvested in the community.
4. Social entrepreneurs should identify geographical areas with strong entrepreneurial culture for entrepreneur opportunities recognition.
5. Social entrepreneurs should engage in collaborations for activities such as funding, monitoring evaluation and non-financial resources acquisition.
6. Skills associated with the social entrepreneur should be embedded within curriculum of tertiary education to allow graduates improve and aid the development of change in response to social needs in Nigeria.

LIMITATIONS AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The current study has a few limitations that maybe covered in the scope for future studies. For example, the study failed to find sufficient literature on the study subject from local sources. The nature of this study may limits its generalisability to other research contexts. As such literature materials from other external sources were also made use of by the researchers. The study is also restricted to the developing economies such as Nigeria as the study unit and thus the research findings may not be inferred from the studies to more general cases in Africa and beyond. This deficiency in the study can be overcome by recommending an extended study on the research topic covering other developing economies.

Another imperfection in the current study is a literature study whereas the future research could focus on a quantitative study as the whatness of the research keep changing with time. Institutional collaborations and partnership are crucial elements

for social enterprise, development and they are more significant during Covid-19 crisis. Future research will be required to investigate the impact of institutional collaboration and partnership in post-pandemic era.

Philanthropic funding is pursued by social entrepreneurs. The future study could find out the kind of commercial activities that a social entrepreneur should engage in post-pandemic. The present study was conducted using literature approach. A study may be done by using quantitative method to get further insights and confirm the truth of the findings of qualitative method

CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

The present study is meant to popularize a better theoretical, comprehensive and acceptance of the complexities associated with social entrepreneurship in remaking post-pandemic Nigeria. It can contribute meaningfully in the direction of future theoretical improvement in social entrepreneurial model. This is in devout wish of the fact that attaining post pandemic recovery in Nigeria is at the crux of ensuring that Nigeria achieves its mandate of supporting the economy in producing skills associated with the social entrepreneur required to drive the economy of the country. It is also true that social entrepreneurs are invaluable in post-pandemic Nigeria on the strength of their ability to support acquisition of resources both human and for creating social value and economic value. The findings of this study may thus be used to bring about better policies bordering on social and environmental issues in Nigeria to address post-pandemic crisis in an effort to remake Nigeria. The work would help in perceiving the social entrepreneurship in post-pandemic context.

This study also contributes to developing social entrepreneurship theories and solves the difficulty in identifying essential abilities to perform such task to start and manage a business. Scholars can be helped by this study by pursuing a similar domain of research which further body of knowledge can be enriched via more extensive research.

REFERENCES

1. Agafonow, A. (2014). Towards a positive theory of social entrepreneurship on maximizing versus satisfying value capture. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125(4), 709-713.
2. Agarwal, M. K. & Mulunga, S. N. (2022). Disruptive thinking in social entrepreneurship: Challenges and effectiveness. *African Journal of Business Management*, 16(4), 82-89.
3. Anjum, T. Ramzani, S. R., Farrukh, M. Raju, V., Nazar, N. Shahzad, I. A. (2018). Entrepreneurship intentions of Pakistani students: The role of entrepreneurship; education, creativity disposition, invention and passion and passion for founding. *Journal of Management Research*, 10(1), 76-100
4. Anderson, B. B. & Dees, J.G. (2006). Rhetoric, reality and research: Building a social foundation for the practice of social entrepreneurship. In Nicholls, A. (ed.). *Social entrepreneurship*. Macmillan New York
5. Bacq, S. & Janseen, F. (2011). The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 23(5-6), 373-403.
6. Barki, G., Comini, G., Cunliffe, A., Hart, S. & Rai, S. (2015). Social entrepreneurship and social business: Representative and prospective research. *Revista de Administracao De Empresas*, 55(4), 380-384.
7. Basit, A., Sing, M. & Hassan, Z. (2018). Factors affecting entrepreneurship intention among students in private sector of Malaysia. *International Journal of Education, Learning and Training*, 3(2), 42-64.
8. Betts, S.C., Laud, R. & Kretinin, A. (2018). Social entrepreneurship: A contemporary approach to solving social problems. *Global Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 31-40.
9. Bornstein, D. (2007). How to change the World Social Entrepreneurs and the power of New ideas. USA: Oxford University Press.
10. Brocks, D. D. & Kim, M. (2011). Social entrepreneurship education resource handwork for colleges and universities engaged in teaching, research and applies learning in social entrepreneurship. Retrieved on the 12th September, 2023 from <https://ssm.com/abstract=1872088>
11. Brouard, F. & Larivet, S. (2020). Essay of clarification and definitions of related concepts of social enterprise-social entrepreneur and social entrepreneurship. In Fayolle, A. & Matlay, H. (eds.) *Handbook of research in social entrepreneurship*. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.
12. Chou, D.C. (2018). Applying design thinking method to social entrepreneurship project.

- Computer Standards and Interfaces*, 55(1), 73-79.
13. Crisan, C. & Borza, A. (2012). Social entrepreneurship and corporate social responsibility. *International Business Research*, 5(2), 106-113.
 14. De Longe, D. & Doddsi, R. (2017). Increasing sustainable tourism through social entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(7), 1977-2002.
 15. De Mirdjan, Z. S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: Sustainable solutions to societal problems. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 11(1), 1-11.
 16. Dees, J.U. (2012). A tale of two cultures: Charity, problem solving and the future of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(1), 321-334.
 17. Steyaert, C. & Dey, P. (2010). The politics of narrating social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Enterprising Communities*, 4(1), 85-108.
 18. Drucker, P.F. (1984). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. New York: Harper Business.
 19. Ebrashi, R. E. (2013). Entrepreneurial theory as sustainable social impact. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 9(2), 188-209.
 20. Fowler, A. (2000). NGOs as a moment in history: Beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation. *Third World Quarterly*, 21(4), 637-654.
 21. Gawel, M. (2013). Social entrepreneurship: action grounded in needs, opportunities and for perceived necessities. *International Journal of Voluntary and Non-Profit Organizations*, 24(4), 281-301
 22. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (2006). *London business school*. London: Macmillan
 23. Goyal, S., Sergi, B.S. & Jaiswal, M.P. (2016). Understanding the challenges and strategic actions of social entrepreneurship at base of the pyramid. *Management Decision*, 54(2), 418-440.
 24. Granados, M.L., Hlupic, V., Coakes E., Mohammed S. (2011) social enterprise and social entrepreneurship research and theory. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 7(3) 198-218
 25. Gras, D. M., Todd, W. M. & Lumpkin, G. T. (2014). The use of secondary data in social entrepreneurship reward assessing the field and identify future opportunities. *Social Entrepreneurship and Research Methods: Research Methodology in Strategy and Management*, 9(1), 49-75.
 26. Gur, F.A., S. Bendickson, T.S., Madden, L and McDowell, W.C. (2020). Entrepreneurial opportunity recognition in the face of disasters. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 26(4), 671-693
 27. Jilinskaya-Pandey, M. & Wade, J. (2019). Social entrepreneurship quotient: An international perspective on social entrepreneur personalities. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 10(9), 265-287.
 28. Kicku, I. J and Lyons, T. S. (2016). *Understanding social entrepreneurship: The relentless pursuit of mission in an ever-changing world*. London: Rulledge.
 29. Korosec, R. L. & Berman, E. M. (2006). Municipal support for social entrepreneurship. *Public Administration Review*, 66(3), 448-456
 30. Kuckertz, A., Brande, L., Gaudig, A., Hinderer, S., Reyes, G. A. A. M., Prochotta, A., Steinbrink, K. M. & Berger, E. S. C. (2020). Startups in times crisis: A rapid response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 13(1), 169-185.
 31. Muscat, E. & Whitty, M. (2009). Social entrepreneurship: Value-based leadership to transform business education and society. *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, 4(1), 31-34.
 32. Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as transformation: critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
 33. Nicholls, A. (ed). (2006). *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change*. USA: Oxford University Press.
 34. Oberoi, R., Halsall, J.P. & Snowden, M. (2022). Social entrepreneurship: An idea whose time has come. Retrieved on the 27th of June, 2023 from <https://indiaosp.ingeosr-in/social-entrepreneurship-an-idea-whose-time-has-come/>
 35. Oberoi, R., Halsall, J.P. & Snowden, M. (2021). Reinventing social entrepreneurship leadership in the COVID-19 era. *Engaging with the New Normal Entrepreneurship Education*, 4(2), 117-136.
 36. Oberoi, R., Halsall, J. & Snowden, M. (2020). A new era of social enterprise: A global viewpoint. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Economic Issues*, 14(1), 79-88.
 37. Oberoi, R., Halsall, J.P. & Snowden, M. (2019b). Reinventing social entrepreneurship leadership in the COVID-19 era: Engaging

- with the New normal. *Entrepreneurship Education*, 4(1), 117-136.
38. Onuoha, J. (2011). Entrepreneurship national culture and Turkey. *Intention Journal of Business and Social Science*, 1(1), 146-149.
 39. Pontus, B., Ulrika, S. H. (2010) Social entrepreneurship a survey of current research. Working papers services from Swedish Entrepreneurship Forum. *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 8(2), 71-112.
 40. Robinson, J. (2006). Navigating social and institutional barriers to markets: How social identify and evaluate opportunities. In Mair, J. Robinson, J. & Hockerts, K. (eds.). *Social Entrepreneurship*. New York: Macmillan.
 41. Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital credit, interest and the business cycle*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 42. Shamsudin, S. F.F., Mamun, A. A., Nawi, N.C.E., Nasir, A. & Zakaria M. N. (2017). Factors affecting entrepreneurial intention among the Malaysian University students. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 51(4), 423-431.
 43. Shaw, E. & Carter, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes. *Journal of Social Enterprise*, 14(3), 418-434.
 44. Snowden, M. (2019). Peer mentoring, guaranteed gold?. In Snowden, M. & Halsal, J. (eds). *Mentorship, leadership and research: Their plea within the Social Science Curriculum*. AG: Springer international publishing.
 45. Snowden, M. & Halsal, J.P. (2014). Community development: A shift in thinking towards heutagogy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Comparative Studies*, 1(3), 81-91.
 46. Snowden, M., Obeoi, R. & Halsall, J.P. (2021). Reaffirming trust in social enterprise in the COVID-19 era: Ways forward (special issue). *Corporate Governance and Sustainability Review*, 5(1), 120-130.
 47. Steyaert, C. & Dey, P. (2010). Nine verbs to keep the social entrepreneurship research agenda dangerous. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(2), 231-254.
 48. Teasdale, S.P., Sunley, P. & Pinch, S. (2012). Financing social enterprise: Social bricolage or evolutionary entrepreneurship. *Social Science Journal*, 8(2), 108-121.
 49. Thompson, J., Alvy, G. & Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship: A new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, 38(5), 328-338.
 50. WHO COVID-19 (2020). Director-General's opening remarks at the Media Briefing on COVID-19. Retrieved on 23 October, 2023 from <https://www.who.int/dq/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-mediabriefing-in-covid-19-11-march-2020>.
 51. World Youth Report (2020). Youth social entrepreneurship and the 2030 agenda.
 52. Young, D.R. (1987). Executive leading in non-profit organisation. In W. W. Powell (Ed.). *The Non-profit Sector: A Research Handbook*. Yale: Yale University Press.
 53. Zappala, G. & Lyons, M. (2009). Recent approach to measuring social impact in the third sector: An overview. Retrieved on 22 (2022) from www.swi.ed.an/uploads.

Source of support: Nil; **Conflict of interest:** Nil.

Cite this article as:

Ugbomhe, U.O. and Peter, A.A. "Social Entrepreneurship: The Power to Remake Post-Covid-19 Nigeria for the Better." *Sarcouncil Journal of Public Administration and Management* 2.6 (2023): pp40-52.