

**ENTREPRENEURIAL INCUBATION WITHIN THE  
ENTREPRENEURIAL UNIVERSITY: THE CASE OF  
INCUBATORS AT THE KOLEA UNIVERSITY POLE**

**Dr. MOHAMMED BELKACEM Faïza \***

School of Higher Commercial Studies - EHEC (Algeria)

[f.mohammed\\_belkacem@hec.dz](mailto:f.mohammed_belkacem@hec.dz)

**Dr. BRAHITI Ibtissem**

School of Higher Commercial Studies - EHEC (Algeria)

[Brahiti-ibtisseme@hotmail.com](mailto:Brahiti-ibtisseme@hotmail.com)

**KECHIT Lounis**

University of Algiers02 (Algeria)

[Louniskechit7@gmail.com](mailto:Louniskechit7@gmail.com)

*Received : 24/03/2025*

*Accepted : 27/05/2025*

*Published : 27/06/2025*

**Abstract:**

Algeria, with its dynamic youth and expanding university network, has recognized the importance of developing a strategy focused on the entrepreneurial university and university incubators have thus become indispensable actors. In this article, through a qualitative and quantitative methodology, we examine the university entrepreneurial incubation activity at the Koléa university pole to highlight some of the challenges and opportunities encountered in the creation of student entrepreneurial projects. The study's results allow us to see that university incubators play a significant role in supporting social entrepreneurship by providing resources, mentorship, and access to essential networks, thereby increasing the societal impact of social entrepreneurs.

**Keywords:** Entrepreneurship, incubator, university, Koléa

**JEL Classification Codes:** L26, M13, I23

---

\* Corresponding author

**Résumé:**

L'Algérie, avec sa jeunesse dynamique et son réseau universitaire en expansion, a reconnu l'importance de développer une stratégie axée sur l'université entrepreneuriale. A cet effet, nous examinons dans cet article, à travers une méthodologie qualitative et quantitative, cette activité d'incubation entrepreneuriale universitaire au pôle universitaire de Koléa, afin de mettre en évidence certains des défis et des opportunités rencontrés dans la création des projets entrepreneuriaux des étudiants. Les résultats de l'étude nous permettent de constater que les incubateurs universitaires jouent un rôle important dans le soutien à l'entrepreneuriat social en offrant des ressources, du mentorat, et un accès à des réseaux essentiels au succès des entrepreneurs sociaux augmentant leur impact sociétal.

**Mots clés :** Entrepreneuriat, incubateur, université, Koléa

**Code de classification Jel :** L26, M13, I23

## **1- Introduction**

This era of entrepreneurial revolution and major innovations has redefined the policies of many countries, driving them to reshape their economies and private entrepreneurship, which continues to be recognized today in the Schumpeterian sense (Schumpeter J.A., 1935), as the engine of all economic dynamics.

Higher education institutions are precisely the ideal place for discovering and learning the necessary skills to embark on entrepreneurship.

Algeria, aware of the role of higher education in promoting an entrepreneurial spirit among students, particularly as it provides solutions to unemployment, regional inequalities, and social exclusion, this has made university incubators key players.

Moreover, according to INSEE, there is a strong correlation between supporting a business beyond its initial years of survival and its long-term sustainability, as 66% of such businesses still exist. Thus, support facilitates better socio-economic and financial integration for project holders (Levey-Tadjinet T, 2011).

It is within this vision that we have focused on studying entrepreneurship in the Algerian context in general, and more specifically within the university environment.

At the Koléa university pole, the incubators of major management and commerce schools have positioned themselves as platforms fostering the emergence of innovative startups with high social value. However, a question arises: **How do the incubators at the Koléa university pole promote entrepreneurship in Algeria?**

To attempt to provide answers to our research question, we start from the hypothesis that the incubators at the Koléa university pole play a major role by creating a conducive climate for project holders and offering holistic support (mentorship, training, access to resources), encouraging students to create their own enterprises with significant social and economic impact.

Thus, the main objectives of this study are:

1. To understand the functioning of university incubators at the Koléa pole.
2. To understand their effects on the development of social entrepreneurship projects.
3. To identify the key success factors as well as the obstacles faced by these incubators in their mission of supporting social entrepreneurs.
4. To compare these practices with those of incubators in other North African countries.

To carry out this study, we will adopt a qualitative and quantitative methodology. Thus, the study will provide a better understanding of the role played by university incubators in the emergence of social entrepreneurship in Kolea university pole. Ultimately, the results should offer recommendations for optimizing the support mechanisms of incubators, strengthening their impact on social innovation.

The theoretical framework of this study explores several interconnected concepts around social entrepreneurship and the role of university incubators in its development. This framework is structured around the following elements: the definition and characteristics of social

entrepreneurship, the functions and impact of university incubators, as well as the exploration of international best practices.

## **2- Literature Review on Social Entrepreneurship**

### **2-1. Definition and Conceptual Framework of Social Entrepreneurship**

The literature on social entrepreneurship agrees on the primacy of the social dimension within their strategies and economic activities (Jackson and al., 2017). Social entrepreneurs innovate to address social needs, not just to generate profit (Mgueraman, 2023). Similarly, social entrepreneurship does not fail to challenge actors in the social and solidarity economy (Glemin & Richez-Battesti, 2018) to place the question of innovation at the heart of reflections. However, there are several definitions:

Dees (1998) was one of the first researchers to provide a broad definition of social entrepreneurship, considering it as the use of entrepreneurial techniques to address pressing social needs.

For Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern (2006), social entrepreneurship is distinguished by its commitment to solving social problems in a sustainable and innovative manner, emphasizing "social value" over "economic value." In this approach, social entrepreneurs differ from traditional entrepreneurs by their primary mission, which is to create a positive social impact rather than maximizing profit.

Thus, hybrid mission theories (Battilana & Dorado, 2010) highlight that social entrepreneurs must juggle between social objectives and economic constraints.

### **2-2. Underlying Theories of Social Entrepreneurship**

#### **2-2-1. Social Capital Theory**

One of the theories frequently associated with social entrepreneurship is the social capital theory (Putnam, 2000). Social capital refers to community support networks and partnerships with local and international actors to maximize their impact.

By using their networks to access resources, social entrepreneurs can overcome funding deficiencies, and mobilize stakeholder support (Mair and Martí, 2006).

### **2-2-2. Social Innovation Theory**

Another key theoretical framework is that of social innovation. According to Mulgan (2006) Social entrepreneurship is often seen as a driver of social innovations, in that it enables the implementation of new service or product models that directly improve the living conditions. Social innovation allows for introducing creative solutions to social issues such as access to education, healthcare, or the fight against exclusion (Bornstein, 2007).

### **2-2-3. Triple Bottom Line Theory**

This theory (Elkington, 1997) suggests that businesses should evaluate their success not only in terms of financial profits but also in terms of social and environmental performance. This framework is particularly relevant for social entrepreneurs, as it reflects their commitment to creating value beyond mere financial profit especially in sectors such as sustainable agriculture, renewable energy, or waste management (Nicholls, 2006). This model allows for the reconciliation of economic imperatives with environmental and social challenges.

## **2-3. Characteristics of Social Entrepreneurship**

**2-3-1. Social and Environmental Objectives:** Unlike traditional entrepreneurship, which prioritizes profit maximization, social entrepreneurship aims to address social issues such as poverty, education, the environment, or access to healthcare. (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010).

**2-3-2. Social Innovation:** Social entrepreneurs propose innovative solutions to existing problems. This can include products or services that address unmet needs or innovative business models that reinvent ways to solve social problems (Yunus, 2010).

**2-3-3. Economic Sustainability:** Although the objective is social, social entrepreneurship initiatives must be economically viable. This involves

to generate revenue while pursuing social missions. (Smith, Gonin, & Besharov, 2013).

**2-3-4. Impact Measurement:** Social entrepreneurs are often required to measure the impact of their initiatives on the communities and environments they aim to serve. This requires robust evaluation tools to quantify and qualify their social impact.

Example: The Grameen Bank, founded by Muhammad Yunus, illustrates these characteristics by offering microloans to disadvantaged populations. Its economic model is based on loan repayment while pursuing social objectives of poverty reduction (Robinson, 2001).

#### **2-4. Challenges and Opportunities of Social Entrepreneurship**

Despite its transformative potential, social entrepreneurship faces several challenges.

##### **2-4-1. Funding**

Funding is one of the major obstacles to the growth of social enterprises. In fact, traditional investors are often hesitant to invest in enterprises whose objective is not solely economic profitability (Zahra and al., 2009). To overcome these obstacles, some social entrepreneurs turn to alternative funding sources, such as crowdfunding or social impact funds (Calic & Mosakowski, 2016).

##### **2-4-2. Measuring Social Impact**

In fact, unlike traditional enterprises, whose success is easily measured by financial indicators, social enterprises must demonstrate their impact on often qualitative dimensions (Bornstein & Davis, 2010). The difficulty is that social impact is often hard to quantify.

Tools such as the Social Return on Investment (SROI) method allow social entrepreneurs to better measure and communicate their impact (Nicholls et al., 2009). However, the adoption of these tools remains limited due to the complexity of metrics and the lack of technical capacity among many social entrepreneurs.

### **2-4-3. Viability of Economic Models**

Moreover, the economic viability of social enterprises is a constant challenge, particularly in the startup phase. Dees (2007) emphasizes that social entrepreneurs must balance their social objectives with the need to generate sufficient revenue to cover operating costs.

### **2-5. Future Perspectives**

Social entrepreneurship continues to evolve, particularly with the rise of digital technologies and collaborative funding models. Online platforms like Kickstarter or Patreon allow social entrepreneurs to obtain financial support more accessibly.

Moreover, the growing of environmental and social awareness in the business world, combined with increasingly favorable public policies, suggests a future where social entrepreneurship could become a dominant model in certain sectors.

## **3- University Incubators: Definition and Functions**

Incubators play a crucial role in the entrepreneurial ecosystem, particularly in supporting social entrepreneurship. Their mission goes beyond the traditional framework of entrepreneurial support, including societal, economic, and environmental objectives. This section presents a theoretical and scientific analysis of the impact of incubators on the development of social entrepreneurship.

### **3-1. Definition of University Incubators**

#### **3-1-1. Definition of Incubators**

An incubator is an organization that provides structured support to young enterprises or project holders for a determined period, to increase their chances of success and sustainability (Peters et al., 2004). The services offered often include mentorship, funding, access to workspace, business networks, and training programs (Mian, 2014).

#### **3-1-2. Definition of University Incubators**

University incubators are structures created to support students and young entrepreneurs in the creation and development of business

projects. They provide a conducive framework for the emergence of innovative ideas by offering tailored resources and support.

### **3-2. Functions of University Incubators**

Incubators offer several essential contributions to the development of social entrepreneurship, both structurally and operationally.

- **Personalized Support:** Incubators provide individualized project follow-up, allowing entrepreneurs to benefit from advice tailored to their specific situation. Cohen and Winn (2007) emphasize that this support helps better articulate social and commercial objectives. According to a study by Zahra et al. (2009), incubators offering strategic mentorship enable social entrepreneurs to overcome complex challenges, such as managing the dual mission (social and economic), while optimizing their social impact.
- **Training and Skill Development:** Training programs are often implemented to strengthen entrepreneurs' skills in key areas such as business management, finance, marketing, and personal development. For example, pitch workshops can be organized to help entrepreneurs effectively present their projects.
- **Networking:** Incubators facilitate access to a network of mentors, experts, and investors. These connections are crucial for the success of young entrepreneurs, as they open doors to funding and strategic partnerships (Phan & Siegel, 2006). An OECD report (2017) demonstrated that access to a strong network doubles the chances of success for social entrepreneurs.
- **Access to Material Resources:** Incubators often offer shared workspaces and technological equipment. This infrastructure allows young enterprises to focus on their development without immediately worrying about operating costs.
- **Access to Financial Resources:** One of the main obstacles faced by social entrepreneurs is access to funding (Tracey & Phillips, 2007). According to a study by Dees and Anderson (2006), social entrepreneurs often lack adequate financial means to start their projects and struggle to attract traditional investors focused on profit maximization. Incubators

act as facilitators by connecting these entrepreneurs with alternative funders, such as social impact funds or public grants.

Furthermore, they provide entrepreneurs with an appropriate framework of spaces, equipment, and support, thus offering an opportunity for success within a legal entity (Buresh & Shehaib, 2019). Consequently, they make their projects more attractive to investors (Kim & Mauborgne, 2014).

Example: The Stanford University Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation offers various resources, ranging from mentorship to specialized training, while facilitating connections with potential investors.

### **3-3. Impact of Incubators on the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem**

University incubators play a crucial role in energizing the entrepreneurial ecosystem, particularly in the field of social entrepreneurship. Their impact manifests through several dimensions:

- Job Creation: Projects supported by incubators contribute to generate direct jobs for youth and indirect jobs in local communities.
- Stimulation of Innovation: Incubators are creative spaces where ideas can be tested and developed; they enable the emergence of solutions that address pressing societal issues.
- Skill Enhancement: By offering training, incubators strengthen the entrepreneurial skills.
- Social Impact Measurement: By encouraging establishing performance indicators they contribute to a better understanding of the effectiveness of social entrepreneurship initiatives.

Example: A study by N. H. Zeller (2018) shows that startups incubated in universities increase their survival rate and generate higher revenues than those without such support.

### **3.4. The Impact of Incubators on the Viability of Social Enterprises**

The effectiveness of incubators in supporting social entrepreneurship can be measured in:

- ***Survival Rate of Incubated Social Enterprises:*** Several studies have shown that incubated social enterprises have higher survival rates than those without such support (Hacket & Dilts, 2004). A survey by the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (2016) revealed that 70% of them survive after five years. This is explained by access support offered during the critical startup phase.

- ***Leveraging Social Impact:*** Social incubators are often specialized in areas such as education, healthcare, or the environment, and the entrepreneurs who benefit from them develop solutions more tailored to community needs (Mulgan, 2010).

A study by Bloom and Smith (2010) shows that incubators help in improving the scalability of social enterprises; their ability to expand their activities while preserving their social mission.

### **3-5. Limitations and Challenges of Social Entrepreneurship Incubators**

Despite their advantages, social entrepreneurship incubators face several challenges. Their economic model often relies on subsidies or public funds, which can limit their ability to support a large number of social entrepreneurs (Grimes, McMullen, Vogus, & Miller, 2013). Second, social entrepreneurs often lack long-term support, particularly after exiting the incubator. According to Alvord, Brown, and Letts (2004), this is, raising the question of the need for more structured post-incubation support.

### **3-6. International Best Practices**

The analysis of university incubators abroad offers valuable lessons for the Algerian context. Among the best practices, we can cite:

- **The Ashoka U Program:** This international network supports universities that integrate social entrepreneurship into their curriculum. Ashoka U provides educational resources, training, and mentorship opportunities.

- **The Fledge Model:** This virtual incubator focuses exclusively on social enterprises. Fledge offers an acceleration program that includes intensive training, mentorship, and access to investors.

- The University of Toronto's Centre for Social Innovation: This center supports social entrepreneurship projects. By integrating social innovation into research and teaching, it contributes to training a new generation of entrepreneurs sensitive to social issues.

These examples of best practices can inspire the development of university incubators at the Koléa university pole by adopting similar approaches that meet local needs.

### **3-7. Conclusion**

This theoretical framework provides a solid foundation for exploring the role of university incubators in the development of social entrepreneurship at the Koléa university pole. By integrating precise definitions, key characteristics, and concrete examples, this study aims to shed light on current practices and formulate recommendations to optimize the impact of incubators on social innovation in Algeria.

## **4- Practical Study: Empirical Analysis**

This section presents the empirical analysis of the study, based on a qualitative approach combining surveys, interviews, and case studies. The objective is to evaluate the actual impact of university incubators in promoting social entrepreneurship at the Koléa university pole. It is structured around three sub-sections: the adopted methodology, the presentation of results, and the analysis of these results in relation to the research question.

### **4-1. Research Methodology**

The methodology of this study is based on a mixed-method approach that combines qualitative and quantitative data. The goal is to capture the diversity of perspectives of the actors involved in the incubators of social entrepreneurship projects.

#### **4-1-1. Exploratory Survey**

An exploratory survey was conducted among incubated students from various schools at the Koléa university pole. This survey aimed to gather information on their entrepreneurial journey, motivations, challenges encountered, and their perception of the support offered by the incubator.

Sampling: The sample includes 50 students and young graduates from various fields (management, finance, marketing, entrepreneurship) who have benefited from university incubator support. The inclusion criteria were to have a social entrepreneurial project supported by the incubator.

Questionnaire: The questionnaire was structured around four main axes: (1) the nature of the entrepreneurial project, (2) motivations for engaging in social entrepreneurship, (3) the role of the incubator in the project's evolution, (4) challenges and obstacles encountered.

The approach uses Likert scale questions, multiple-choice questions, and open-ended questions to obtain a quantitative and qualitative overview of social entrepreneurs' perceptions of their incubation experience and their impact on society.

#### **4-1-2. Semi-Structured Interviews**

In addition to the survey, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 individuals who are incubator managers and mentors of Koléa. The interviews allowed for a deeper understanding of the information gathered from the surveys.

#### **4-1-3. Case Studies**

Semi-Structured Interview: This structure will allow for the collection of relevant data through that delve into the perceptions, motivations, and challenges of social entrepreneurs.

### **4-2. Detailed Interview Structure**

The interview should be semi-structured to allow flexibility for the interviewee while covering the main themes. It is preferable to divide the interview into several parts:

#### **4-2-1 Presentation and Context**

Objective: To put the interviewee at ease and present the purpose of the interview.

Questions:

- Can you briefly introduce yourself and describe your professional background?
- How did you start in the field of social entrepreneurship?

- What is your current role in your social enterprise or project?

#### **4-2-2 Role of the University Incubator**

Objective: To explore the impact of incubators on creation and growth of social enterprises.

Questions:

- How did you come to join the university incubator?
- What are the main resources you have obtained through this incubator (funding, mentorship, networks, etc.)?
- How has the university incubator helped you develop your social enterprise?
- What challenges have you encountered in your interaction with the incubator?

#### **4-2-3. Link between Incubator and Social Entrepreneurship**

Objective: To understand the specific role that university incubators play in social entrepreneurship compared to traditional incubators.

Questions:

- In your opinion, how do university incubators differ from other types of incubators in supporting social entrepreneurs?
- What type of training or specific support for social entrepreneurship have you received?
- What concrete impacts have you observed on the local social entrepreneurial ecosystem thanks to the university incubator?

#### **4-2-4. Social Innovation and Impact**

Objective: To assess the perception of social innovation and the impact of incubated social enterprises.

Questions:

- What are the main social innovations you have introduced within your enterprise?
- Do you have concrete examples of improvements in social or economic conditions thanks to your enterprise?

- How has the incubator contributed to these innovations and their implementation?

#### **4-2-5. Challenges and Opportunities**

Objective: To identify the obstacles and growth levers for social entrepreneurship.

Questions:

- What are the main difficulties you have faced in your entrepreneurial journey?
- How have you overcome these challenges with the help of the incubator?
- What are your recommendations for improving the support of university incubators in social entrepreneurship?

#### **4-2-6. Future Perspectives**

Objective: To understand the expectations and future projects of social entrepreneurs.

Questions:

- What are your short- and long-term plans for your social enterprise?
- Do you think university incubators will be able to continue supporting you in these projects?
- How do you see the evolution of social entrepreneurship in the coming years?

#### **4-2-7. Conclusion: Closing the Interview**

Objective: To summarize the main points and thank the interviewee.

Questions:

- Is there a point you would like to add or elaborate on?
- Do you have recommendations for improving future university incubators in Algeria or elsewhere?

### **4.3. Results Obtained**

The results of the survey and interviews have provided a portrait of the effectiveness of university incubators in supporting social entrepreneurs at the Koléa university pole.

#### **4-3-1. Profile of Social Entrepreneurs**

The survey revealed that the majority of incubated entrepreneurs (65%) are motivated by specific social challenges, such as improving the quality of life in rural areas, providing access to education for disadvantaged children, or promoting sustainable development. Approximately 45% of respondents indicated that their choice to engage in social entrepreneurship was motivated by their desire to contribute to society. It means to combine economic and social aspects to address market failures, in other words, the consequences of economic activity, with a focus on the common good.

#### **4-3-2. Perception of Support**

The entrepreneurs interviewed generally expressed satisfaction with the support offered by university incubators. In particular:

**Financial Support:** 60% of respondents mentioned that the incubator had helped them obtain funding, whether through grants or innovation competitions.

**Technical Support and Mentorship:** Project holders valued mentorship as a key success factor, with 80% of them indicating that the advice and guidance from mentors had helped them better structure their project and refine their economic model.

**Networking:** Another point highlighted by the incubates is the importance of the network provided by the incubator. Approximately 70% of entrepreneurs were able to establish professional relationships and partnerships with other enterprises, which strengthened their ability to achieve their objectives.

#### **4-3-3. Challenges Encountered**

Despite the positive feedback, several obstacles were identified as:

- Access to Sustainable Funding: Although the incubator helps obtain initial funds, many projects struggle to attract investors or secure bank loans to scale up.
- Lack of Post-Incubation Follow-Up: Once the incubation phase is over, entrepreneurs often feel left alone, with little additional support to face new challenges.
- Lack of Visibility: Some entrepreneurs noted difficulties in making their projects known to a wider audience, which limits their ability to attract additional clients or partners.

#### **4-4. Analysis of Results**

The results obtained show that the university incubators at the Koléa pole play a crucial role in supporting social entrepreneurship, but they face challenges that sometimes limit their impact.

##### **4-4-1. Impact of Incubators on the Development of Social Projects**

The analysis of case studies confirmed that the support of incubators has had a significant effect on the maturation of projects, particularly in terms of economic viability and the structuring of business models. Projects that benefited from prolonged follow-up and intensive mentorship saw their social impact grow, particularly in terms of local job creation and awareness of environmental issues.

##### **4-4-2. Issue of Project Sustainability**

A weakness was identified: The absence of post-incubation follow-up, coupled with difficulties in accessing long-term funding, undermines the sustainability of projects.

##### **4-4-3. Recommendations for Improving the Impact of Incubators**

Based on these results, it is recommended to:

- Strengthen post-incubation programs to ensure long-term follow-up of projects.
- Encourage the establishment of partnerships with financial organizations and investors to facilitate access to sustainable funding.

- Develop social impact measurement tools to help entrepreneurs better demonstrate the added value of their projects to stakeholders, which could help them raise funds more easily.

## **5- Comparison of University Incubators at the Koléa pole with North African Countries**

By focusing on a comparison of university incubators at the Koléa university pole with those in neighboring countries ( Tunisia and Egypt), which often share comparable socio-economic contexts, the idea is to compare practices and approaches for supporting social entrepreneurship.

### **5-1. Analysis of University Incubators in Koléa**

#### ***Context and Structure:***

What are the specific characteristics of the incubators in Koléa? What are the links with the university, public/private partnerships, and available resources (funding, experts and infrastructure)?

What types of projects do these incubators encourage (focus on social, technological, environmental entrepreneurship?) What is their specific role within the university and in the region?

#### ***Services and Support:***

What's the nature of the support provided by the incubators, including mentorship programs, workshops, access to material resources (workspaces, equipment), and connections with investors. What is the importance given to social impact projects in the Koléa incubators?

#### ***Challenges Encountered:***

What is the main obstacle faced by these incubators: funding difficulties, lack of connection with international business networks, or limitations in access to technological and human resources?

## 5-2 Benchmarking of University Incubators in North African Countries

Each country (Tunisia, Egypt) has a specific context, but it is relevant to study the best practices implemented in universities with renowned incubators. Here is an analysis by country:

**a- Tunisia:** Tunisia has developed a dynamic ecosystem around business nurseries and incubators by offering incubation platforms with a focus on digital technologies and social entrepreneurship.

Strengths: Access to funding through international funds and European partners.

Results: Creation of high-impact startups, particularly in the field of social and solidarity economy.

**c- Egypt:** In Egypt, the American University in Cairo (AUC Venture Lab) stands out as one of the leading incubators. Its focus on social innovation and the creation of high-value enterprises has inspired several other initiatives.

Strengths: Strong connections with the private sector and international actors, intensive acceleration programs for impact startups.

Results: Active network of local and foreign investors, and incubation of several socially-oriented enterprises that have achieved rapid growth.

## 5-3. Comparison of Practices

### - Resources and Infrastructure:

Koléa: Limited access to certain financial and technological resources, but a rapidly developing university environment.

Tunisia, Egypt: Access to external funds and modern infrastructure through international partnerships, co-financed programs by foreign organizations.

### - Mentorship and Support Models:

Koléa: More local approach with a lack of international network for incubated projects.

North African Countries: Often supported by international organizations (such as USAID, the European Union, or NGOs), and strong links with multinational companies.

- Support Policies for Social Entrepreneurship:

Koléa: Nascent focus on social entrepreneurship, with local initiatives.

Tunisia, Egypt: National programs and fiscal incentives to promote social entrepreneurship (e.g., social innovation policy in Tunisia).

#### **5-4 Recommendations for Koléa**

-Develop International Partnerships: Koléa could benefit from programs similar to those in Tunisia and Egypt, by partnering with international initiatives to obtain funding and technical support.

-Structure Mentorship: Inspired by the incubators in these countries, it would be useful to formalize mentorship in Koléa by recruiting national and foreign experts in various fields as social innovation.

-Encourage Public Policies with incentives similar to Tunisian mechanisms that favor social impact projects.

#### **6- Conclusion**

The schools of the Koléa university pole demonstrate their ambition to put their academic potential at the service of the community by encouraging an entrepreneurial spirit, training enterprising and socially responsible learners. This is the mission of the incubators of these institutions, which offer co-working spaces, mentorship, access to resources, and enhance networking opportunities, thereby increasing not only the integration of these young enterprise creators into their new economic and social environment but also the chances of survival of their projects. However, to maximize their effectiveness, incubators must overcome several challenges, particularly the need for long-term support and the sustainability of their own economic models.

Moreover, to thrive in the era of global competition, higher education institutions must be innovative in their programs and activities. Thus, despite the integration of entrepreneurship education into university curricula, this remains insufficient as it only benefits certain fields such

as commercial sciences, economics, and management. It is therefore essential to intensify entrepreneurship training programs across all disciplines.

It is also recommended to integrate a module titled "Innovation Management" into university programs. This initiative would address the growing need for skills related to innovation management and entrepreneurship, training students capable of creating and piloting innovative projects in a competitive environment.

Furthermore, it is proposed that any student be able to enroll in the "Business Management and Entrepreneurship" program as a second specialization (minor program), both in-class and remotely, to complement their basic training with business and entrepreneurship education. This should be enriched by a multitude of activities: simulation workshops, organized visits to startups, hackathons, and competitions.

## **Bibliography:**

1. ALVORD S.H, BROWN L.D., & LETTS C.W., "*Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: An exploratory study*". The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 40(3), 2004, pp.260-282.
2. AUSTAIN J. STEVENSON H. and WEI-SKILLEN J., "*Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both?*" Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 30(1), 2006, pp.1-22.
3. BATTILANA J. and DORADO S., "*Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations*". Academy of Management Journal, 53(6), 2010, pp.1419-1440.
4. BLOOM P. N. and SMITH B. R., "*Identifying the drivers of social entrepreneurial impact: Theoretical development and an exploratory empirical test of SCALERS*". Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 1(1), 2010, pp.26-145.
5. BORNSTEIN D., "*How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*". Oxford University Press, 2007.
6. BURESH A. and SHEHAIB S., "*The role of business incubators experiences in supporting creative and innovative projects of business*

- organizations and their implications for sustainable development (experiences and approaches)*". Finance and Business Econoy review, 3 (2), 2019, pp.94-115.
7. CALIC G. and MOSAKOWSKI E., "Kicking Off Social Entrepreneurship: How A Sustainability Orientation Influences Crowdfunding Success". Journal of Management Studies, 53(5), 2016, pp.738-767
  8. COHEN B. and WINN M. I., "Market imperfections, opportunity and sustainable entrepreneurship". Journal of Business Venturing, 22(1),2007, pp.29-49.
  9. DEES J.G. and ANDERSON B.B., "Framing a theory of social entrepreneurship: Building on two schools of practice and thought". In Research on social entrepreneurship Vol. 1, 2006, pp.39-66.
  10. DEFOURNY J. and NYSSSENS M., "Conceptions of Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences". Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, March 2010
  11. GLEMAIN P. and RICHEZ-BATTESTI N, « *De l'économie sociale et solidaire à l'entreprise sociale : entre tournant entrepreneurial et innovation* ». Une clé de lecture. Marché et organisations, 31, 2018, pp.13-19. <https://shs.cairn.info/revue-marche-et-organisations-2018-1-page-13>
  12. GRIMES M. G. MCMULLEN J. S. VOGUS T. J. and MILLER T. L., "Studying the origins of social entrepreneurship: Compassion and the role of embedded agency". Academy of Management Review, 38(3), 2013, pp.460-463.
  13. KIM W.C. and MAUBORGNE R., « *La stratégie océan bleu comme alternative à la recherche e l'avantage concurrentiel* », Harvard Business Review, 2014, pp.159-173
  14. LEVY-TADJINE T., « *Peut-on modéliser la relation d'accompagnement entrepreneurial ?* », La revue des sciences de gestion, Direction et gestion n°251 Ressources humaines, 2011, pp.83-90
  15. MAIR J. and MARTI I., "Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight", Journal of World Business, february 2006, pp.36-44.
  16. MGUERAMAN A., « *L'entrepreneuriat social, vers une meilleure compréhension du concept*», Revue Française d'Economie et de Gestion « Volume 4 : Numéro 1 » 2023, pp.185- 209

Entrepreneurial incubation within the entrepreneurial university: the case of incubators at the Kolea university pole

17. MIAN S.A ., “*Business incubation mechanisms and new venture support*” A review and research agenda. *Technovation*, 34(1), 2014, pp.42-53.
18. MULGAN G., “*Measuring social value*” *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 8(3), 2010, pp.38-43.
19. PETERS L. RICE M. & SUNDARARAJAN M., “*The role of incubators in the entrepreneurial process*”. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 29, 2004, pp.83-91.
20. ROBINSON M.S., “*The Microfinance Revolution – Sustainable Finance for the Poor, Banque mondiale*”, Washington, 2001.
21. SCHUMPTER J.A., “*The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*”. 1934, Translated by R. Opie. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1911)
22. SMITH W. GONIN M & BESHAROV M., “*Managing Social-Business Tensions: A Review and Research Agenda for Social Enterprise*”, *Business Ethics Quarterly Review*, July 2013, pp.407-442.
23. TRACEY P. & PHILLIPS N., “*The distinctive challenge of educating*”, *Academy of management learning and education*, 2007, Vol 6, n°2, 2007, pp.264-271
24. ZAHRA H and al., “*A Typology of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, Search Processes and Ethical Challenges*”, September 2009, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2009, pp.519-532