

The Role of Social Entrepreneurship in Community Recovery and Development in the Post-COVID-19 Pandemic Period

SHOMOYE-OLUSI, Adeyinka Maryam, OREKOYA, Ibrahim Oluwapelumi, ADEPEJU-OREKOYA, Qaozara Adebanye and AKINTIMEHIN, Olamide

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/35552/>

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

SHOMOYE-OLUSI, Adeyinka Maryam, OREKOYA, Ibrahim Oluwapelumi, ADEPEJU-OREKOYA, Qaozara Adebanye and AKINTIMEHIN, Olamide (2022). The Role of Social Entrepreneurship in Community Recovery and Development in the Post-COVID-19 Pandemic Period. In: AMANN, W., STACHOWICZ-STANUSCH, A., TRIPATHI, S.K., KHAN, S. and VON KIMAKOWITZ, E., (eds.) Humanistic Crisis Management : Lessons Learned from COVID-19. Humanism in Business Series ((HUBUS)) . Springer International Publishing, 293-319. [Book Section]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

The Role of Social Entrepreneurship in Community Recovery and Development: Post COVID-19 Pandemic

Adeyinka Mariam Shomoye-Olusi¹, Ibrahim Oluwapelumi Orekoya², Qaozara Adebanye Adepeju³, Olamide Akintimehin⁴

This is an Author Accepted Manuscript version of the following chapter:

Shomoye-Olusi, A.M., Orekoya, I.O., Adepeju-Orekoya, Q.A., Akintimehin, O. (2022). The Role of Social Entrepreneurship in Community Recovery and Development in the Post-COVID-19 Pandemic Period. In: Amann, W., Stachowicz-Stanusch, A., Tripathi, S.K., Khan, S., von Kimakowitz, E. (eds) *Humanistic Crisis Management: Lessons Learned from COVID-19*. Humanism in Business Series. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. The final authenticated version is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-04252-2_16

Users may only view, print, copy, download and text- and data-mine the content, for the purposes of academic research. The content may not be (re-)published verbatim in whole or in part or used for commercial purposes. Users must ensure that the author's moral rights as well as any third parties' rights to the content or parts of the content are not compromised.

¹ Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria

² Lagos Business School, Pan-Atlantic University, Lagos, Nigeria

³ University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria

⁴ Landmark University, Omu-Aran, Kwara State, Nigeria

The Role of Social Entrepreneurship in Community Recovery and Development: Post COVID-19 Pandemic

Adeyinka Mariam Shomoye-Olusi, Ibrahim Oluwapelumi Orekoya, Qaozara Adebanye Adepeju, Olamide Akintimehin

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic is the part of the world wide pandemic of corona virus disease 2019 (COVID 19) caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome corona virus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). The first confirmed case in Nigeria was announced on 27th February 2020, and the number of identified cases has sprung up to 52000 and has since been affecting the economic activities of the country that recently came out of recession. The country is challenged to revive the economy, reduce constant unemployment and poverty level which impact negatively in micro and macro-economic activities of the country. This requires a refocus on social entrepreneurship on their role in job creation, improvement of standard of living, reduction in poverty level as well as social growth and development as entrepreneurship has been recognized as a key ingredient for economic growth and development. This refocusing was demonstrated by discussing how social entrepreneurship and humanism can make positive contribution to the micro and macro growth of the community, and nation at large. Reviews of recent and relevant literatures on the predictor and criterion variables revealed that social entrepreneurship leads to improved welfare of the society, adjusting to the pressing needs of the people by providing various packages of solutions for the problems of everyone as such is an important aid to improved economic standardization and it is obvious that the solution to this global challenge lies in human support and actions in this global trying times.

Keywords: Social entrepreneurship; Community Recovery; Development, COVID-19

Introduction

The idea of entrepreneurship has become increasingly important in society majorly in terms of development and welfare. Some of the structural problems eliminated by entrepreneurship have amongst many others been lower unemployment tendencies and increased propensities for sovereign inventions and innovations (Abu-Saifan, 2012). To this end, social entrepreneurship is defined as the process by which business owners channel their entrepreneurial activities towards the creation of social value. While social entrepreneurship might look like “entrepreneurship” itself in the real sense, it differs from it in terms of the end objective. While the main objective of entrepreneurship is to satisfy needs profitably, with social entrepreneurship, there is little or no focus on personal and business profit generation (Sahasranamam and Nandakumar, 2018). Social entrepreneurship is a concept within the socio-economic space that replicates the need to address numerous societal problems in imaginative and justifiable ways. As introduced earlier, social enterprises are tailored to have a social impact rather than profit generation for its stakeholders. This objective could be achieved by the provision of market commodities in an entrepreneurial and innovative manner, using the proceeds to achieve social objectives such as bridging the gap between entrepreneurs who have access to

social capital and those that do not. While traditional entrepreneurship is targeted at exploiting available market opportunities, social entrepreneurship is aimed at tackling market failure. Social enterprises contribute to national economic development through the re-investment of business profits to expand the benefits of target groups or voluntary organizations such as orphanages, remand homes, etc. Therefore, the objective of this chapter is to evaluate the role of social entrepreneurship as a panacea for community development and recovery. The chapter is organized as follows: Definition of social entrepreneurship. The second section focuses on Covid-19 and social entrepreneurship in Nigeria. The third section presents an overview of African emerging economies. The chapter concludes by providing the policy implications and suggestions for future research.

2.1 Definition of social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship is a relatively new discipline that explains how entrepreneurs charge themselves with the responsibility of creating social value and usefulness to the society besides from achieving the economic objective for which the business was established (Abu-Saifan, 2012). This implies that entrepreneurs show dedication and passion for satisfying social good and improving wellbeing and not just focused on profit-making motive. Social entrepreneurship encompasses streams of activities and processes that lead to the creation and consolidation of social value by individuals, groups of citizens, and organizations (Pacut, 2020). The concept of social entrepreneurship has undeniably gained increased attention recently because of their ability to solve global issues (Agarwal, Chakrabarti, Brem, and Bocken, 2018; Kelly and Mair, 2016). To ensure a proper understanding of social entrepreneurship and what it entails, some key terms associated with it would be defined thus:

- i. **Social Enterprise:** The entrepreneurial combination of societal targets with emphasis on wider social, ecological, and community objectives.
- ii. **Social Entrepreneur:** A person who creates and implements a product or service offering to tackle social problems.
- iii. **Social Venture:** An initiative (a scheme, firm, or incident) aimed at societal innovation.
- iv. **Social Start-Up:** A new organization or enterprise established to solve social or environmental problems.
- v. **Social Innovation:** The introduction of new models, ideas, and methods aimed at addressing socio-economic issues.
- vi. **Social Capital:** The social connections and resources an entrepreneur needs to attain physical (financial capital) and immaterial (human capital) assets necessary for solving social problems efficiently (Akintimehin et al., 2019; Dai, et al., 2015).

According to the works of Rahdari et al., (2016), the concept of social entrepreneurship is defined to be an essential cog in ensuring the attainment of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through the creation and development of environmental values like poverty alleviation, employment generation, and waste management (Becker, et al., 2017). Social entrepreneurship begins with small, local efforts and often confronting challenges within the locality but attracts global attention

such as accessibility to portable water, promoting small venture creation, or even waste management. Social entrepreneurship leads to improved welfare of the society, adjusting to the pressing needs of the people by providing various packages of solutions for the problems of everyone (Kumar et al., 2019). In the opinion of Uchehara (2019), social entrepreneurship connects the missing link between the business and the social facts, with a focus on community and societal service rather than placing much emphasis on a company's profitability. Businesses in Nigeria are trying to adopt the concept of social entrepreneurship as the government is consciously or unconsciously endeavoring to encourage social entrepreneurship behavior and foster social entrepreneurship with good public recognition and strong identification with the brand. The wholesome of social enterprise is that the social investor does not aim for any personal financial gain, except that the company should cover all costs and earn a profit (Pangriya, 2019), as they are established to accomplish social missions and combat the social challenges confronting the community.

Social entrepreneurship is important because it drives social good and advantage, it equally caters for the marginal population, women, children, the vulnerable as well as the society in general. Globally, social entrepreneurs are addressing numerous unsolved social vices and challenges while enhancing human capital development around the world, hence social entrepreneurship should be considered as a consequential factor towards global social good and economic prosperity (Javed et al., 2019) as the United Nations mentioned that the world needs holistic development in terms of economic, political, social and environmental progress for sustainable coexistence on earth (Ugoani, 2019). Numerous countries across the globe are confronted with different social challenges that equally offer economic and social opportunities. While economic entrepreneurship has a primary focus on wealth creation, social entrepreneurship focuses primarily on environmental protection and social value creation. Social entrepreneurs derive satisfaction and feeling of great pleasure and happiness when they can, together with their stakeholders, solve social problems that exist and impedes communal growth (Irawan, 2019).

Several researchers have investigated the role of various national government sectors supporting the activities of social entrepreneurship. Kim et al. (2014) examined the role of the Korean government in providing support for social enterprises within their economy, with some regulatory mechanisms to support these enterprises suggested and implemented for greater efficiency. Bozhikin, Macke and da Costa (2019) performed a meta-analytic review of 478 scientific pieces of research relating to social entrepreneurship and by doing this, their research has been able to identify six levels by which the government can enable its development. Interestingly, their study further identified the role played by non-state actors in the social entrepreneurship sector. Mendez-Picazo, Galindo-Martin and Castano-Martinez (2020) carried out an empirical investigation using 15 OECD countries to investigate the effect of general and social entrepreneurship on sustainable development. Their general findings revealed that general entrepreneurship had a greater impact on sustainable development.

Covid-19 And Social Entrepreneurship in Nigeria

In a bid to fight the spread of COVID-19 which came into Nigeria on 27th February 2020 through a foreigner (Nigeria Centre for Disease Control [NCDC]), businesses have diverted their efforts from mere maximization of profit to welfare of the country. The virus has created a unified effort among businesses and business owners to partner with the government to curb the spread of the virus. Jack Ma Foundation donated materials to Nigeria for the fight against COVID-19. The items donated include 100,000 facemasks; 9999 overall; 20000 reagents for testing and 913 face shield (NCDC). The federal government enforced phases of lockdown on the country. The lockdown which was mostly felt by the poor families further worsened their situation. To lessen the effect of the lockdown on the underprivileged, wealthy Nigerians and some NGOs donated food items. Local equipment was also manufactured to help fight the virus. Ventilators were produced from local materials to ensure the availability of the medical equipment to treat patients. The motive was borne out of need not to maximize profit but to treat patients in Nigeria.

Having identified the importance of forming a partnership to fight COVID-19, the private sector in Nigeria through the Private Sector Coalition Against COVID-19 contributed immensely to the fight against COVID-19. The Central Bank of Nigeria and some private organizations led the initiative to collaborate with the government to address the pandemic. The private sector players contributed a whopping 26 billion Naira (\$72 million equivalent) (UN Women). Digital startups are not left out in the collaboration as they have been inventing equipment to help the affected persons.

An overview of African emerging economies

Africa is challenged with diverse problems ranging from climate change to portable water scarcity, biodiversity and ecosystem depletion, desertification, low resilience to natural disasters, the potential non achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), energy crisis, food crisis, limited benefits from globalization, health security, the global financial crisis, trafficking and piracy, low penetration of ICT services, urbanization, need to develop better disaster response mechanisms, genetically modified crops concerning food security and technology transfer and many others (Economic Commission for Africa, 2012). Despite these varying impediments, Africa still has a huge potential to do better and the key question should address what African countries need to do to achieve development. Africa was subjected to numerous forms of exploitation by the Western powers in the nineteenth century. Progressive population increment and concentration in Europe from around the early fifteenth century required an increasing supply of farmland, foods, and energy, but there were also widespread epidemic diseases, wars, and exploitation by rulers and landlords (Park, 2019). Given the growing importance and potentials that Africa for the emerging economies, both as a source of input and as future markets, most emerging economies are seeking to engage in strategic partnerships with Africa. In recent years, China, India, Turkey, the Republic of Korea, and Brazil have all held large bilateral summits specifically targeted at increasing cooperation with Africa and Africa has been the major beneficiary of global aid disbursements (Kaplinsky & Farooki, 2009). Between 2000 and 2016, Africa experienced strong economic growth rates (averaging 4.6% annually), greater than Latin America, and that of the Caribbean (2.8%) yet lower than developing Asia (7.2%). These resulted from high commodity prices, improved macroeconomic management, and strategies to diversify growth (Africa development dynamics, 2018).

A Review of Previous Pandemic and its Impact on Africa's Emerging Economies

Africa is the most vulnerable continent with overwhelming populations susceptible to infectious diseases and is mostly predicted to be significantly affected by the outbreak of a pandemic. Therefore, this section summarizes the observed direct and indirect effect of the previous pandemic on the growth of developing economies in Africa. Diseases and economic behavior are theoretically assumed to be inversely related. Diseases impact directly on human health, which is, high morbidity and mortality may be caused among countries' populations which subsequently threaten the development of economic activities, productivity, and general prosperity of the society (Dauda, 2018).

Human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immune deficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS), considered as a global pandemic is one of the leading causes of morbidity and mortality, sub-Sahara Africa being the region mostly affected recorded 61% of new infections in 2018 (Wikipedia). Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) with about 10% of the world's population has over two-third of the people living with HIV. This overwhelming number may be disastrous to the continent's economic well-being as those affected are majorly adults and women who are the key components of the labor force, thereby presenting serious economic hindrances to the growth of the African continent. The first cases of HIV and AIDS were reported in 1981 (Azuh, Osabuohien, Nwaubani & Ugwuanyi, 2014). Two decades later, it had already infected 40 million people worldwide out of which 28.5 million (approximately 75%) reside in Africa (UNDP, 2004). Nigeria has the second-largest HIV epidemic in the world and one of the highest rate of new infection in sub-Saharan Africa (Avert, 2019), the size of Nigeria's population indicates that 1.9 million people were living with HIV/AIDS in 2018. New survey results indicate that Nigeria has an HIV prevalence of 1.4% among adults aged 15-49 (UNAIDS, 2019). This is not only a health issue but a substantial threat to economic growth, as it indicates a gross reduction in productivity and manpower output of individuals within the employable and non-dependent age bracket. The desirable productivity in economic, industrial, mining, and agricultural activities will drastically reducing thereby imposing a heavy burden on their families, communal activities, and eventually on the economy by slowing the productivity of the labor workforce due to constant sickness, sick leave requests from work and other issues.

The Ebola virus disease, another pandemic that distorted the economic progress of Africa was a rare but severe and often fatal illness whose outbreak was first discovered in 1976 but the largest outbreak in West Africa was experienced between 2014 and 2016. The most severe impact of the Ebola epidemic, which began in Guinea in December 2013 and quickly spread to Liberia and Sierra Leone, and led to significant loss of human lives and suffering. The record indicated that more than 21,000 cases were being reported, more than 8,000 people died, and numerous more have lost family members or became orphaned (World Bank Group, 2015) resulting in an incalculable human cost. According to the World Bank Group (2015), there was a marked reduction in travel and tourism in the directly affected countries, but also across the continent. As a powerful vehicle for economic growth and job creation, lower growth in travel and tourism created economic concerns. The restriction of movements of goods and services, the quarantine of communities that are food baskets of the affected countries, the fear of trading with affected areas, the closure of borders and international stigmatization that has raised premiums on ships berthing in West Africa have affected access to food (United Nations Development Group, 2015). The Ebola pandemic negatively impacted people's

consumption habits and stimulated the prevalence of undernutrition. Additionally, numerous health care facilities and workers were forced to close down and were diverted to take care of Ebola-related symptoms. Huber, Finelli, and Stevens (2018) suggested that the reduced availability of health care workers and diverted resources also significantly impacted the provision of non-Ebola virus disease-related care such as malaria, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS and other diseases which claimed the lives of some of the patients.

In furtherance, the COVID-19 pandemic is an ongoing global pandemic whose outbreak was first identified in Wuhan, China in December 2019. The World Health Organisation declared the outbreak a pandemic on March 11th, 2020, and as at the time of writing this, there are more than 14.7 million cases in over 188 countries and resulting in over 610,000 deaths. The outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic has undoubtedly distorted the economic, political, religious as well as the financial structure of the world economies, nevertheless, developing economies and emerging market like the African continent is one of the most hit by this 21st-century pandemic. The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) in its April 2020 report stated that the impact of COVID-19 on African economies could be the slowing of growth to 1.8 percent in the best-case scenario or a contraction of 2.6 percent in the worst case, which has the potential to push 27 million people into extreme poverty. Even if the spread of COVID-19 is suppressed in Africa, its economic damage will be unavoidable. The African continent is highly linked to the Chinese market makes the continent more vulnerable to economic damages (Africa International Trade and Commerce Research, 2020). The price of oil, which accounts for 40 percent of Africa's exports, has halved, and major African exports such as textiles and fresh-cut flowers have crashed as countries especially China that happens to be the largest importer of such products cut down on demand for such products and services; funds are now diverted to the health sector in a bid to curb the pandemic. Tourism – which accounts for up to 38 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) of some African countries – has effectively halted, as has the airline industry that supports it (ECA, 2020). Nigeria, Africa's most populous black nation experienced very poorly per capita between 2017 and 2020, the economy began to show symptoms of mild economic recovery just before the pandemic. Nigeria still depends on crude oil, no doubt the impact will be felt across all sectors of the economy.

History of Humanistic Management

The word "humanistic" has its origin from the word "*Humanism*". This spurred from Italy in the 15th century. Humanism in its broader definition represents the ability of humans to think and reason (Huxley 1957, 1961). To sum the two divergent views, humanism is a major factor that shapes the actions and thought processes of humans in their communities. Management is a field directed at conducting the operations of enterprises in a productive manner and has been shaped by divergent views. It is impossible to differentiate between individuals and machine-like issues. The reason being that in studying methods of operation and human relations, the two cannot be set apart (Follett, 1941, 1925). In the early part of the management study, "*humanistic management*" did not appear together until 1967 in *Management: A Humanistic Art* (Lilienthal, 1967). During these early times, scholars had different views regarding humanistic management. It has been proposed that humanistic management encompasses the encouragement of

employees by assigning more tasks and changing job tasks to promote fulfillment and efficiency (Herzberg 1968). Lilienthal (1967) proposed a divergent view by positing that management should transverse beyond technical aspects to incorporate humanness thus, management will be seen as being humanistic. Humanistic management is similar to employee fulfillment (Swart, 1973). Barnard showed how imperative it was for companies to honor people while promoting togetherness and bond (Wolf, 1974). There was also a proposition around the organization and its culture. Thus, there should be amendments in corporate environments in a way that the perception around human interactions, behaviors, and operations that impact and affect employees within the organizational culture will be modified Cunningham and Tichy (1983). Humanistic management was recognized as an avenue for efficiency and investment in human capital (Daley, 1986). Humanistic management significantly relates to the behaviour and encouragement of employees (Daley, 1986). With a focus on organizations within the western world, there should be a shift from a functionalistic approach to management to a radical-humanistic approach (Aktour, 1992). Thus, leadership should aim at focusing on humans and their inclusiveness (Plas, 1996). Policies should consider people. Organizational purpose and culture should be restructured such that people are seen beyond factors of production (Ghoshal and Bartlett, 1997). This is imperative to ensure that organizations promote the fulfillment of the employee. Thus, there is a need to make people the centre of an organisation's development (Pfeffer 1998). The need to bring a humanistic approach to firms has also been recognized. Employees are valuable and should be treated as such. Their liberty must be upheld and must not be mistreated by authority (French and Bell, 1999).

Some scholars contributed to further the humanistic perspective to management. One such scholar was Follett who was seen as the forerunner of modern management (Graham, 1995). Her perspective has a significant difference from that of her counterparts. Contrary to Taylor's view, Follett (1940; 1987) was not focused on the intensity of efforts employees put in to the work or the recess given in between work to prevent tiredness. She was more focused on the harmonious relationship with employees. While complementing the idea of Follett on the harmonious relationship, it is also of crucial value for making individual integral to the business. In advancing the field, he asked - 'What is an individual?', 'What is a person?', 'To what extent do people have the power of choice or free will?' (Barnard, 1968). After a comprehensive study of Barnard, it is important to note that humanistic values are important to comprehending his existence and thoughts. He valued humans and the growth of his thinking, his activities, and welfare (Wolf, 1974). Peter Drucker, one of the outstanding experts in management studies also contributed to humanistic management through the principle of *communitarian* vision (Kurzynski, 2009; Schwartz, 2004). Working in an organization offers humans the platform to make contributions and attain success (Drucker, 1973).

Other scholarly views that may be seen as aligning with humanistic management include (Elton, Mayo 1933; 1946) who emphasized the need for human behavior in organizations as well as Maslow (1954) who averred that human needs and motivations in behavior were vital. Adding to Mayo's study, McGregor (1960), Herzberg (1959; 1968; 1976) and Argyris (1957) emphasized the effect of creating an economic activity that promotes fulfillment, eliminating hierarchy, and encouraging employees to be involved in

decision making. The reason is that the existence of these things will encourage productivity. The year 2000s brought with it intense effort to develop the field of humanistic management. By leveraging on historical antecedents of humanistic management, HM was viewed as a type of management that stresses and recognizes the state of being human and focused on the advancement of man to its maximum limit and all ramifications (Melé 2003:79). Drucker similarly averred the need to recognize humans to be integrated with management (Linkletter & Maciariello 2011; Maciariello 2014). Further to the development of humanistic management, the idea of humanistic management was institutionalized through the establishment of the Humanistic Management Network. The network was established to advance the cause of humanistic management by advocating for the incorporation of HM principles in the plans and policies of organizations (Spitzeck et al., 2009).

Humanistic Management Theory

Mary Parker Follett is regarded as the mother of modern humanistic management. Her focus lies in working together with employees (Follett 1940, 1987). Her management theory focused on the following guidelines:

- *Fostering Relationship*: Fostering relationships between and among high and low-level staff will ensure harmonious work relationship and existence within a company. Thus, relationships and be fostered through meetups, peer-to-peer learning organized within the organization.
- *Mutuality of interaction*: Further to a fostering relationship, employees provide mutual assistance to one another with one another. Similarly, there is a synergy of efforts
- *Equality of efforts*: All efforts and services rendered by the employees will be considered equal. Each task is significant to the success of other tasks.
- *Consistency of efforts*: There must be a consistency of efforts among employees.

In addition to the above, Follett, believed that employees should be made a full part of an organization. Collaboration should be encouraged to promote fulfillment. Similarly, collectivism should be promoted over individualism. One such framework that has been used to explain the humanistic management theory is the *Mental Framework*. The Mental Framework views business from a human perspective rather than from a technical perspective. Here, employees are viewed as humans first before what they can do for the company (von Kimakowitz). This research work will align itself with the three-step technique to Humanistic Management of the Humanistic Management Centre (HMC, 2016; von Kimakowitz et al 2011, p. 5). They include the following:

1. Guaranteed human dignity
2. Incorporation of Business ethics in decision making
3. Continuous Involvement of parties

Guaranteed human dignity

The dignity of people particularly employees must be guaranteed in business. Dignity connotes that a thing cannot be bought by any price. Adequate and prompt compensation regime, conducive, and healthy environment among others are ways companies can guarantee the dignity of its staff. The humanistic management theory thus ensures and advocates for honourable treatment of employees by organizations.

Incorporation of Business ethics in decision making

Humanistic Management avers that ethical consideration should be introduced and involved in the decision-making process. By guaranteeing the dignity of employees, companies will evaluate their actions and only pursue activities that will advance the greater good. This it does willingly (von Kimakowitz).

Continuous Involvement of parties

The involvement of concerned parties is necessary for the companies to know how their employees are faring within their employment. It involves how employees are affected by the company's policies (Freeman, 1984). By doing this, the company will enjoy wide acceptance among its employees. It will also promote the accountability of the organization and the common welfare of its people (von Kimakowitz). Various other scholars have also presented their views on the theory of humanistic management. Arnaud and Wasieleski (2014) view liberty at the workplace to be central to the theory of humanistic management. The Humanistic Management Network views the theory of humanistic management as management which evaluates the decisions of businesses based on 3 interconnected guidelines namely: That the dignity of man should be guaranteed and protected always; that business decisions must have its foundation in ethics and that corporate responsibility is integral to commencing and sustaining conversations with all concerned parties. The guidelines will enhance welfarism through employment opportunities that are beneficial to the world and favourable to individuals (www.humanetwork.org). There is the need to have a structured theory of management that perceives man in his wholesomeness who has rights and ability to think and acquire knowledge (Andreu and Rosanas 2012, p. 137–8). There is the need for a theory of management to be directed to a humanistic approach which focuses on promoting the dignity of man (Dierksmeier 2011). Organizations that do not protect the dignity of man are termed non-humanistic. Humanistic management theory sees a future where organizations are committed to creating a conducive environment for individuals and giving back to the community (Spitzeck, 2011).

Stemming from a case study of 19 companies that embraced humanistic management theory in its operation, one similar thing among the companies was the change of focus on profit accumulation to the promotion of welfare (Kimakowitz et al., 2011). Humanistic management is all about conversations and respect for the dignity of man. The conversation is tailored in a manner that concerned parties acquire new knowledge and wider than learning around the economic and technical aspects of work (Rodríguez-Luesma et al. 2014). Organizations that practice humanistic management should make their employees self-responsible and treated as humans beyond being part of labor (Alvira 1992, p. 47). Humanistic management can thus be defined as management that recognizes and pursues the overall advancement of man (Melé 2003a, b, p.79).

Business leaders are having a paradigm shift from a singular view of success to a multi-view of success. The actions and inactions of these business leaders are seen to have long-term effects. Initially, they were trained to avoid complexities of business, now they are trained to include it in their plans (Dierksmeier 2016). Business leaders are no longer praised for their intelligence and commitment to concerned parties but now they are concerned with increased obligations to other parties or people that will be affected by their decisions. (Whether and Chandler 2005; Freeman et al 2007). Now, the

communities are asking business leaders to pursue activities beyond the maximisation of profits (Spitzeck et al 2009). A new study has thus been undertaken on organizations to research not just their willingness to make profits but through the welfare activities, they have undertaken (Mele & Dierksmeier, 2012). Stakeholder theorists argue that the economic person is self-centered and only concerned about satisfying his wants (Dierksmeier, 2011). Humanistic management theorists believe that humans utilize their liberty to engage in communications that have a lasting effect and viewing others as ends in themselves, not as means (Pirson & Lawrence, 2010). The Humanistic model posits that internal motivation spurs human beings to develop themselves (Melé, 2003).

Humanism

Humanism is a principle that has as its focus the individual, his dignity, integrity, freedom, and development. The principle reinforces that man is not a means to an end. Rather, man is the bearer of his end. A man carries humanity in himself (Erich Fromm 1961). In humanism, employees are seen beyond the instruments of profit-making (Mele, 2008). Julian Nida-Rumelin (2008) provided 4 important elements of humanism which will be discussed in this work. They are:

- **Refinement:** The nature of humans is such that it can be refined through enlightenment and learning.
- **Reasoning and Reason:** Humans re-empowered with the ability to think and reason.
- **Universalism:** Humanism is universal. It disallows for differentiation or discrimination based on culture, status, ethnic group, or nation.
- **Individualism:** Humanism is ingrained in principles that negate collective identities. It believes in the individual and addresses the individual as a unit rather than as an entity.

In organizations where humanism is upheld, organizational culture is transformational such that the identity of the organization is created based on the relationship among employees (Brickson, 2007). Such organizations promote regular communication among its shareholders and are driven by a crosswise created set of values (Dierksmeier & Pirson, 2008). Organizations that are in the quest of purpose rather than wealth accumulation effectively inspire their employees and stakeholders (Collins & Porras, 2002) which will in turn affect their profitability. It is imperative to note that businesses are required to merge and synchronize profit and social outcomes (Sánchez, 2003). Yunus (2008) posits that segregation of social and economic dimensions in business is meaningless. Companies have now recognized the need for corporate social responsibility and social entrepreneurship in creating not just economic but also social values for itself and the society it operates.

Social entrepreneurs are individuals who are committed to helping people and derive satisfaction developing solutions rather than merely accumulating and amassing wealth (Yunus, 2008). He went further to explain that these individuals are interested in forming a specialized enterprise which perhaps may be profit-making or non-profit-making enterprises with no loss incurred. Three basic forms of social enterprises exist namely external social enterprises, integrated social enterprise, and embedded social enterprise (Alter, 2006). Alter averred that the forms of social enterprise are based on the precedence or preference accorded to the financial and social of the enterprise. External

social enterprise promotes social programmes in a way that is different from its profit-driven business operations. This usually involves partnerships with NGOs. An Integrated social enterprise is synchronized and merged with the operation of the business or company. An embedded social enterprise, business, and social activities are pursued at the same time. Social programmes are funded through the profit or income of the business (Pirson and Lawrence, 2010).

The Reinforcement of Humanism in Business Activities during Covid-19 Pandemic

Capitalism has made organizations to view human beings as means to an end. The end being the accumulation and maximization of wealth. The accumulation and maximization of wealth within a short period have encouraged the exploitation of labour (Aktouf and Holford, 2015). Companies believe that this is necessary to achieve corporate efficiency (Baeschler, 1995) and rationality (Hirschman, 1997). Ironically, this approach has met with success especially among companies in Western countries that are evaluated through their profit over a long period. Having evaluated the effect of this, little wonder there has been a call for corporate ethics that emphasizes humanness (Aktouf and Holford, 2015).

There has been great segregation among top-level executives and low-level employees which creates a division between mortality and immortality. Death is removed from businesses and employees are busy pursuing life such that businesses continue to operate for enduring times without death (Sievers, 1994 p. 56-57). Sievers further expounded that businesses give immortality to a few members who sacrifice others. According to him, top-level executives become immortal while low-level employees are mortals. In aligning our thoughts with Sievers, little wonder there is toxicity and competition among most corporations and businesses among workers across the world. Employees are committed to working at the detriment of their fellow employees to get promotions, pay rise, and attain the immortal position as described by Sievers. Aktouf and Holford (2015) made certain propositions as departures from the management practices entrenched in capitalism. The propositions are outlined as follows:

- Management practice and structure that is characterized by absolute rights and exceptional advantages are archaic and should be dismantled
- Strategies used by top executives should be replaced
- The scientific methods that include behavioral science, the science of decision-making, behavioral science, and econometric models which have interfered with management theory should be changed.

Thus, for humanism to be reinforced with businesses the propositions above should be enforced.

The role of humanism in ensuring post-COVID-19 pandemic recovery

In the 20th century, the term humanistic management surfaced in business and managerial literature only occasionally and mostly with a narrow meaning. Conceptually, humanism explains the significance and the normative value of human beings both to the individual as well as to the community and overall societal welfare. As such, the concept of humanism involves a critical reflection of the constitution of society and of the manner, social interactions between human beings proceed (Hans d'orville, 2015). The humanist ethics believes that the material growth should be undertaken as a collective good, which was to serve all participants of a community and meant to enable the socio-economic

progress of the society. Global problems like climate change, environmental degradation, natural resources depletion, environmental and water pollution and the loss of biodiversity, growing social inequalities and lack of inclusion, economic uncertainty, shrinking cultural diversity and disappearing languages, social upheaval and new forms of conflict and war put to test the progress of human civilization and the very core of the humanist idea (Hans d'orville, 2015). Humanism addresses everybody and is universal in its outreach (Pirson & Lawrence, 2010). Human beings in the humanistic view are guided by globally applicable principles to build and maintain long-term relationships. Humanism is intrinsically motivated to self-actualize and serves humanity through what they do; that is the persons are central and integral of their decision making, unlike economic approach where people become a mere part of the production or distribution processes, without full respect for their rationality, freedom, and capacity to grow as human beings (Mele, 2013). The business should respect the humanity of people, treating them always as an end and never as a mere means; people should participate in business in a way appropriate to each situation, seeking to avoid others feeling as simple receptors of orders; business should favour human potential in aspects such as creativity, rationality, character and strong social and human support as this COVID-19 pandemic not only point to the need for humanism but exposes a strong purpose to focus on humanism. The pandemic has created an ultimate sense of solidarity and global connectedness to our shared human values, thereby creating a good ground to re propagate societal passion for humanism in the aspect of business and all facet of the society.

Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic has revealed that businesses should move from its objectives of merely accumulating and maximizing profits to promoting the welfare of people. There were concerted efforts because it has been identified that without such collaboration, COVID-19 will wreck the economy and hinder businesses from making profits. To promote humanistic management in entrepreneurship post-COVID, businesses are encouraged to change their mind-sets. The change starts with the mind of business leaders and HR heads. The mind should be restructured to prioritize the well-being of humanity over profits. Then, the wellbeing of employees should be paramount so that they can attain their full potentials. It is necessary to infuse ethics education in business schools and higher institutions of learning such that business leaders can learn how to maintain a balance between business goals and wellness of people at large (Swanson 2004). Higher institutions of learning should train managers who will create an ethical and socially responsible environment in business (Alsop, 2006). COVID-19 has united humanity. It has dismantled class structure and has shown the world that we all need to look out for one another. Thus, businesses and entrepreneurs should hold on to this lesson post-COVID-19.

Policy implications and suggestions for future research

Several decades of research on entrepreneurship has focused on entrepreneurial ventures and its relationship to ventures success, economic development or prosperity. Our review reveals that the literature views entrepreneurship from the economic perspective and there are limited amount of the extant scholarship on social entrepreneurship as a pertinent aid to communal prosperity and social wellness. First, most papers use the term social entrepreneurship simply to describe the non-

governmental organisation. They seldom discuss how entrepreneurialism and entrepreneurial ventures could concern themselves with societal good and communal wellbeing, most of their definitions are attributed to profitability and objective attainment. Second, social entrepreneurship is often broadly defined; it is applied to a wide range of organisation which differs in size, aims and beliefs. Thus, the value of borrowing the “social” construct from other disciplines, such as socio-ecology, to move entrepreneurship scholarship forward is currently limited. Based on these findings, we argue that future studies should incorporate insights from extant scholarship on social entrepreneurship and humanism. Specifically, researchers should take a more holistic view and explore different entailments of social entrepreneurship and humanism not only in terms of crisis or economic challenges. Most importantly, we call for an empirical research on exploring the role social entrepreneurship plays in shaping the positive trajectory of social systems. By offering a timely review of the literature, we characterize the current state of knowledge, and identify opportunities to integrate diverse and longitudinal sets of scholarship at the intersection of social entrepreneurship and humanism especially in times of economic challenge or crisis. In this way, we hope that future contributions move away from portraying entrepreneurial firms as majorly profit and innovative venture that has little or no business with social welfare and individuals toward a more nuanced, critical discussion of the role social entrepreneurship plays in long-term communal sustainability and prosperity.

References

- Abu-Saifan, S. (2012). Social entrepreneurship: Definition and boundaries. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 2(2), 22-27.
- Africa International Trade and Commerce Research (2020). *COVID-19 endemics and Nigeria export volume*. Retrieved from <http://www.africainternationaltrade.com>
- African Union Commission/OECD (2018), “Africa's integration into the global economy”, in *Africa's Development Dynamics 2018: Growth, Jobs and Inequalities*, OECD Publishing, Paris/African Union Commission, Addis Ababa.
- Akintimehin, O.O., Eniola, A.A., Alabi, O.J., Eluyela, D.F., Okere, W. & Ozordi, E. (2019). Social capital and its effect on business performance in the Nigerian informal sector, *Heliyon*, 5(1), 1-13.
- Aktouf, O. & Holford, W. D. (2009). The implications of humanism for business studies. *Humanism in business*, 101-122.
- Aktour, O. (1992). Management and theories of organizations in the 1990s: Toward a critical radical humanism. *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 407-31.
- Alsop, R. (2006). Business ethics education in business schools: A commentary. *Journal of Management Education*, 30(1), 11–14.
- Alter, S. K. (2006). Social enterprise models and their mission and money relationships. *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change*, 205-232.
- Andreu, R., and J.M. Rosanas. (2012). Manifesto for a better management. A rational and humanist view. In *Towards a new theory of the firm. Humanizing the firm and the management profession*, J.E. Ricart and J.M. Rosanas (Eds), 109–150. Madrid: Fundación BBVA.

- Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization. The conflict between system and individual*. New York: Harper.
- Arnaud, S., & D. Wasieleski. (2014). Corporate humanistic responsibility: social performance through managerial discretion of the HRM. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(3): 313–334.
- Avert (2019). *HIV and AIDS in Nigeria*. Retrieved from <http://www.avert.org>
- Azuh, D., Osabuohien, E.S.C., Nwaubani, O.O., & Ugwuanyi, B.E. (2014). Cost implications of the prevalence of HIV/AIDS on the economic development of Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(13), 24-33.
- Barnard, C. I. (1968). *The functions of the executive* (Vol. 11). Harvard university press.
- Becker, S., Kunze, C., & Vancea, M. (2017). Community energy and social entrepreneurship: Addressing purpose, organisation and embeddedness of renewable energy projects. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 147, 25-36.
- Bozhikin, I., Macke, J. & da Costa, L.F. (2019). The role of government and key non-state actors in social entrepreneurship: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 226, 730-747.
- Brickson, S.L. (2007). Organizational identity orientation: The genesis of the role of the firm and distinct forms of social value. *Academy of management review*, 32(3), 864-888.
- Collins, J. & Porras, J. (2002). *Built to last*. New York, HarperCollins.
- Cunningham, M. E., and Tichy, N. (1983). Planning for humanism. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 3, 87-90.
- d'Orville, H (2015). New humanism and sustainable development. *Cadmus Journal*, 2(5), 90-101.
- Dai, W.D., Mao, Z.E., Zhao, X.R., & Mattila, A.S. (2015). How does social capital influence the hospitality firm's financial performance? The moderating role of entrepreneurial activities. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 51, 42-55.
- Daley, D. M. (1986). Humanistic management and organizational success: The effect of job and work environment characteristics on organizational effectiveness, public responsiveness, and job satisfaction. *Public Personnel Management*, 15, 131-42.
- Dauda, R.S. (2018). HIV/AIDS and economic growth: evidence from West Africa. *International Journal of Health Plan Management*, 34(1), 1-14.
- Davies, T. (2008). *Humanism*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Dierksmeier, C. (2011). Reorienting management education: From Homo oeconomicus to human dignity. In W. Amann, M. Pirson, C. Dierksmeier, E. Von Kimakowitz, & H. Spitzack (Eds.), *Business schools under fire. Humanistic management education as the way forward* (pp. 19–40). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dierksmeier, C. (2016). What is 'humanistic' about humanistic management?. *Humanistic Management Journal*, 1(1), 9-32.
- Dierksmeier, C. (2011). Reorienting Management Education: From the Homo Economicus to Human Dignity. Humanistic Management Network, Research Paper Series No. 13–05.
- Dierksmeier, C., & Pirson, M. (2010). Freedom and the modern corporation. *Philosophy of Management (formerly Reason in Practice)*, 9(3), 5-25.

- Drucker, P. F. (1973). *Managers: Tasks, responsibilities, practices*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Economic Commission for Africa (2012). *ECA report: New and Emerging Challenges in Africa: Summary Report*. Retrieved from www.uneca.org
- Economic Commission for Africa (2020). *ECA report: COVID-19 in Africa; protecting lives and economies*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org>
- Economic Commission for Africa (2020). *ECA report: COVID-19 in Africa; protecting lives and economies*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org>
- Follett, M. P. (1940). Dynamic administration. The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett. In H.C. Metcalf, and L. Urwick (Eds). New York, London: Harper and Brothers.
- Follett, M.P. (1941). Dynamic administration. In The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett, ed. Henry C. Metcalf and L. Urwick. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Follett, M.P. (1987). La primera adición es de 1949 (Management Publication Data, London). Freedom and coordination. Lectures in business organisation. In L.Urwick (Ed), Edited with an introduction. New York, London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Freeman, R. (1984). *Strategic Management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Freeman, R.E., Kirsten Martin & Bidhan Parmar (2007). Stakeholder capitalism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74(4): 303-314.
- French, W.L., and Bell, C.H. (1999). *Organizational development: Behavioural science intervention for organization improvement*. Englewoods Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ghoshal, S., & Bartlett, C.A. (1997). *The individualized corporation: a fundamentally new approach to management*. New York: Harper Business.
- Graham, P. (1995). *Mary Parker Follett – Prophet of management: A celebration of writings from the 1920s*. Introduction by Peter Drucker. Boston, Massachusetts, USA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Graham, P. (Ed). (1995). *Mary Parker Follett – Prophet of management: A celebration of writings from the 1920s*. Introduction by Peter Drucker. Boston, Massachusetts, USA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 46, 53-62.
- Herzberg, F. (1976). *The managerial choice: To be efficient and to be human*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Hirschman, A.O. (1997). *The Passions and the Interests*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Huber, C., Finelli, L., & Stevens, W. (2018). The economic and social burden of the 2014 Ebola outbreak in West Africa. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 218(S5), S698-704.
- Huxley, J. (1957). *Religion without revelation*. New York: Harpers.
- Huxley, J. (1961). *The Humanist Frame*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Irawan, A., Suryanto, S., & Mashud, M. (2019). The dimensions of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Economics, Business and Political Researches*, 4(8), 91-100.

- Javed, A; Yasir, M; & Majid, A. (2019). Is social entrepreneurship a panacea for sustainable enterprise development? *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 13(1), 9(66).
- Kaplinsky, R., & Farooki, M. (2009). *Africa's cooperation with new and emerging development partners: options for Africa's development*. UN-OSSA.
- Kim, Y.D., Yoon, S., & Kim, H.G. (2014). An economic perspective and policy implication for social enterprise. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 11(3), 406-413.
- Kimakowitz, E.V., M. Pirson, H. Spitzeck, C. Dierksmeier, and W. Amann. (2011). *Humanistic management in practice*. Houndmills: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Kumar, A., Kiran, P., & Kishore SV, K. (2019). A scientometric analysis of social entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 8(12), 342-348.
- Kurzynski, M. (2009). Peter Drucker: Modern day Aristotle for the business community. *Journal of Management History*, 15, 357-74.
- Lilienthal, D.E. (1967). *Management: A Humanist Art*. New York: Carnegie Institute of Technology.
- Linkletter, K.E., and Maciariello, J.A (2011). *Drucker's lost art of management: peter Drucker's timeless vision for building effective organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Maciariello, J.A. (2014). *A year with Peter Drucker: 52 weeks of coaching for leadership effectiveness*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. New York: Macmillan.
- Mayo, E. (1946). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGregor, D. V. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Melé, D. (2003). The challenge of humanistic management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44, 77-88.
- Mele, D. (2008). Current Trends of Humanism in Business. In H.Spitzeck, M.Pirson, W.Amman, S. Khan and E. von Kimakowitz (Eds.). *Humanism in Business*: Cambridge, U.K., Cambridge University Press.
- Mele, D. (2013). Antecedents and current situation of humanistic management. *Africa journal of business ethics*, 7(2), 52-63.
- Mele, D., & Dierksmeier, C. (2012). *Human development in business: Values and humanistic management in the encyclical Caritas in veritate*. Humanism in business series. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Méndez-Picazo, M. T., Galindo-Martín, M. A., & Castaño-Martínez, M. S. (2020). Effects of sociocultural and economic factors on social entrepreneurship and sustainable development. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 1-9.
- Nida-Ruemelin, J. (2008). Philosophical Grounds of Humanism in Economics. *Humanism in Business: Perspectives on the Development of a Responsible Business Society*. H. Spitzeck, M. Pirson, W. Amann, S. Khan and E. von Kimakowitz. Cambridge, U.K., Cambridge University Press.

- Pacut, A. (2020). Drivers toward social entrepreneurs' engagement in Poland: an institutional approach. *Administrative Science*, 10(5), 2-24.
- Pangriya, R. (2019). Hidden aspect of social entrepreneur's life; a content analysis. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(66), 2-19.
- Park, J.D. (2019). *Re-Inventing Africa's development linking Africa to the Korean development model*. Macmillian Publishers.
- Pfeffer, J. (1998). *The human equation: building profits by putting people first*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pirson, M. A., & Lawrence, P. R. (2010). Humanism in business – Towards a paradigm shift? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(4), 553–565.
- Plas, J.M. (1996). *Person-centered leadership: an American approach to participatory management*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Rahdari, A., Sepasi, S., & Moradi, M. (2016). Achieving sustainability through Schumpeterian social entrepreneurship: The role of social enterprises. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 137, 347-360.
- Rodríguez-Luesma, C., A. Davila, and M. Elvira. (2014). Humanistic leadership as a value-infused dialogue of global leaders and local stakeholders. In *Humanistic perspectives on international management*: 1–91, ed. N.C. Lupton and M. Pirson. Houndmills: Palgrave- MacMillan.
- Sahasranamam, S., & Nandakumar, M. K. (2020). Individual capital and social entrepreneurship: Role of formal institutions. *Journal of Business Research*, 107, 104-117.
- Sánchez, C. (2003). Value Shift: Why companies must merge social and financial imperatives to achieve superior performance.
- Schwartz, M. (2004). Drucker's communitarian vision and its implications for business ethics. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 13(4), 288-301.
- Sievers, B. (1994). *Work, death, and life itself: Essays on management and organization* (Vol. 51). Walter de Gruyter.
- Spitzeck, H. (2011). An Integrated Model of Humanistic Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(1): 51–62.
- Spitzeck, H., Amann, W., Pirson, M., Khan, S., and Kimakowitz, E. V (Eds.). (2009). Humanism in business – State of the art. A reflection on humanistic values in today's business world. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swanson, D. L. (2004). The buck stops here: Why universities must reclaim business ethics education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 2(1), 43–61.
- Swart, J.C. (1973). The worth of humanistic management: Some contemporary examples. *Business Horizons*, 16, 41-50.
- Uchegara, F. (2019). The Impact of Social Entrepreneurship on Wealth Creation in Nigeria: A Case Study of Selected Non-for-Profit Organizations (NPOs). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(6), 915–938.
- Ugoani, J. (2019). Social Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Development: The Nigerian Conservation Foundation Phenomenon. *American Journal of Business and Society*, 4(1), 16-31.

- UNAIDS (2004). *AIDS epidemic update in 2004*. Retrieved from <http://www.data.unaids.org>
- UNAIDS (2019). *Press release on Nigeria HIV prevalence*. Retrieved from <http://www.unaids.org>
- United Nation Development Group (2015). *Socio-economic impact of Ebola virus disease in West African countries. A call for national and regional containment, recovery and prevention*.
- Werther Jr, W. B., & Chandler, D. (2010). *Strategic corporate social responsibility: Stakeholders in a global environment*. Sage.
- Wolf, W.B. (1974). *The basic Barnard: an introduction to Chester I. Barnard and his theories of organization and management*. Itaka: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations - Cornell University.
- World Bank Group (2015). *The economic impact of Ebola on sub-Saharan Africa; updated estimate for 2015*.
- Yunus, M. (2008). Social entrepreneurs are the solution. *Humanism in business: Perspectives on the development of a responsible business society*, 35, 185.

About the Authors

Adeyinka Maryam Shomoye-Olusi is a PhD student in Management in the Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos, Nigeria. Her area of specialization is Entrepreneurship. She holds a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration (Second Class Upper Division) from Oduduwa University, Nigeria, and Master's degree in Business Administration from Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria. She currently works as an Adjunct Lecturer at Caleb University, Lagos.

Ibrahim Oluwapelumi Orekoya is MSA Research Assistant at Lagos Business School, Pan-Atlantic University, Nigeria. He holds a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration (First Class Honours) from Babcock University, Nigeria and Master's degree in Management from the University of Lagos, Nigeria. His core research interests are in innovation, entrepreneurship, and strategy. He is a Graduate Member of the Nigerian Institute of Management (Chartered).

Qaozara Adebanye Adepeju is a final year Law student at the University of Lagos, with strong interest in finance, investment policies and social entrepreneurship. She is passionate about research, writing and knowledge acquisition. She is a 2019 Nigeria Higher Education Foundation (NHEF) Scholar.

Olamide Akintimehin holds a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration from Landmark University, Omu-Aran, Kwara State, Nigeria, and Master's degree in Marketing from the University of Lagos, Nigeria. He is presently an Assistant Lecturer in the Department of Business Studies, Landmark University. He has authored and co-authored eight research articles in scopus-indexed journals.