Social Enterprise J

Challenging the assumptions of social entrepreneurship education and repositioning it for the future: Wonders of cultural, social, symbolic and economic capitals

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Challenging the assumptions of social entrepreneurship education and repositioning it for the future: Wonders of cultural, social, symbolic and economic capitals

Abstract

Purpose: Social entrepreneurship education (SEE) is gaining increasing attention globally. Our paper focuses on how social entrepreneurship education may be better understood and reconfigured from a Bourdieusian capital perspective with an emphasis on the process of mobilizing and transforming social entrepreneurs' cultural, social, economic and symbolic resources.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Drawing on qualitative research with a sample of social entrepreneurship educators and mentors, we generate insights into the significance of challenging assumptions and establishing values and principles and hence that of developing a range of capitals (using the Bourdieusian notion of capital) for social entrepreneurship education.

Findings: Our findings highlight the significance of developing a range of capitals and their transformative power for social entrepreneurship education. In this way, learners can develop dispositions for certain forms of capitals over others and transform them to each other in becoming reflexive social agents.

Originality/Value: We respond to the calls for critical thinking in entrepreneurship education and contribute to the field by developing a reflexive approach to social entrepreneurship education. We also make recommendations to educators, who are tasked with implementing such an approach in pursuit of raising the next generations of social entrepreneurs.

Keywords Social entrepreneurship education, capital, symbolic capital, capital conversion, Bourdieu, habitus.

1

Introduction

Entrepreneurship education is a growing subject domain. There remains a need for additional and robust intellectual foundations at all levels (Landstrom, Gabrielson, Politis et al., 2022; Byrne, Fayolle and Toutain, 2014; Fayolle, 2013; Kyrö, 2015; Pittway and Cope, 2007) for entrepreneurship education in general, and social entrepreneurship in particular. Social entrepreneurship education (SEE) has emerged as a sub-domain of entrepreneurship education not only in response to the overall demand for social entrepreneurship as a method of addressing social needs (Garcia-Gonzalez and Ramirez-Montoya, 2021; Chell, Nicolopoulou and Karatas-Özkan, 2010), but also for empowering individuals in disadvantaged circumstances towards starting social ventures and impactful projects (Santos, Neumeyer and Morris, 2019). Recognising wider societal issues, universities have repositioned themselves and developed programs on social entrepreneurship and innovation (Mdleleni, 2022) drawing on international examples. As these grand societal challenges are getting more complex, university research is evolving to be more problem-orientated, engaged and transdisciplinary (Belcher et al., 2022). Education programmes are no exception to this. Such research-led education programs entail transdisciplinary rooting to develop (Shaw and de Bruin, 2013); however, some of those programs are not adequately connected to individual-learner, community- and societal-level needs (Byrne et al., 2014; Santos et al., 2019). Moving beyond traditional boundaries of entrepreneurship education, in this paper, we focus on how social entrepreneurship education may offer competencies – i.e. abilities that lead to effective actions for social entrepreneurship – by mobilising and transforming learners' cultural, social, economic and symbolic resources that will help them transcend the aforementioned issues at different levels. We consider social entrepreneurship education from a process-relational perspective (Karatas-Ozkan, 2011) and

2

focus on education as a process in this paper. This is aligned with the complexity of entrepreneurship in terms of social processes, outcomes and dynamics. Entrepreneurship education is better positioned if more attention is paid to various contexts of entrepreneurship and the processes that surround them. Social entrepreneurship education with the emphasis on co-construction processes resulting from individual-social-context interaction entails this reflective process-relational approach even more so as learners need to rethink their purpose, rebalance their actions and reengage with their stakeholders and communities to impact positive change. Accordingly, we position our paper in this domain by taking a Bourdiuesian perspective with a particular emphasis on capitals to demonstrate the value of 'inner transformation', in Wilson's (1996) terms, that individuals need to go through in engaging with social entrepreneurship education.

The Bourdieusian (1977) theory of practice focuses on human agency and interaction with the social world through key concepts of habitus, field, capitals, strategies and doxa (Tatli, Ozbilgin, and Karatas-Ozkan, 2015). The main emphasis is on the co-generative relationship between the micro and macro levels of social reality – in other words, between capitals and the field, through developing *habitus*. Individuals are positioned in a field with respect to different forms of capital, and develop different strategies to acquire, reconfigure and transform the volume and kinds of capital in order to strengthen their power position within the field (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 129). Capitals are generated, legitimized and transformed to each other by the logic of *habitus* embedded in a social structure, which is the field. In this regard, Bourdieu's theory acknowledges social actors' potential to transform their circumstances and settings by producing and reproducing mechanisms and actions through everyday interactions. This core aspect of Bourdieusian theory lends itself to explore and demonstrate the value of

3

individuals' processes of transformation through education effectively. It tasks us to engage in a critical scrutiny of how individual dispositions, values, motivations and resources available (i.e. capitals) shape transformative experiences, such as becoming a social entrepreneur. Taking a Bourdieusian lens, understanding such complex processes is imbued with the notion of the concept of opportunities emerging unequally for different individuals, and individual inequalities may be compounded in the uneven conversion of opportunities to achievements (Hart, 2019). In the context of social entrepreneurship education, our focus is on capitals that these learners develop and transform to enhance their positions as social entrepreneurs in the field. We also generate insights into how social entrepreneurship education (SEE) programs should be shaped in line with this transformative experience and the specific habitus of learner social entrepreneurs. This focus triggers two interrelated questions: (1) What constitutes capital in the context of SEE? (2) What is the kind of habitus that the SEE field generates for the accumulation of multiple capitals and their conversion (as part of a transformative and reflexive experience), leading to meaningful outcomes for social entrepreneurship?

Drawing on empirical evidence generated through interviews conducted with entrepreneurship educators and mentors, our findings highlight the significance of developing a range of capitals and their transformative power. We also reveal the ability of social entrepreneurship education to help learners develop dispositions for certain forms of capitals over others and transform them to each other in becoming reflexive social agents. Learners can be empowered as potential social entrepreneurs navigating complex and often uneven routes of creating social ventures addressing social issues and inequalities. In this journey, transformation between different forms of capitals is instrumental in balancing the paradoxical aspects of social impact and business

4

reality and in aligning personal values and self-interest with social good and community interests, which underpin their venture. Such alignment is fundamentally important for any social entrepreneurship activity to achieve meaningful outcomes.

Our study makes multiple contributions to social entrepreneurship education: first, by critically reflecting on the theoretical foundations of social entrepreneurship education and examining its prevailing assumptions, we respond to the call for critical thinking in entrepreneurship and sustainability (including social entrepreneurship) education. Using the Bourdieusian lens, we develop a reflexive approach which focuses on the conversion of capitals as a way of gaining legitimacy as social entrepreneurs in the field. Bourdieusian perspectives of management and entrepreneurship education and learning have been celebrated in numerous scholarly work (e.g. Karatas-Ozkan and Chell, 2010; Karatas-Ozkan, 2011; Obembe, 2012; Mughal et al., 2018). We join these debates by challenging the existing assumptions of social entrepreneurship education and offering a new way forward for repositioning it through better understanding its values and guiding principles towards a reflexive and synergistic approach to capitals. Hence, the second contribution of the paper is practical. Social entrepreneurship education (SEE) is a relatively new domain in entrepreneurship education (Howorth, Smith and Parkinson, 2012). We offer new directions for the social entrepreneurship educators and mentors, reflecting on what we garnered through the empirical study. We endorse the view that SEE programs should place the notions of alignment, authenticity, and reflexivity as their core principles.

We have structured our paper as follows: The first section positions the paper within the domain of social entrepreneurship education as a sub-field of entrepreneurship education scholarship,

5

with the objective of highlighting key research issues and the gaps identified by the extant literature. The second section presents our theoretical orientation, Bourdieu's conceptual universe including the habitus, field, and capitals, with a particular emphasis on how capitals are developed, mobilised and converted. The third section outlines our method by emphasising the situated nature of SEE and explaining the research context internationally and nationally, while the fourth section presents our key findings structured by our theoretical tools of habitus, field, and capitals. The fifth section concludes the paper with discussing these findings by revisiting theoretically- and conceptually-driven arguments and highlighting our contributions to knowledge. Finally, we offer recommendations for educators in the field of SEE.

Theoretical invitation for social entrepreneurship education: a Bourdieusian perspective

In illuminating reflexivity, Bourdeiu's conceptual universe has three major concepts: the habitus, the field, and capitals. According to Bourdieu, social fields, such as the academic education, or social entrepreneurship fields, constitute webs of relations of power and reflexivity that permeate institutions and individual choices and chances. Habitus, for Bourdieu, is taken-for-granted assumptions about the field of relations that shape individual dispositions. Habitus serves as a legitimating device between the field of relations and the individual agency. Bourdieu identifies that the field is constituted by three fundamental dimensions of capital: the volume, the structure or composition, and the change in these three elements over time (Bourdieu, 1986; Townley, 2015, p. 191). Bourdieu's concept of capital has been instrumental in enabling scholars to examine the operation of both economic and symbolic wealth creation in societies (Huppatz, 2009). For Bourdieu, capital is a form of resource that one can accumulate, invest (in), and further utilize (Thevenot, 2011), which can assume monetary and non-monetary, as

6

well as tangible and intangible, forms (Anheier et al., 1995). This is particularly important in the context of social entrepreneurship as social entrepreneurs operate with a diverse range of resources and they are expected to recombine resources in a socially innovative and impactful way (Bojica, Jiménez,, Nava and Fuentes-Fuentes, 2018). There are four types of capital: the *economic*, the *social* (i.e. one's connectedness and embeddedness in a social setting), the *cultural* (i.e. one's educational background, knowledge and experience in a particular domain) and the *symbolic* capitals (i.e. one's respectability, status and power in a certain socio-economic context) include material and non-material resources, which can have symbolic value, as well as culturally and socially significant attributes, such as education, connectivity, prestige and status (Harker et al., 1990; Özbilgin et al., 2005).

Given the focus on SEE as a form of cultural capital accumulation, cultural capital refers to long-standing dispositions, acquired through education, socialisation with family and peers or personal improvement, cultural appreciation and understanding, and habitus acquired in the socialisation process (Anheier et al., 1995; McKeever et al., 2014; Townley, 2015). Cultural capital also involves more institutionalised forms, such as formal educational qualifications, training, and mastery of knowledge. Social capital refers to the actual and potential resources that can be deployed through membership of social networks (Bourdieu, 1986). Economic capital includes monetary and non-monetary financial resources at an individual's disposal. Finally, Bourdieu (1998, p. 47) defines symbolic capital as the amalgam and situated value of all other forms of capital owned by individuals. Tatli and Özbilgin (2012) stress that it is the use of symbolic capital that mediates the functioning of other capitals, thus legitimising them in the field.

Each of these forms of capital confers certain strength, authority, and power on their holders (Bourdieu, 1987). Human agents strive to accumulate capitals, hence gaining a stronger position in the fields that they inhabit. In their Bourdieusian analysis, Tatli and colleagues (Özbilgin and Tatli, 2011; Tatli and Özbilgin, 2012; Tatli et al., 2015) point out that struggles over the accumulation of capital are a function of the wider socio-economic context. In this context, Townley (2015) usefully notes the significance of time as an important dimension of Bourdiesian capitals, because any form of capital is transferred through time in either an objectified (i.e. material) form, or an embodied form. Individuals need to devote time and energy to gain from their investment. This very process of investing time and energy and engaging in a field provides a reflexive experience (Townley, 2015, p. 189). These reflexive actions and experiences form the learning stocks of individuals, as a part of their developmental trajectory shaped by their habitus.

This brings us to the notion of mobilisation and transformation of multiple forms of capital. The capacity of the individual to transform each type of capital into a different type is significant at this point of the discussion. The distinctive qualities of the different forms of capital and processes of conversion between them have to be understood, in recognition that each form of capital has its own distinct legitimacy (Svendsen and Svendsen, 2004: 240).

How individuals may deploy, transform and convert their capital endowments has been highlighted by various scholars (De Clercq and Voronov, 2009; Huppatz, 2009; Karatas-Özkan and Chell, 2010; Pret et al., 2016; Spigel, 2013; Tatli and Özbilgin, 2012). Applications of the concept of capital in the field of entrepreneurship are evident in studies focusing on entrepreneurial legitimacy (De Clercq and Voronov, 2009), entrepreneurial learning (Karatas-

8

Özkan, 2011) and entrepreneurial resource acquisition (Pret et al., 2016). However, the use of Bourdieu's theory of capitals, both in entrepreneurship education and social entrepreneurship research, remains limited. As a theoretical lens, Bourdieu's conceptual universe bridges the gap between subjective and objective structures, as well as material and non-material resources in the social world (Bourdieu, 1986). Bourdieu's concept of capital allows us to tackle the artificial divide between the social and the economic, which has prevailed in the social entrepreneurship field from its inception. Offering an expanded framework, Nicolopoulou (2014) captures how multiple capitals of social entrepreneurship are mediated by symbolic capital and what transformation potential they possess. It is this interactive process of capital conversion, beyond the legitimizing forces of field in the form of law, regulations, and formal rules (Thevenot, 2011, p. 39) that lies at the heart of social entrepreneurship as a relational process. Differentiating between different forms of capital and understanding their conversion potential enables a multi-layered appreciation of wealth creation (i.e. social entrepreneurs at the micro-individual level engaging with social issues at the meso-community level, all of which are embedded in the macro-national/international settings of the socio-political and economic environments) revealing the injustices and inequalities in the realm of social entrepreneurship.

Bourdieu's theory of practice is employed by Jones (2014) in investigating how the historical masculinization of entrepreneurship informed UK policy and higher education (HE) approaches to entrepreneurship education. While this application focuses on the field-level reality of entrepreneurship education, we propose a more holistic approach that considers the interplay between habitus, field, and capitals. This may allow us to understand the learner's transformation as emergent social entrepreneurs and shape our education offerings according to their needs.

9

Field of social entrepreneurship education

Social entrepreneurship has gained traction as a process to address grand and complex, economic, social and ecological challenges with the objective of sustainable development and community empowerment (Finlayson & Roy, 2019; Littlewood & Holt, 2018), drawing on from surplus driven enterprise models. Social entrepreneurs, in this regard, are considered as change agents through their engagements with a wide range of organisation models including both not-for- and for-profit, which underline innovative, social value creation activity and reinvestment of surplus for its sustainability (Chell, Nicolopoulou, and Karataş-Özkan, 2010; Nicholls, 2008). Underpinned by triple and multiple bottom-line principle, there is a diversity of social enterprises and models. Despite the growing interest and proliferation of literature on social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship education has remained under-studied and under-theorized. Additionally, its position within the broader field of entrepreneurship education needs to be better established (Bridge, 2015; Dobele and Pietere, 2015).

Historically, entrepreneurship education is rooted back in the attempts of the US universities with Harvard Business School offering the first entrepreneurship course in 1947 (Katz, 2003; Nabi, Linan, Fayolle et al., 2017; Woods, Dell and Carroll, 2022). Courses and later programmes focusing on self-employment and new venture creation were developed mostly in the business schools. This trend was followed by European universities, with the UK leading many of such entrepreneurship programmes, courses and university-wide support structures such as university incubators (Karatas-Ozkan, Murphy and Rae, 2005) since early 1990s. The focus shifted from the emphasis on functional and technical aspect of how to start a new venture to orienting

10

learners to become enterprising individuals (Lackeus, 2015). The research on entrepreneurship education, however, remained disconnected until early 1990s after which we have seen more enthusiastic scholars engaging with several aspects of entrepreneurship education through different angles and hence contributing to the establishment of scholarly community (Landstrom, 2020). The growth of entrepreneurship education programmes has accelerated in 2000s with more focus on process-relational dimension of entrepreneurial learning (Karatas-Ozkan, 2011; Karatas-Ozkan and Chell, 2010), encouraging and implementing practice-oriented, participatory action-oriented and experiential learning approaches. Entrepreneurship education programmes have reached to the level of being offered at more than 3000 institutions by 2016 coupled with several academic outlets supporting the development of the field (Harvey, Kelly, Morris et al., 2010; Morris and Liguori, 2016; Woods et al., 2022). Research on entrepreneurship education has enhanced the theoretical and methodological rigour of the field (Ratten and Usmanij, 2021; Loi and Fayolle, 2022), addressing several challenges faced as entrepreneurship education has evolved in terms of expectations, objectives and contexts.

Individual-social-context interaction (Loi and Fayolle, 2022; Anderson, Drakopoulou-Dodd and Jack, 2021) has become a prominent dimension of entrepreneurship education with this growth, also as critique of neo-liberal approaches to entrepreneurship education. With more emphasis on individuals and creating opportunities in this neo-liberal discourse, universities have pushed for the development of entrepreneurial and creative individuals who can make themselves as the centre of their project and seek opportunities for new ventures. What seems to be missing here is the individual-social-context nexus. Siimilarly, Dodd, Lage-Arias, Berglund et al. (2022) invite us to rethink and address the following question: 'how can we avoid reconstructing tacit dialectic relationships between social and economic'? (p.691). One powerful way forward for

11

entrepreneurship education could be to engage with students in dialogue and critical reflection as part of co-creation process, and not to follow rigid business tools to make these learners become grounded as ethical change agents (Dodd et al., 2022).

This critique of entrepreneurship education failing to address social, cultural and economic dimensions holistically and respond to needs and challenges in diverse settings (Woods et al., 2022) has provided further impetus for social entrepreneurship education focusing on motivational (e.g. social cause-based) and relational (e.g. energising, mobilising and inspiring communities) dimensions of education process. Scholarship in social entrepreneurship education has supported this field development by evolving from awareness-raising in terms of the role of education in social entrepreneurship to in-depth examination of learning processes and the effectiveness of specific educational tools and pedagogical approaches. Smith and Woodworth (2012), for instance, focus on pedagogical strategies to help students raise their self-efficacy and develop identities as social entrepreneurs. Departing from the premise that social entrepreneurship involves the challenge of competing business and social demands, they propose a paradoxical leadership model whereby differentiation of multiple logics, their acceptance and integration feature as the key principles of relevant pedagogical tools. Pache and Chowdhury (2012), on the other hand, extend the argument to educating social entrepreneurs in institutionally embedded ways. In other words, they call for them to be equipped with the behavioral skills of bridging competing logics –-welfare logic, commercial logic, and public sector logic – thus becoming 'trilingual', and at ease with the cultures and dynamics of these different worlds (Pache and Chowdhury, 2012, p. 506), which correspond to cultural, economic, social and symbolic capitals.

12

Heterogeneity of learners and context-sensitivity is often highlighted in designing programs of social entrepreneurship education (Howorth et al., 2012). The authors advance the debate by placing emphasis on the social processes of learning. Their findings reveal the importance of nurturing familiarity, positive relations, and trust with learners in the initial stages of programs so as to forge a strong affinity and relationality between the social entrepreneurship education programs and the participant actors as reflexive social entrepreneurs. Relationality in the context of social entrepreneurship education is the interplay between micro individual agency, meso institutional structures and macro national policies (Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2005), all of which constitute process-relational outcomes as entailed by social entrepreneurship (Nicolopoulou et al., 2015). The present study addresses the calls for new theoretical frames and responds to the shifting trends in the field of social entrepreneurship education research and practice, by approaching the research problematisation through the lens of Bourdieusian theory (Bourdieu, 1986, 1989; 1990, 1998; Tatli et al., 2014). This has allowed us to capture the complex dynamics of social entrepreneurship in a way that helps to develop learner social entrepreneurs as reflexive change agents. Pässilä, Oikarinen and Harmaakorpi (2013) make a useful distinction between reflection and reflexivity. They view reflection as a cognitive activity whereas reflexivity is much deeper than this as it involves unsettling conventional practices through dialogical and relational activities. Hence, reflexivity is context-dependent, temporal, and denotes provisional nature of knowledge; entails maintaining a curious and open-minded approach and might necessitate improvisation and performative action. In the context of social entrepreneurship education, could reflexivity be about questioning assumptions of (commercial) entrepreneurial activity and addressing social and environmental issues by developing actions underpinned by the values and guiding principles associated with impacting change and social inclusion?

13

Relating this to Bourdieusian theoretical lens, we revisit our questions as (1) What constitutes capital in the context of SEE? and (2) What is the kind of habitus that the SEE field generates for the accumulation of multiple capitals and their conversion (as part of a transformative and reflexive experience), leading to meaningful outcomes for social entrepreneurship?

Method

Research context

We acknowledge the importance of international and national contexts in understanding entrepreneurship education. Social entrepreneurship education (SEE), similar to entrepreneurship education, has an international character that crosses national borders, and is quite diverse. The reason for this has been the lack of professional institutions that control entry to and practice in this field (unlike some management education fields such as accounting and HRM) and the use of social entrepreneurial examples from a wide range of countries in pedagogical approaches.

In the UK context, entrepreneurship education has gained prominence with the New Labour Governments in the post-1997 period. With the introduction of tailored funding schemes such as Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF), Science Enterprise Centres were established in many universities across the country. These centres were tasked with embedding entrepreneurship education across the universities in which they are located (all disciplines including physical, natural, social sciences, engineering, medicine and business schools) and supporting the commercialization activity. SEE has emerged as a sub-domain of this movement particularly from mid-2000 onwards with an increasing emphasis on finding a new methodology

14

and a model to deliver social value as well as economic value. Many universities – particularly, business schools – began to incorporate social entrepreneurship in their curricula both at undergraduate (UG) and postgraduate (PG) levels. It is also worth noting that interdisciplinary perspectives are evident in some institutions, such as social entrepreneurship courses being taught across faculties having diverse bases of students and educators. We have provided an illustrative overview of the current UK SEE sphere in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 here

Production of empirical material

This study draws on qualitative study techniques of data collection and analysis and involves semi-structured interviews with 26 social entrepreneurship educators and mentors, drawn from a sample of 20 UK universities. SEE, as shown in Table 1, is still an emerging sub-domain of entrepreneurship education, and there is a scattered approach to inclusion of SEE within UK university programmes. Adopting purposive sampling technique (Patton, 2014), we recruited these 26 educators and mentors. Purposive sampling is highly applicable in this study as a deliberate choice of participants due to qualities that they hold for a given research problem (Etikan, Musa and Alkassim, 2016) has been made. As a non-random sampling strategy, we, as researchers, set out to find educators and mentors in the field of SEE, who can and are willing to provide information by virtue of knowledge and experience (see Bernard, 2002; Etikan et al.,

15

2016 for purposive sampling). As our main focus is on the overall approach, programme content, curriculum design and implementation and therefore we looked at the structural/field-level and relational matters, which were influenced and practised highly by educators and mentors. There are many actors in the social entrepreneurship field, such as students, alumni and business school leaders in shaping the curriculum. This is one of the limitations of our study methodologically.

The characteristics of the sample are demonstrated in Table 2 below.

Insert Table 2 here

The semi-structured interviews with these participants focused on their role in SEE, main competencies that students should develop, components of SEE education (underpinned by values), methods of teaching, changes in approaches to SEE, capitals required, and issues surrounding reflexivity, and approaches and challenges of social entrepreneurship education. From these, we produced interview transcripts and field notes. Field notes included records of our initial hunches, important themes that emanated from the interview conducted, and with some potential connections between data points, for instance, how we could ask participants to elaborate on a certain theme further in the subsequent interviews. The interview data were analysed inductively by teasing out key themes in order of significance, corresponding to the research questions. Bourdieusian theory, mainly forms of capitals, as aggregate themes, has formed our overall bridging framework for analysis and interpretation. Drawing on these constructs, we moved back and forth between *emi*c (data-driven) (Tatli and Ozbilgin, 2012) and *etic* (theoretically driven) readings of the empirical material. In other words, an iterative and

16

reflexive approach to data analysis was followed whereby we have analyzed, revisited the data and connected them to emerging findings, and progressively refined our focus and understanding (Tracy, 2013) to address our key research questions. Our questions have entailed a closer examination of characteristics and aspects of capital in the context of SEE, and the kind of habitus that the SEE field generates for the accumulation of multiple capitals and their conversion as part of a transformative and reflexive experience, leading to meaningful outcomes for social entrepreneurship. To this end, our coding procedure follows the softer version of analytic approach provided by Strauss and Corbin (1998), which encompasses open coding, axial coding and selective coding (Seale, 2004). Open coding, which leads to first-order codes, means identifying instances of data according to emerging analytic themes. First order-codes included themes from the data such as multiplicity of capitals. Axial coding aims to identify the second-order codes, which explicate the interconnections between the open codes and theoretical categories. Blending theory with data (building on emic and etic approach as described above), our theoretical constructs, namely, capitals, habitus of SEE, and field-level reflexivity formed the core of our second-order codes. Selective coding is the stage at which third-order codes and core categories are identified, which led to the development of a reflexive approach to SEE underpinned by mobilization and conversion of capitals for meaningful transformative experience. This form of three-stage coding also demonstrates triangulation in analytical terms (Gioia et al., 2013). Two of the researchers coded the data in order to ensure inter-reliability.

Insert Figure 1 here

17

Findings

We have structured this section around three main themes that emanated from our data: the themes are (i) questioning underlying values and assumptions in the habitus of social entrepreneurship, (ii) developing educational content and methods to support the legitimacy of the field of social entrepreneurship, and (iii) understanding multiplicity of capitals and their conversion process in the field of social entrepreneurship education. The importance of connecting the 'why', 'what' and 'how' dimensions of entrepreneurship education is well established (Byrne et al., 2014; Fayolle, 2008). This translates to our findings as follows: Understanding the link between social entrepreneurship-related values and assumptions, which is the habitus (the 'why' aspect); process-relational field-level influences to developing the content, which is the reflexivity of the field (the 'what' question); and the different range of capitals and conversion processes (the 'how') of social entrepreneurship education.

Questioning underlying values and assumptions in the habitus of social entrepreneurship

One distinct theme emerging from the interviews is that in developing education programs for social entrepreneurship, the key departure point should be that of questioning the underlying values and assumptions of social entrepreneurship, i.e. its habitus, and conceptualising them in such a way that interlocking elements, such as addressing a social problem, finding creative and innovative solutions, and energising and mobilising communities can form the foundation for curriculum development. Social entrepreneurship education should be informed by a good understanding of the underlying values and assumptions of the entrepreneurs engaging in relevant activities. Words of the participants illustrate the multi-faceted nature of social

18

entrepreneurship, and how it should be covered in education, as illustrated by the following

quote from a visiting lecturer who is highly engaged in enterprise activities:

Social entrepreneurship has very much to do with the broad area of communities taking
control of their own destinies. So we're not coming at this from a business perspective,
but from the perspective of sustainability, and community development and
engagement, local governance. (P26, visiting lecturer)

Social entrepreneurship habitus involves operating with multiple bottom lines and surplus

creation for community development, rather than profit maximisation for shareholders. Self-

sufficiency and long-term sustainability of social ventures are specifically accorded reference

enterprise values compared with non-profit organisations, such as charities and for-profit

organisations, such as private enterprises. In other words, participants thought that an alternative

vision of how business should operate in society is a core feature of social enterprise.

Social entrepreneurs engage with both social (voluntary) and commercial sector dynamics. They

are challenged by the task of bridging two conflicting narratives (social and business) (Nayir and

Shinnar, 2020; Agrawal and Hockerts, 2013). Understanding the unique context of social

enterprise habitus, and developing awareness of the field-specific factors of social business

development is crucial. For the learners, this entails paradoxical thinking, learning to manage

competing logics, and being mindful of tensions arising from these logics. On the part of the

educators, it is imperative to account for the field-level contextual dynamics that inform the

processes of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise when designing the curriculum.

Drawing on their previous industry experience, a lecturer states:

The context and the characteristics of the social enterprise are different from a regular
private business. Although there were some similarities obviously with private industry,
it was the context, the characteristics of the sector, for example, in managing change,

there were differences in how to manage the voluntary sector than it was in private industry, because of the characteristics of the voluntary sector environment. (P16, Lecturer)

There is dissimilarity between profit generation and the social value creation habitus of

private and social enterprises. One participant elaborates:

Obviously in private industry, you are not looking for funders, it's a different operation and there is definitely the tension between the value-driven ethos and the need to generate money. (P9, Lecturer)

Differences in values also result in variations in the way changes should be designed

and delivered.

The change process was different in some ways because of the people involved; because of also the tension of people wanting to be value driven, but also having to take on board the professionalisation aspect, where they had to look financially and commercially credible for funders. (P16, Lecturer)

The interviews also revealed the importance of scrutinising the socio-economic and political

fields surrounding social entrepreneurship. One prevailing assumption across Europe,

particularly in the UK, is that social enterprise habitus are charged with public service delivery,

which is increasingly replacing welfare state provision as suggested by a lecturer, who is also

involved in consultancy projects in the industry:

Social Enterprise organisations are more subject to the whims of Government and the political agendas, of what the Government is going to support and promote. So there's a sort of move towards, you know, getting these organisations to fill gaps that maybe the Government should be filling. So all of it is part of the political environment as well. (P16, Lecturer)

Developing educational content and methods to support reflexivity

The politically charged nature of the social entrepreneurship field in which social enterprises operate raises issues for reflexivity of social entrepreneurs, including the necessity to move away from being viewed as a substitute for public service delivery, or becoming politicised according to the vested interests of governments. Consequently, the wider context, both political and economic, becomes a key concern for social entrepreneurship educators as they develop curricula.

The nature of the social entrepreneurship field necessitates the development of educational content and methods to deal with its complexities and the fundamentally paradoxical nature of reflexivity in the field. Conventional business school programs prescribe a profit-oriented habitus, which often contradicts social entrepreneurship values. Considering the growing interest in the concept of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise employment as a viable career path, the research participants identified the opportunity to raise a new generation of social entrepreneurs, embracing ethical values and addressing both social and business missions, in a way that is connected with realities of the field and impacts change. In the words of experienced educators in the field:

We will have thousands and thousands of potential new entrants into the social enterprise world, for students graduating, particularly over the next four or five years. As getting a job recedes into the distance, there is a good opportunity to actually create lots of new ethically minded (it may not be Social Enterprises in any one strict definition), but ethically minded, and ethically motivated, small businesses. (P17. Senior Lecturer)

So the first thing is to be able to understand that any social entrepreneur solution is one in a constellation of solutions; and some are non-profit and before-profit. And so understanding that they are not the first person to make an intervention in their field, and that whatever they come up with, is just one intervention. And to understand that it has a relationship to others in that field. So it's important for students to understand that the intervention isn't in a vacuum. (P.24, Professor)

21

The social entrepreneurship field is also seen as highly interdisciplinary, due to its dual nature and underlying assumptions, as discussed above. This cross-disciplinary approach is imbued with a critical approach to sustainability and how it manifests itself in social enterprise teaching. 'Sustainability' is defined here in its broadest sense, including sustainability of the organisation created, sustainability of communities, sustainability of community-led projects, and sustainability of related service delivery for beneficiaries (Shepherd and Patzelt, 2011). To some extent, sustainability arguments give a refreshed form of reflexivity to the learners of social enterprise. Addressing multiple bottom lines, social enterprise field and habitus need to be embedded as a methodology within the curriculum. The following extracts from interviews highlight this need for integrating critical and multi-dimensional issues in social entrepreneurship education:

Ideally, you've got students in Engineering, looking at Engineering through a social entrepreneurial lens. You've got students in Oceanography looking at it through a social entrepreneurship lens. Looking at a system and thinking; looking at a design and thinking; looking at business modelling, developing all those skills. That is the holy grail. (P21, Senior Lecturer)

In terms of sustainability, it would therefore be useful to students to realise that sustainability is built around mutual reinforcement of social welfare, economy, and environment. (P3, Principal Lecturer)

You should show how it is different to other business models in that it allows a social mission, they don't have to prioritise shareholder value in the same way corporations do, so it gives them more freedom to pursue a genuine triple bottom line. I'll introduce notions of triple bottom line, enterprises that relate to an environment, social lens, and commercial lens. (P1, Lecturer)

However, the interviewees also warned against the pitfalls of an imbalance between social and enterprise missions, which materialise as lack of financial awareness and grant-dependency:

One of the key components of the social entrepreneurship curriculum has to be financial awareness, because these organisations are very much value driven, but

22

you've also got to be commercially driven. I feel that getting a balance of that is quite important. (P20, Professor)

Research participants argued that a salient aspect of social entrepreneurship curriculum development is the distinction between the social entrepreneurship field as a process and a social enterprise habitus as its most common organisational form. Social entrepreneurship education is important in developing an alternative habitus, which incorporates the notion of growth linked to the sustainable development of communities, and in addressing social and environmental issues on an ongoing basis through regeneration and new social venture projects:

Social entrepreneurship is more like people seeking to engender new forms of growth. Now that might be with or within the corporation, or within their own community. People seeking to create new value, create new growth, create new enterprises, create new ventures, new endeavours ... (P2, Senior Lecturer)

One participant was critical of the way that the traditional understanding of economic growth is often charged with the notion of 'passing the costs' of production on to society, and that the social enterprise curriculum reinforces this particular habitus:

It is important to show how social enterprise can fit into the context of society as an alternative model of business, where our current model really is unsustainable because it relies on constant economic growth, it relies on business success that generally entails externalising as many of the costs of production as possible onto society. (P1, Lecturer)

Contextualizing and defining social entrepreneurship entails putting it into the historical context of the field of social enterprise. Our data show that the key pillars of the field of social entrepreneurship education should incorporate a new habitus with value-driven understanding,

23

situated nature (context), historical evolution (of social enterprise), and multiple bottom-line

approaches.

First of all there must be a passion, a love for it, for anything else, but I think with social enterprise even more. If you are not attuned with the social context and with what you are trying to really pursue, I don't think that you can really succeed as a social entrepreneur . (P 25, Lecturer)

Using case studies, our participants cited that guest social entrepreneurs as role models,

knowledge exchange through consultancy, and field projects were being instrumental in

facilitating the learning of emergent social entrepreneurs:

We set up students to do consultancy projects, which require a sort of action research… After they meet the entrepreneur within the Social Enterprise of the presentation, there's a field trip to the Social Enterprise... The research groups undertake the research; they have access to the Social Entrepreneurs, they ask more questions, and we have lectures looking at the core values of the company, and we measure against the theory of core values. So a consultancy report and the pedagogy is very much about activity assessment. (P19, Lecturer)

These empirical insights also demonstrate the value of experiential learning in social

entrepreneurship education. As social entrepreneurship is a relatively young subject domain, it

is important to draw on broader theories of social sciences, management and organisation

studies; however, it is also important to differentiate it from traditional entrepreneurship

education.A lecturer who is highly engaged on social impact generation among undergraduate

student body in his institution suggested that:

I think the challenge is increasing the legitimacy of experiential education. So I think it's making experiential education much more valid as a way of learning, because I wouldn't want to do a program on social entrepreneurship education where you had 10 modules where you're sitting in a classroom learning about social innovation theory, social entrepreneurship, institutional theory. That's not social entrepreneurship, that's just a – that's missing the opportunity that social

24

entrepreneurship offers, which is understanding the world and understanding by doing.
(P24, Lecturer)

It's all about the "economy of experience", and unless we really understand that, all of education, you know, our "uber" moment, hasn't come yet, but it will come very soon. But this model is designed for the 1930s. (P 21, Senior Lecturer)

An educator who is involved in curriculum development of social entrepreneurship education

highlights that|:

So going into the ground will develop these social aspects, because you know, like to develop this understanding of what social enterprise is, the impact of social enterprise, I think students need to see and feel that by themselves. While in regular entrepreneurship education, it's more about you know, like focusing on how to develop the market, develop the project. (P23, Senior Teaching Fellow)

Another distinctive feature of social entrepreneurship education is that it has to be underpinned

by challenge-based learning approaches achieved through facilitation and coaching rather than

traditional methods of teaching. Since learners are tasked with addressing unmet social and/or

environmental challenges, and do this in an ideologically and purpose-driven way, the

challenge-based learning approach is particularly in tune with the dynamics of social

entrepreneurship:

Social entrepreneurship lends itself easily to challenge-based learning, because you always have external challenges. ... Students love that. The partners love it. We love it, because it gives us – it makes it an authentic experience. But it also means we as educators have a very different role. So, with challenge-based learning, you are not a teacher, you are a coach, fundamentally. So, you can never give students answers. (P26, Visiting Lecturer)

Finally, in terms of methods of social entrepreneurship education, the participants underlined

the crucial place of peer learning across different platforms, such as online resource and

knowledge sharing, and setting up team-based activities and assessment. Peer learning was

25

considered particularly important because it is aligned with the one of the key values of social

entrepreneurship, which is *collaboration* rather than *competition*.

Understanding multiplicity of capitals and their conversion process

One way of addressing the key challenges associated with social entrepreneurship education is

that of placing emphasis upon the development and mobilisation of the different forms of

capitals by the learners themselves. An important challenge stems from the very nature of social

entrepreneurship field in terms of its dual characteristics and the emphasis on issues of

sustainability, given that societies and economies are fast-changing, as are the social issues that

social entrepreneurs need to respond to:

Some of the challenges that come with that idea are separating it from the foundations, trusts for charities, and the differences between more than profit, and what that actually means philosophically to the students. I think one of the hardest concepts we find they want to grasp is the idea that social enterprise is not a charity; it does trade, it does make money, but the values that it contributes are measured in a range of ways. (P19, Lecturer)

In addition to the dynamic and contextual nature of the social entrepreneurship field, our

participants drew attention to the difficulties of measuring social value and impact, arguing that

this is a key challenge that needs to be addressed when designing social entrepreneurship

education.

We talk about social enterprises as entities that are primarily achieving public and social value. We have to use context for students. So, unless a student can relate to that context, I don't think they'll get it. And that's the difficulty even for the entrepreneur. The social entrepreneur will have different measures for the kind of social value that they are creating, depending on context. (P2, Senior Lecturer)

Given the rising importance of the phenomenon across the globe and the internationally

acknowledged nature of social entrepreneurship education it is becoming increasingly necessary

to apply a global and comparative perspective to the teaching of social entrepreneurship. It is

26

crucial to recognize cultural differences and identify social problems by understanding the

constraints in a certain socio-economic and political milieu, which give shape to social, cultural

and symbolic capitals. As highlighted by our participants, internationalisation of the curriculum

supports this process of mobilisation of different capitals.

Internationalisation of curriculum is very important. And in view of the students that
we take, then we have for them to learn cultural differences, for them to see the
differences in how you set up a social enterprise and how they function in different
settings. (P19, Lecturer)

The very complex nature of social entrepreneurship makes it imperative that learners acquire

multiple capitals and operate with a range of capitals in pursuing social and business missions.

Social entrepreneurship requires a full spectrum of capitals, and a reflexive approach to capital

attainment and conversion should underscore the development of education agendas:

We have to look at the whole range of social, cultural, artistic and so on, value that we
might create beyond just money. And for me, social entrepreneurship and the social
value that it might yield in various ways is an important part of teaching
entrepreneurship as a full spectrum, not just as part of it, which just reflects certain
entrenched agendas really. (P2, Senior Lecturer*)*

Several features of different forms of capital have emerged in our empirical research. Symbolic

capital is highly valued in social entrepreneurship as it touches on the very role of social

entrepreneurs as reflexive change agents and the recognition and pride from contributing to

community and society:

There's some impact in terms of students, graduates, becoming agents of change . (P3,
Principal Lecturer)

I think students are being receptive to it. And I think the students come often with the
– with an agenda to effect change and make the world a better place, and often quite

27

altruistic and they are therefore quite receptive to ideas of sustainability, social improvement, not exploiting resources and this kind of thing . (P2, Senior Lecturer)

They had to give reflections at the end of it, and a very common theme was that they'd been allowed to practice the skills they'd learnt, and in a way that contributed to the community. They felt really good about that, and a lot of them said that they would like to make sure any enterprise they start up had some social aspect to it. (P1, Lecturer)

Cultural capital dimensions refer to self-awareness as change agents, paradoxical thinking skills, developing confidence through experience, problem-solving, leadership, and challenge-based learning and reflexive actions. A full repertoire of knowledge and skills is required for social entrepreneurship, and a holistic approach to cultural capital development is imperative in developing education initiatives:

Students should be effective as leaders of social enterprise, as founders or as trustees. In order to be effective they need to possess certain skills. They need to exercise good judgement, to communicate effectively, build teams, handle the finances, think strategically, and be beware of the signs of growth and how you might overcome them. So the full repertoire of knowledge and skills…(P20, Professor)

And self-awareness skills are fundamental, but they understand not just how to perform in groups, or how to do a task, but to be able to reflect on their ability and their competency and their capitals. So, it's almost like a mental capital, a mental resource that one needs (P24, Professor)

Cultural and social capitals form the key capitals mediated by the symbolic capital in social entrepreneurship education. Social entrepreneurs often operate in resource-constrained environments and it is essential to deploy social capital to harness resources. Social capital takes the form of learning to collaborate, networking, establishing partnerships, and creating synergies to achieve a social cause, which sometimes entails conflict resolution. It relates to cultivating new forms of competencies which are different from traditional entrepreneurial contexts of start-

28

ups. The people-centred approach, empathy, and reflexive agency are all components of these competencies which can be mobilised through conversion of capitals accumulated in the process of education and practice of social entrepreneurship:

SE requires a different set of skills...I think there's been a move from entrepreneurs – from what we thought entrepreneurial skill sets were, to what they are now, and the most innovative effective organisations and companies embrace that. So, it is looking at skills like empathy; it is talking about creativity; it is thinking about problem solving ....it's a greater focus on people-centred skills. And that for me is what a social entrepreneur is different than a traditional commercial entrepreneur…(P 25, Lecturer)

In social entrepreneurship we want to encourage prosocial ways of resolving conflict. (P 25, Lecturer)

Bourdieusian theoretical position has allowed us to delineate qualities and aspects of multiple forms of capital underpinning social entrepreneurship and those that learners develop and transform during the process of social entrepreneurship, and the kind of habitus that social entrepreneurship field generates for a transformative experience leading to meaningful outcomes in the pursuit of addressing grand societal, economic and ecological challenges. Embedded in values and principles forging the socially and symbolically charged elements of social entrepreneurship, SEE requires reflexivity and careful consideration of learners' needs and social entrepreneurship trajectories.

Discussion and conclusions

We argue in this paper that social entrepreneurship education requires a reflexive curriculum which takes account of the particular habitus of the social entrepreneurship field that has a unique set of ways in which students need to learn to deploy and mobilise their capital resources. Our study is novel in two important ways. First, it explores social entrepreneurship education through a sociological lens drawing from the Bourdieusian approach and advances the

29

theoretical foundations of the SEE field. Second, we make contributions to practice and policy by drawing on empirical evidence base and providing policy insights to advance a reflexive approach to social entrepreneurship education, with specific implications for education policy and practice.

The social entrepreneurship field and its habitus are complex. Understanding this complexity and the multiplicity of processes involved in social entrepreneurship necessitates an approach that bridges material and non-material aspects, and social and commercial dimensions (Pache and Santos, 2010). Applying the Bourdieusian conceptual universe allows us to deal with the artificial divide between the social and economic elements prevailing in the social entrepreneurship field. The socially and ideologically driven field of social entrepreneurship can allow us to question the prevailing habitus of social enterprise, embedded in values and assumptions forging the socially and symbolically charged elements of social entrepreneurship activity. This links us to what capitals mean in the context of social entrepreneurship education. This has significant implications for social entrepreneurship education. It is therefore fundamentally important to develop a reflexive approach (Collien, 2017; Passila et al., 2013) that is underscored by the processes of capital accumulation and conversion. Our findings clearly demonstrate that cultural, social, and symbolic capitals are the principal forms of capitals that need to be nurtured in the process of education, with the understanding that their intelligently crafted combination will yield financial resources (economic capital) necessary for social entrepreneurship activities. These align with Bourdieu, who argues that cultural capital consists of an embodied state, an objectified state, and an institutionalised state. For the *embodied* state, in terms of forms of knowledge that resides within us, we have revealed the importance of specific language cues of the social enterprise world that learners choose to adopt

30

such as social impact, system, and design thinking (to solve problems) (Sarooghi et al., 2019) and sustainability. With regard to the *objectified* state, which could be explained as material resources to indicate the interface between cultural, social, and economic capitals, we emphasise the significance of – for example – learning to utilise social venture funds and technology in the form of utilising digital platforms, given the importance and rapid pace of digitalisation in a post-pandemic society. Finally, the *institutionalised* state can refer to the way society measures social capital in the context of SEE.

Symbolic capital, particularly, is a vital component of social entrepreneurship education programs, as the participants need to acknowledge and draw upon a repertoire of values and principles that guide their thinking, approach and practice in designing social impact ventures and solutions, as reflected differently by Hagg and Kurczewska (2019). This marks the key differences between conventional entrepreneurship education and social entrepreneurship education. Social entrepreneurship education is distinct in a sense that it is underpinned by a community-driven collaborative approach underlined by sensitivity to social and environmental problems and societal challenges, empathy, human-centred outlook, social- impact generation, and international stance. It is also imbued with challenge-based learning impacting this notion of raising awareness for sensitivity towards social and/or environmental problems. Innovative methodologies which bring attention to alignment with authenticity and mindful practice will fare much better in terms of the creation of potential impact. The more aligned future social entrepreneurs are with the habitus of values incorporated in their intended pursuits, the greater chance they will have to operate as successful agents of change who can navigate the social entrepreneurship field by accumulating, deploying, and trading off various forms of capital. Subtle reproduction of societal power relations through habitus-field dynamics is well debated

31

by Collien (2017). We also highlight how all of these processes are motivated by learners' need to gain reflexivity as social entrepreneurs, as change agents. Students take a particular stance for their social entrepreneurial practices and habitus. Through habitus Bourdieu encourages us to understand how formative influence of the past is a determinant of an individual's cognitive and intentional structures bringing about empirical action (Waghid and Oliver, 2017). In the context of social entrepreneurship education, development of learners as change makers is intrinsically connected with an application of their imaginative judgements in driving and enacting change. Educators and mentors also bring their own habitus to the co-creation process of social entrepreneurship education. Equally, educators and mentors reflect on their practice and find ways forward to develop their teaching and mentoring practice to establish the reflexivity. This is what we mean by 'repositioning SEE for the future' in this paper.

Designing pedagogical strategies that enable the operationalization of such a reflexive approach is an important next step. Our empirical findings reveal that many traditional techniques and assignments can be tailored to specifically focus on the field, the habitus, and the cultural, social and symbolic forms of capital development and conversion. Employed collectively, these capitals serve the purpose of achieving a balanced approach in developing both the social enterprise and the agency of learners as reflexive social entrepreneurs. As Dal Magro, Pozzebon and Schutel (2020) postulate, this could also be explained as transformative learning that is experienced at the epistemic level, contributing to changes in values and leading to development of community-based competencies, which are ingrained in the very nature of social entrepreneurship. On a practical level, conventional methods of entrepreneurship education could be revisited by introducing new and more community-based pedagogical tools, such as

32

community internships, work shadowing with social entrepreneurs, social innovation/sustainability challenge exercises, simulation games, and social mission metrics exercises, all of which are underpinned by critical, reflexive, transformative and challenge-based learning approaches. Lectures and other traditional methods as part of the social entrepreneurship habitus lay the groundwork to help students identify with social entrepreneurship by first establishing its foundation, values, and principles (Smith and Woodworth, 2012). Contextualised examples of successful and unsuccessful cases of social entrepreneurship add to the cultural (and social) capital of learners by eliciting student involvement and the application of relevant skills, knowledge, and concepts to address social problems, as they can sensitise students to the transformative potential of different forms of relevant capital involved in social entrepreneurship.

For the field of social entrepreneurship education, further practical implications include enriching student experience by creating a space for them to pursue their passion by using social enterprise as a tool and by developing contemporary skills. Such skills include forward thinking, emotionally intelligent ways of relating to people and communities surrounding their social venture and using digital and artificial intelligence skills responsibly by maintaining human-centredness in approaching issues and challenges that they want to tackle through their social entrepreneurship journey. Universities and other education establishments could be more proactive to create accelerator type of environments for SE learners during their study. Blended with their education, this kind of a vibrant start-up accelerator programme can bring together networking events with social entrepreneurs and other actors of social entrepreneurship ecosystems (such as impact investors) to get inspiration and learn from with

33

internships/placements and international trips to areas whereby social entrepreneurship is strongly present in addressing unmet needs. In such ways, learners will truly have a transformative experience by focusing on life-long skills such as treating people and resources with respect and dignity, valuing diversity of people, ideas, issues and solutions, and cross-cultural communication skills.

In summary, the Bourdiesian lens has the potential to inform the future development of curriculum content and teaching strategies through a more reflexive approach. We argue that the reflexive approach to SEE is underscored by processes of development, mobilization and conversion of capitals, and by also taking a critical approach to the habitus of SEE. Future research may expand on the conceptual lens introduced in this paper by integrating further theories from the fields of education and social psychology to illuminate both the cognitive and social processes of learning in the course of developing cultural, social, and symbolic capital in the field of social entrepreneurship. Future research could also engage with students, alumni, business school leaders as key actors and stakeholders of SEE and include their perspectives in shaping up a reflexive approach. Another future research avenue could be a critical content analysis of SEE curricula with the objective to evolve and advance such curricula in order to develop better informed education programmes addressing sustainability, impact and social justice related agendas and challenges

References

Agrawal, A., & Hockerts, K. (2013), "Institutional theory as a framework for practitioners of social entrepreneurship". In Social innovation (pp. 119-129). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Anheier HK Gerhards J and Romo FP (1995), "Forms of Capital and Social Structure in Cultural Fields: Examining Bourdieu's Social Topography". The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 100, pp. 859-903.

Belcher, B.M., Claus, R., Davel, R. and Jones, S.M. (2022), "Evaluating and improving the contributions of university research to social innovation", Social Enterprise Journal, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 51-120.

Bernard, H. R. (2002). Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches (3rd ed.). Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Bissola R., Imperatori B and Biffi, A (2017), "A rhizomatic learning process to create collective knowledge in entrepreneurship education: Open innovation and collaboration beyond boundaries", Management Learning, Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 206-226.

Bojica A M, Ruiz Jiménez JM, Ruiz Nava JA and Fuentes-Fuentes MM (2018), "Bricolage and Growth in Social Entrepreneurship Organisations", Entrepreneurship & Regional Development Vol. 30, No. (3-4), pp. 362-389.

Bourdieu P. (1977), *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu P. (1986), "The Forms of Capital". In: Richardson JG (ed) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood, 241-258.

Bourdieu, P (1987), "What Makes a Social Class? On the Theoretical and Practical Existence of Groups", Berkeley Journal of Sociology, Vol. 32, pp. 1-18.

Bourdieu, P. (1989), "Social Space and Symbolic Power", Sociological Theory, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.18-26.

Bourdieu, P. (1990), *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu P. (1993) *Sociology in Question*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bourdieu P. (1998) Practical Reason, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (1992). An invitation to Reflexive Sociology. University of Chicago Press.

Bridge S. (2015), "Is Enterprise Education Relevant to Social enterprise?" Education+ Training, Vol. 57, No. 8-9, pp. 1009-1019.

Byrne J, Fayolle A and Toutain O (2014) Entrepreneurship Education: What We Know and What We Need to Know. In: Chell E and Karatas-Özkan M (eds) *Handbook of Research on Small Business and Entrepreneurship,* edited by Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 261-288.

Chell E, Nicolopoulou K and Karataş-Özka M (2010), "Social Entrepreneurship and Enterprise: International and Innovation Perspectives", Entrepreneurship and Regional Development Vol. 22, No. 6.pp. 485-493.

Collien I (2018), "Critical–reflexive–political: Dismantling the reproduction of dominance in organisational learning processes", Management Learning, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 131-149.

Dal Magro R, Pozzebon M and Schutel S (2020), "Enriching the intersection of service and transformative learning with Freirean ideas: The case of a critical experiential learning programme in Brazil", Management Learning, Vol. 51, No.5, pp. 579-597.

De Clercq D and Voronov M (2009), "The Role of Cultural and Symbolic Capital in Entrepreneurs' Ability to Meet Expectations about Conformity and Innovation", Journal of Small Business Management, Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 398-420.

Dobele L and Pietere A (2015), "Competitiveness of social entrepreneurship in Latvia", Regional Formation and Development Studies, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 40-50.

Dodd, S., Lage-Arias, S., Berglund, K., Jack, S., Hytti, U., & Verduijn, K. (2022). Transforming enterprise education: sustainable pedagogies of hope and social justice. Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 1-15.

Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). "Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology", Organizational Research Methods, 16(1), 15-31.

35

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5(1), 1-4.

Fayolle A (2008), "Entrepreneurship Education at the Crossroads: Towards a More Mature Teaching Field", Journal of Enterprising Culture, Vol. 16, pp. 325-337.

Fayolle A (2013), "Personal Views on the Future of Entrepreneurship Education", Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, Vol. 25, pp. 7-8.

Finlayson, E., & Roy Michael, J. (2019). Empowering communities? Exploring roles in facilitated social enterprise. Social Enterprise Journal, 15(1), 76-93. doi:10.1108/SEJ-04-2018-0035.

Hägg, G., & Gabrielsson, J. (2019). A systematic literature review of the evolution of pedagogy in entrepreneurial education research. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 26 (5), 829-861.

Hägg, G., & Kurczewska, A. (2019), "Who is the student entrepreneur? Understanding the emergent adult through the pedagogy and andragogy interplay", Journal of Small Business Management, Vol. 57, pp. 130-147.

Harker R, Mahar C and Wilkes C (1990) *An Introduction to the Work of Pierre Bourdieu: The Practice of Theory*. New York: Saint Martin's Press.

Hart, C. S. (2019), "Education, inequality and social justice: A critical analysis applying the Sen-Bourdieu Analytical Framework", Policy Futures in Education, Vol. 17. No. 5, pp. 582-598.

Harvey, C., Kelly, A., Morris, H., & Rowlinson, M. (2010). The association of business schools. Academic journal quality guide, 4, 1-15.

Howorth C, Smith SM and Parkinson C (2012) Social Learning and Social Entrepreneurship Education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 11(3): 371-389.

Huppatz K (2009), "Reworking Bourdieu's Capital: Feminine and Female Capitals in the Field of Paid Caring Work", Sociology, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 45-66.

Jones S (2014), "Gendered Discourses of Entrepreneurship in UK Higher Education: The Fictive Entrepreneur and the Fictive Student", International Small Business Journal, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 237-258.

Karatas-Özkan M (2011), "Understanding Relational Qualities of Entrepreneurial Learning: Towards a Multi-Layered Approach", Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, Vol. 23, No. 9-10, pp. 877-906.

Karatas-Özkan M. and Chell E. (2010), *Nascent Entrepreneurship and Learning*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishers.

Kyrö P. (2015), "The Conceptual Contribution of Education to Research on Entrepreneurship Education", Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, Vol. 27, No. 9-10, pp. 599-618.

Lackéus, M., & Middleton, K. W. (2015). Venture creation programs: bridging entrepreneurship education and technology transfer. Education+ Training, 57 (1), 48-73.

Landström, H., Gabrielsson, J., Politis, D., Sørheim, R., & Djupdal, K. (2022). The social structure of entrepreneurial education as a scientific field. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 21(1), 61-81.

Littlewood, D., & Holt, D. (2018). How social enterprises can contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)–A conceptual framework. In Entrepreneurship and the Sustainable Development Goals (pp. 33-46): Emerald Publishing Limited.

Loi, M., & Fayolle, A. (2022). Rethinking and reconceptualising entrepreneurship education a legacy from Alistair Anderson. Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 34, (7-8), 701-721.

McKeever E, Jack S and Anderson A. (2015), "Embedded Entrepreneurship in the Creative Re-construction of Place", Journal of Business Venturing, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 50-65.

Mdleleni, L. (2022), "University as a vehicle to achieve social innovation and development: repositioning the role of the university in the society", Social Enterprise Journal, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 121-139.

Mughal F, Gatrell C and Stead V (2018), "Cultural politics and the role of the action learning facilitator: Analysing the negotiation of critical action learning in the Pakistani MBA through a Bourdieusian lens", Management Learning, Vol. 49, No. 1, pp. 69-85.

36

Nayır, D. Z., & Shinnar, R. S. (2020), "How founders establish legitimacy: A narrative perspective on social entrepreneurs in a developing country context", Social Enterprise Journal, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 221-241.

Nicholls, A. (2008). Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change: OUP Oxford.

Nicolopoulou K (2014), "Social Entrepreneurship between Cross-currents: Toward a Framework for Theoretical Restructuring of the Field", Journal of Small Business Management, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp. 678-702.

Nicolopoulou K, Lucas I, Tatli A and Karatas-Ozkan M, Costanzo A, Özbilgin LM and Manville G (2015), "Questioning the legitimacy of social enterprises through Gramscian and Bourdieusian perspectives: the case of British social enterprises", Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp.161-185.

Özbilgin M and Tatli A (2005), "Book Review Essay: Understanding Bourdieu's Contribution to Organization and Management Studies", Academy of Management Review, Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 855-877.

Özbilgin M and Tatl A (2011), "Mapping out the Field of Equality and Diversity: Rise of Individualism and Voluntarism", Human Relations, Vol. 13, pp. 177-198.

Özbilgin M, Küskü F and Erdogmus N (2005) Explaining Influences on Career 'Choice': the Case of MBA Students. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 16(11): 2000-2028.

Pache AC and Chowdhury I (2012), "Social Entrepreneurs as Institutionally Embedded Entrepreneurs: Toward a New Model of Social Entrepreneurship Education", Academy of Management Learning and Education, Vol.11, No. 3, pp. 494-510.

Pache AC and Santos F (2012), "Inside the Hybrid Organization: Selective Coupling as a Response to Conflicting Institutional Logics", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 56, No. 4, pp. 972-1001.

Patton, M.Q., 2014. *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage publications.

Pässilä AH, Oikarinen T and Harmaakorpi V (2015), "Collective voicing as a reflexive practice", Management Learning, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 67-86.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice. Sage publications.

Pret T, Shaw E and Drakopoulou Dodd S. (2016), "Painting the Full Picture: The Conversion of Economic, Cultural, Social and Symbolic Capital", International Small Business Journal, Vol. 34, No. 8, pp. 1004-1027.

Ratten, V., & Usmanij, P. (2021). Entrepreneurship education: Time for a change in research direction?. The International Journal of Management Education, 19(1), 100367.

Santos SC, Neumeyer X and Morris MH. (2019) Entrepreneurship education in a poverty context: An empowerment perspective. *Journal of Small Business Management* 57:6-32.

Sarooghi H, Sunny S, Hornsby J and Fernhaber S (2019) Design Thinking and Entrepreneurship Education: Where Are We, and What Are the Possibilities? *Journal of Small Business Management* 57:78-93.

Seale C (2004) Validity, Reliability and the Quality of Research. In: Seale C (ed) *Researching Society and Culture* London: Sage Publications, 72-83.

Shaw E and de Bruin A 2013. "Reconsidering Capitalism - The Promise of Social Innovation & Social Entrepreneurship?" *International Small Business Journal* 31(7): 737-746.

Shepherd DA and Patzelt H (2011), "The New Field of Sustainable Entrepreneurship: Studying Entrepreneurial Action Linking "What Is to Be Sustained" With "What Is to Be Developed", Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Vol. 35, pp. 137–163.

Smith IH and Woodworth WP (2012), "Developing Social Entrepreneurs and Social Innovators: a Social Identity and Self-Efficacy Approach", Academy of Management Learning and Education, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 390-407.

37

Spigel B. (2013), "Bourdieuian Approaches to the Geography of Entrepreneurial Cultures". Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, Vol. 25, No. 9-10; pp. 804-818.

Strauss AL and Corbin JM (1998), *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Svendsen G and Svendsen G (2004), On the Wealth of Nations: Bourdieu's economic and Social Capitals. In: Swartz D and Zolberg V (eds) *After Bourdieu*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 239-266.

Tatli A and Özbilgin M (2012) An Emic approach to Intersectional Study of Diversity at Work: a Bourdieuan Framing. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 14: 180-200.

Tatli A, Özbilgin M and Karatas-Özkan M. (2015), *Pierre Bourdieu, Organisation, and Management*. New York: Routledge.

Tatli A, Vassilopoulou J, Özbilgin M, Forson C and Slutskaya N (2014), "A Bourdieuan relational perspective for entrepreneurship research". Journal of Small Business Management, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp. 615-632.

Thevenot L (2011), "Power and Oppression from the Perspective of the Sociology of Engagements: a Comparison with Bourdieu's and Dewey's Critical Approaches to Practical Activities", Irish Journal of Sociology, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 35-67.

Townley B. (2015), "Exploring Different Forms of Capitals: Researching Capitals in the Field of Cultural and Creative industries" In: Tatli A, Özbilgin M and Karatas-Özkan M (eds) *Pierre Bourdieu, Management and Organisation*, London: Routledge, pp.187-206.

Tracy SJ (2013) *Qualitative Research Methods: Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis and Communicating Impact*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Waghid, Z., & Oliver, H. (2017). Cultivating social entrepreneurial capacities in students through film: Implications for social entrepreneurship education. Educational Research for Social Change, 6(2), 76-100.

Woods, C., Dell, K., & Carroll, B. (2022). Decolonizing the Business School: Reconstructing the Entrepreneurship Classroom through Indigenizing Pedagogy and Learning. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 21(1), 82-100.

Appendix 1

38

Interview guide

1) What is your role? To whom do you teach Entrepreneurship/Social entrepreneurship?
2) What do you think are the main competencies that students should develop for SE during their program/modules?
3) What are the components of SE education?
4) What are the methods of your teaching?
5) How does SE education differ from entrepreneurship education?
6) What kind of capitals do students need to develop? Does your teaching facilitate this, if so how?
7) How do you evaluate your education practices in the domain of SE from a student /learner perspective? What is their evaluation of your approach?
8) What do you think the main challenges are in the SE field?
9) How do you think your students gain legitimacy in this domain as social entrepreneurs?
10) What are the key challenges for the future of SE education (Considering all sorts of digital transformation and a variety of sources affecting the educational context and methods)?

Figure 1. Analytical framework (Developed by authors; figure concept adopted from Pache and Santos, 2012)

First-order Categories	Second-order Themes	Aggregate Dimensions

First-order Categories

-Questioning underlying values and assumptions of social entrepreneurship (SE)
-Social entrepreneurs as change agents
-Operating with multiple forms of capitals
-Managing transformation of capitals
-Developing awareness of context-specific factors
-Historical evolution of social enterprise

-Cross-disciplinary roots of SE
-Sustainability and community-driven approach
-Operationalisation of multiple capitals

-Context of education
-Alignment with levels of analysis
-Complexity of the diverse tasks involved
-Situated learning
-Action learning
-Problem-based learning
-Knowledge exchange

- Dual nature of SE and sustainability question
-Sensitivity to different institutional influences
-Achieving social impact
-Internationalisation

Second-order Themes

Key pillars of SE education, leading to key capitals

Key components of SE education, bridging capitals and habitus

Educational content for reflexivity, forming *habitus*

Major challenges of SE education, bridging habitus to field

Aggregate Dimensions

Development of multiple capitals and transformation processes

Economic Capital

Symbolic Capital

Social Capital

Cultural Capital

1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: UK Landscape of SEE programmes: Illustrative overview

Name of the University	Programme	Duration	Target student/ learner group	Key emphasis in approach and programme descriptions
London School of Economics	MSc Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship	One-year Full time	PG students	Social innovation; interdisciplinary approach to social entrepreneurship
Hult International Business School	MSc in Social Entrepreneurship	One-year Full time	PG students	Uniquely global; real-world relevance; results-driven curriculum; experiential learning; professional coaching; cutting edge simulations; practical projects and challenges; robust toolkit to transform raw ideas into high-impact social ventures; understand theory of change and impact metrics; leadership skills to attract capital, team members and partnerships.
University of Oxford	Online Social Entrepreneurship short course	2.5 months	Learners at all levels, all profiles	Desire for change; creative solutions to address social problems; empower you to see social entrepreneurship as a force for social change; valuable tools to prepare you

				to make an impact on the lives of others; definitional disputes; social value proposition; ecosystem approach; empowerment model: partnering with targeted community; social innovations: scaling social impact; path to social entrepreneurship; thoughts for changemakers.
University of Wales	Social Enterprise Management (Certificate of Higher Education)	1 year full-time

2 years part-time | People working in social enterprise or with an interest who are aware of potential and challenges of social enterprise as an aspect of business. | Rethinking business for a changing world; studying social business from a contemporary perspective; progressive and transformational approach to learning; building independence and self-determination in our learners; developing professional skills and intellectual skills, including critical thinking, problem-solving, creativity and reflection; engendering a future-facing outlook including learning to think about the consequences of actions; how business and society can be adapted to contribute to sustainable futures; to produce graduates who are global citizens and who contribute to shaping a sustainable world through |

				their personal and professional lives.
University of Strathclyde	MSc in Social Innovation & Entrepreneurship	1 year full-time	PG students	Promote knowledge exchange and share new methodologies for socially progressive research and entrepreneurship; prompting trans-disciplinary research across real-world contexts.
Goldsmiths, University of London	MA in Social Entrepreneurship	1 year full-time and 2 years part-time	PG students	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 2: Sample and profile of participants

Participant Identification number	Role in HEI	Function in HEI with respect to SE education	Level of SEE course taught	Social Enterprise Experience Y/N
P1	Lecturer	Educator	UG	Y
P2	Senior Lecturer	Educator	PG and UG	Y
P3	Principal Lecturer	Educator	UG and PG	Y
P4	Senior Lecturer	Educator	PG	N
P5	Employer Engagement & Entrepreneurship Manager	Mentor	PG	Y
P6	KTP Manager	Mentor	PG	Y
P7	Senior Lecturer	Educator	UG and PG	Y
P8	Visiting lecturer	Educator and mentor	PG	Y
P9	Lecturer	Educator	PG	N
P10	Lecturer	Educator	PG and UG	N
P11	Professor	Educator	PG	Y
P12	Lecturer	Educator	UG	Y
P13	Senior Lecturer	Educator	PG	Y
P14	Senior Lecturer	Educator	PG and UG	N
P15	Professor	Educator	PG	Y
P16	Lecturer	Educator	PG	Y
P17	Senior Lecturer	Educator	UG	N
P18	Senior Lecturer	Educator	PG	Y

P19	Lecturer	Educator	PG and UG	N
P20	Professor	Educator	PG	Y
P21	Senior Lecturer	Educator	UG	Y
P22	Professor	Educator	PG	N
P23	Senior Teaching Fellow	Educator	PG and UG	N
P24	Professor	Educator	PG	Y
P25	Lecturer	Educator	PG	N
P26	Visiting Lecturer	Mentor	PG	Y