

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF SOCIAL
ENTREPRENEURSHIP

MIR HOSSAIN SOHEL

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF SOCIAL
ENTREPRENEURSHIP

MIR HOSSAIN SOHEL

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Management)

Faculty of Management
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

FEBRUARY 2018

Specially dedicated to my family.
Also, for those who want to become a researcher.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

By the name of Allah, the most merciful, the most benevolent. First and foremost, I would like to express my heartiest gratitude to my supervisor Associate Prof. Dr. Kamariah Ismail. Her careful guidance, kindness, friendly & positive behavior and her undying spirit continuously motivated me to keep focus on research work. Indeed, she has taught me to be diligent and steadfast in my work. I am truly grateful.

I am indebted to all my friends and colleagues Mohammad Shamsuddoha, Mohammad Alamgir, Weng Song Lim, Habibur Rahman, Sarder Mohammad Yahya, Raian Zafar, Ananya Raka, Umee Nur Ayuniza, Hasni Ayu for their guidance and kindness.

My heartiest thanks go to my beloved parents for teaching me to be persistent and diligent in work. Their sacrifices are the source of my all achievements.

Last but not least, I would like to take the opportunity to express my gratitude to Universiti Teknologi Malaysia for supporting me in form of Research University Grant (GUP) vot no. 02H08.

Johor Bahru, February, 2018

Mir Hossain Sohel

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurial ventures addressing social issues has widely spread as a global phenomenon. Although numerous studies have been conducted, the concept is difficult to define. However, the positive impact of social entrepreneurship on alleviating social problems has already been proven. As a newly evolved form of entrepreneurship with a keen difference from its commercial counterpart, social entrepreneurship encounters unique challenges. The research identified the challenges and developed an institutional framework model to foster the growth of successful social entrepreneurial ventures and overcome the challenges to bring positive, systematic and sustained social change. A qualitative phenomenological study was conducted to explore the experiences of 13 social entrepreneurial ventures from four sectors namely social venture, financial institution, NGO and academic institutions located in Selangor and Johor. A snowball sampling method was adopted to select participants for the study. The study used the modified Van Kaam method by Moustakas with Nvivo 9 software application to analyze and interpret data collected through personal semi-structured interviews using open ended questions. The major challenges found within the sample were related to entrepreneurial funding, government policy, entrepreneurial culture, and lack of talented employees. Nine core themes that emerged from the analysis of interview data were government policy, financial institutions, entrepreneurial culture, academia and research institutes, accounting and financial advisory firms, legal firms, private sector CSR initiatives, incubators, and advocacy and interest groups. The findings of the study confirmed seven variables and identified two new ones to add to the existing literature associated with social entrepreneurship institutional framework. Based on the findings the major supporting elements of the institutional framework found within the sample were financial institutions, entrepreneurial culture, and academic and research institutions. The research has filled the gap in the literature pertaining to the understanding of social entrepreneurship institutional framework from the experiences of social ventures in contrast to theory or assumptions. Future research can be conducted to identify the effectiveness of social entrepreneurship institutional framework in re-strategizing government intervention programs for the effective development of social entrepreneurship in Malaysia.

ABSTRAK

Usaha keusahawanan yang menangani masalah sosial telah tersebar luas sebagai satu fenomena global. Walaupun banyak kajian telah dijalankan, konsep ini adalah sukar untuk ditakrifkan. Walau bagaimanapun, kesan positif keusahawanan sosial dalam mengurangkan masalah sosial telah terbukti. Sebagai bentuk keusahawanan yang baru berevolusi dengan perbezaan minat dari rakan sejawatannya, keusahawanan sosial menghadapi cabaran yang unik. Kajian ini mengenal pasti cabaran dan membangunkan model rangka kerja institusi untuk memupuk pertumbuhan usahawan sosial yang berjaya dan mengatasi cabaran untuk membawa perubahan sosial yang positif, sistematik dan berterusan. Kajian fenomenologi kualitatif telah dijalankan untuk mengkaji pengalaman 13 usaha keusahawanan sosial dari empat sektor dikenali sebagai keusahawanan sosial, institusi kewangan, NGO dan institusi akademik yang terletak di Selangor dan Johor. Kaedah pensampelan bola salji telah digunakan untuk memilih responden untuk kajian ini. Kajian ini menggunakan kaedah Van Kaam yang diubahsuai oleh Moustakas dengan aplikasi perisian Nvivo 9 untuk menganalisis dan menafsir data yang dikumpulkan melalui wawancara separa berstruktur menggunakan soalan terbuka. Cabaran- cabaran utama yang diperoleh dalam sampel adalah berkaitan dengan pembiayaan, dasar kerajaan, budaya keusahawanan dan kekurangan pekerja berwibawa. Sembilan tema teras yang diperoleh dari analisis data temu duga adalah dasar kerajaan, institusi kewangan, budaya keusahawanan, institut akademik dan penyelidikan, firma perunding dan perunding kewangan, firma guaman, inisiatif CSR sektor swasta, inkubator, dan kumpulan sokongan dan berkepentingan. Dapatan kajian mengesahkan penemuan tujuh pembolehubah dan mengenal pasti dua pembolehubah yang baru untuk menambah kepada kajian sedia ada yang berkaitan dengan rangka kerja institusi keusahawanan sosial. Berdasarkan dapatan kajian, unsur-unsur sokongan utama rangka kerja institusi yang terdapat dalam sampel adalah institusi kewangan, budaya keusahawanan serta institusi akademik dan penyelidikan. Kajian ini telah mengisi jurang dalam kajian lepas berkenaan dengan memahami rangka kerja institusi keusahawanan sosial dari pengalaman usaha sosial berbanding dengan teori atau andaian. Kajian seterusnya boleh dilaksanakan bagi mengenal pasti keberkesanan rangka kerja institusi keusahawanan sosial dalam menyusun semula program kerajaan bagi keberkesanan pembangunan keusahawanan sosial di Malaysia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	xii
	LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xvi
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Background of the Study	1
	1.2 The Social Sector and Social Entrepreneurship	3
	1.3 Statement of the Problem	5
	1.4 Research Questions	11
	1.5 Research Objectives	13
	1.6 Significance of the Study and Justification of the Research	14
	1.7 Scope of the Research	15
	1.8 Summary and Outline of the Study	15
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	18
	2.1 Social Entrepreneurship Overview	18

2.1.1	What is Entrepreneurship?	19
2.1.2	What is Social Entrepreneurship?	23
2.2	Is ‘Social Entrepreneurship’ Entrepreneurship?	27
2.3	What is the ‘Social’ Element in ‘Social Entrepreneurship’?	29
2.4	Role of Innovation in Social Entrepreneurship	32
2.5	Commercial Vs. Social Entrepreneurship	35
2.6	Triggers of Social Entrepreneurship	39
2.7	A Process Model Framework of Social Entrepreneurship	42
2.7.1	Phase – 1: Exploring the Opportunity	42
2.7.1.1	The Opportunity Identification	44
2.7.1.2	Information Search and Evaluation	48
2.7.1.3	Selecting the Opportunity	49
2.7.2	Phase – 2: Exploiting the Opportunity	50
2.7.2.1	Innovation	50
2.7.2.2	Business Modeling	51
2.7.3	Phase – 3: Execution and Growth	57
2.7.3.1	Add strategic partners and expand stakeholder base	57
2.7.3.2	Market expansion	59
2.7.4	Phase – 4: Realizing Success and Hunt for New Mission	60
2.8	The Case of Elevyn.com	61
2.8.1	Recognizing the Opportunity	62
2.8.2	The Elevyn.com Innovation and Start-up	63
2.8.3	How does Elevyn Works	64
2.8.4	Community Empowerment	67
2.8.5	Challenges Faced by Elevyn	69
2.9	Institutional Framework	70
2.9.1	The Concept of Institution	71
2.9.2	Institutionalization and Venture Development	72
2.10	Theoretical Framework: Social Entrepreneurship Institutional Framework	74
2.11	Social entrepreneurship in Asia: Moving towards a Structured Framework and Challenges	79

2.11.1	State of the Market	81
2.11.2	Role of the Government and International Institutions	82
2.11.3	Role of Supporting Institutions in the Framework	84
2.11.3.1	Bangladesh	84
2.11.3.2	India	87
2.11.3.3	Thailand	89
2.11.4	Social Entrepreneurship Challenges in Asia	92
2.11.4.1	Barriers to Social Entrepreneurship Development	92
2.11.4.2	Policy Challenges to Social Entrepreneurship Development	94
2.12	The proposed Social Entrepreneurship Institutional Framework	97
2.13	Summary	104
3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	106
3.1	Introduction	106
3.2	Qualitative research	107
3.3	Research Philosophy	110
3.4	Qualitative phenomenological Approach	112
3.5	Research Design Strategy	115
3.6	Sampling Methods	117
3.7	Data Collection	122
3.7.1	Face-to-face Interview	122
3.8	Interview Protocol and Process	122
3.8.1	Pilot Study	125
3.8.2	Interview Protocol and the general direction of the Questions	126
3.9	Data Analysis	129
3.10	Research Quality- Validity and Reliability:	131
3.11	Ethical Considerations	133
3.12	Summary	133

4	RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	134
	4.1 Introduction	134
	4.2 Data Collection	135
	4.3 Data Analysis	138
	4.3.1 Listing and preliminary grouping	139
	4.3.2 Reduction and Elimination	140
	4.3.3 Clustering and thematizing	140
	4.3.4 Final Identification of the Invariant Constituents and Themes by Application	140
	4.3.5 Constructing an Individual Textual Description for Each Participant	141
	4.3.6 Constructing an Individual Structural Description for Each Participant	141
	4.3.7 Constructing a Textual-Structural Description of the Meanings and Essences of the Experience for Each Research Respondent	141
	4.4 Research Findings from the Sample of Social Entrepreneurial Ventures, Government Departments and Academic Institutions	142
	4.4.1 Research Findings from the Sample of Social Ventures	142
	4.4.2 Research Findings from the Sample of Government Departments and Academic Institutions	155
	4.5 Data Clustering and Textual Description of Questionnaires	158
	4.5.1 Impact of Academic and Entrepreneurial Background on Social Venture Creation	159
	4.5.2 Reasons for Getting Involved in Social Entrepreneurship	161
	4.5.3 Factors Differentiating Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship	164
	4.5.4 Challenges Facing Social Ventures During Venture Creation and Growth	166
	4.5.5 Factors contributing to Challenges Facing Social Ventures	171

4.5.6	Support Elements for Overcoming Challenges	177
4.6	Summary	182
5	DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	184
5.1	Introduction	184
5.2	Summarizing the Problem and Purpose of Study	186
5.3	Review of Significance to Research and Social Entrepreneurship	187
5.4	Discussions of Core Themes	187
5.5	Implications of Findings	197
5.6	Contribution of the Study	198
5.7	Significance of the Study to Social Entrepreneurship - The Social Entrepreneurship Institutional framework	203
5.8	Recommendations for Action	204
5.9	Recommendations for Future Research	213
5.10	Summary	214
	REFERENCES	216
	Appendices A-C	239-245

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Conceptualizing Social Entrepreneurship (Compilation by the researcher)	24
3.1	List of Respondents	120
4.1	Impact of Academic and entrepreneurial background on social venture creation	161
4.2	Reasons for getting involved in social entrepreneurship	164
4.3	Factors differentiating social and commercial entrepreneurship	166
4.4	Challenges facing social ventures during venture creation and growth	169
4.5	Factors contributing to challenges facing social ventures	171
4.6	Support elements for overcoming challenges	180

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	A continuum of social entrepreneurship: Social goals to commercial exchange	31
2.2	Phases of Social Venture Development Cycle	42
2.3	Sources of Opportunities	44
2.4	Business Model of a venture	52
2.5	Operating model of WaterHealth International	53
2.6	Strategic partner Adding model of International Development Enterprises	58
2.7	Franchise model	59
2.8	Private-not-for-profit partnership model	59
2.9	How does Elevyn works	66
2.10	The SE Space in the Social Entrepreneurship Institutional Framework	78
2.11	Bangladeshi Institutional Framework Partners engagement with SEs	85
2.12	Financial Advisors and Accountants participation in SE sector of Bangladesh	86
2.13	Indian Institutional Framework Partners engagement with SEs	87
2.14	Supporting Institutions participation in the SE institutional framework of India.	88
2.15	Thailand Institutional Framework Partners engagement with SEs	90

2.16	Supporting Institutions participation in the SE institutional framework of Thailand.	91
2.17	The Proposed Social Entrepreneurship Institutional framework	99
5.1	The established Social Entrepreneurship Institutional framework	204
5.2	Quality Vs Fund availability of venture Matrix	206
5.3	The assistance an institutional framework can provide social ventures at different stages of their development	207

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NGO	-	Non-Governmental Organization
ADB	-	Asian Development Bank
SEV	-	Social Entrepreneurial Venture
SE	-	Social Entrepreneurship
MTDC	-	Malaysian Technology Development Corporation
MARA	-	Majlis Rakyat Malaysia
UTM	-	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
NFP	-	Not-for-Profit Organization
HIV	-	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ROI	-	Return on Investment
NGDO	-	Non-Governmental Developmental Organization
BRAC	-	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee
CSR	-	Corporate Social Responsibility
MSME	-	Micro-small and Medium Enterprises
SME	-	Small and Medium Enterprises
TSEO	-	Thai Social Enterprise Office
BOI	-	Board of Investment
MyPec	-	Malaysia Practice Entrepreneurship Center

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX NO.	TITLE	PAGE
A	Guiding Questionnaire for the Social Entrepreneurs	239
B	Invitation Letter for Interview	243
C	List of Publication	245

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In recent years there has been a steady growth in the number of social entrepreneurial ventures globally and their interventions in institutional voids or underserved markets are making a significant difference (Bornstein and Davis, 2010; Drayton, 2006; Harding and Cowling, 2006; Seymour, 2012). This represents the power of social entrepreneurship to address social and environmental issues across the globe, not only those that are primarily in need of economic development. This may be due to a number of factors like – i) recent crisis in the world economy, ii) the concern that capitalism lacks ethical soul, and iii) recognition that management education lacks a framework that is ‘good’ (Seymour, 2012).

The recent crisis in the world economy like the dot com bubble, housing crisis, credit and financial crisis, high unemployment etc. has highlighted the flaws in the capitalist system. As noted by Porter and Kramer (2011) –

“.....in recent years business increasingly has been viewed as a major cause of social, environmental and economic problems. Companies are widely perceived to be prospering at the expense of the broader community.....the more business has begun to embrace corporate responsibility; the more it has been blamed for society’s failures.....A big part of the problem lies with companies themselves, which remain trapped in an outdated approach to value creation that has emerged over the past few decades. They continue to view value narrowly.” (p.1)

In the face of such escalating crises, governments and multilateral agencies have increasingly struggled to provide timely and effective interventions. Moreover, in many developed and developing countries government has systematically retreat themselves from the provision of public goods (as defined by Samuelson 1954). As a result, the ‘supply side’ of resources available for public goods became static. The ever increasing societal and environmental crises coupled with the traditional institutions inability to address them effectively has also led to the rapid growth in the ‘demand side’ for new frameworks and models that create social and environmental value. To address these issues, many attempts have been taken to develop philosophies and frameworks that will allow creating such ‘a better place’. These frameworks have included the triple-bottom-line concepts pushed by practitioners of corporate social responsibility and sustainable development. In recent years, social entrepreneurship has emerged as a global phenomenon in the context of these social and environmental demand and supply side developments (Hockerts et al., 2007; Nicholls, 2006). Driven by a new breed of innovative and visionary ‘change makers’, social entrepreneurs combine the business, charity and social movement models to reconfigure solutions to community problems and deliver new sustainable social value. Although a good number of social change-makers like Mother Theresa, Florence Nightingale, Mahatma Gandhi etc. are found throughout the history, but what differentiates the modern-day change-makers from them is the application of extraordinary variety of approaches as well as the scale and reach of the new social impact being generated.

Social entrepreneurship as viewed in this research refers to a process of serving the basic needs and rights of the individuals which are not addressed by the traditional

organizations. The main objective of social entrepreneurship is to change or modify the social and/or economic arrangements that create the situation of failure to cater the basic needs.

1.2 The Social Sector and Social Entrepreneurship

The growing disastrous performance of the market and the state as mechanisms for providing solutions to contemporary economic, social and environmental problems led to emerge of ‘social entrepreneurship’. The market has been largely accused of overlooking social needs and generating refutable social inequalities. The state, on the other, is criticized for stifling initiatives, red-tape bureaucracies while absorbing growing portion of national income (Austin et al., 2006). Neither the government nor the business community has taken substantial effort to address the socio-environmental problems, such as extreme poverty and hunger, violation of human rights, environmental degradation etc. (Trivedi and Stokols, 2011). Traditionally, the non-profits, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the charities, or the voluntary or social sector used to come forward to challenge these complex problems. This mechanism of the social sector also varies in different economies. In welfare economies as in Scandinavian countries, the state works collectively with the social sector in addressing these complex socio-environmental problems, whereas in case of ‘free market’ economies the social sector is more or less on its own (Salamon, 2001; Salamon et al., 2003).

The growth of the social sector, irrespective of government support, accelerated due to the failure of the current welfare system in aligning the expectations from the system with the reality (Aparicio et al., 2016). Researchers argued that the inadequacy of the current welfare system boxed the initiatives, discharged people from individual responsibilities and resulted in increased dependency on the government (Fraser and Gordon, 1994; Salamon et al., 2003). Globalization also played a huge role

in reducing the state's involvement in the socio-economic development process and rather introduced "participatory development" concept underlining the association of grassroots aspiration and exuberance through NGOs and thus innovating the 'third sector' or 'third way' to confront the socio-economic-environmental problems (Salamon, 2001). The consolidated effect of the increased literacy level, development in communication technology and dissemination of information increased people's consciousness of the ecological crisis and made it easier to organize and mobilize resources in alleviating the problems (Salamon, 2001; Stokols et al., 2009).

The substantial growth of social enterprises over the last couple of decades is evident from the US economy where 1.6 million registered non-profit organizations are contributing approximately \$836.6 billion in revenue and 5.5% of the GDP involving 56% of the US adult volunteers (Blackwood, 2012). In USA, the total philanthropic market was \$248.5 billion in 2004 which was only \$5.4 billion in 1954. The individual donors earning less than \$100,000 contributes almost 75% of the market (Austin et al., 2007).

Despite being an emerging sector yielding substantial social and economic growth, the social sector is yet to be recognized as an important one in the traditional socio-economic framework due to its voluntary nature of activities and difficulties in calculating the contribution of such organizations in the economy (Álvarez et al., 2014). The underlying assumptions of the traditional socio-economic framework are – i) the complex socio-economic problems will be addressed by government initiatives and local communities rather than commercial sector, ii) long-term external financing is required to sustain the initiatives, and iii) top-down approach will be followed in problem solving (Trivedi, 2010). The success of the traditional framework largely depends on socio-economic policy changes and political commitment. This framework failed to prove its effectiveness time and again irrespective of poor or rich economy or free-market or welfare economy. The initiative and programs conceived and designed by development agencies through top-down approach failed to bring any sustainable positive social change due to their detachment from the members of the society (Peredo and Chrisman, 2006). The current global economic recession and difficulties

in funding social programs (where a large number of organizations are combating for the limited funding possibilities) raised the necessity of finding out frameworks through reconciling the gap between government, social and corporate sectors to bring about sustained positive social change without relying on long-term external funding or political commitment. The United Kingdom is the first country to acknowledge the importance of social sector for social and economic development and created the 'third sector' comprising the social enterprises, charities and non-governmental organizations, community groups sharing the common characteristic of social value creation under the department of "Office of the Third Sector". This mere recognition facilitated the social sector organizations with huge human and material resource investments which strengthened the moral of the social entrepreneurs and facilitated capacity building (Trivedi and Stokols, 2011).

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Which factors are impeding the social venture development process? This question arises from two sets of gaps in the social entrepreneurship literature: one is empirical, and the other is theoretical. On the empirical side, there is a lack of studies on the social venture development process and factors limiting their growth (Dacin et al., 2011; Maclean et al., 2013). Emerging social entrepreneurial ventures differ from their traditional counterparts in many ways (Austin et al., 2006). The stages of developing a social venture is quite unlike with the commercial venture development process (Perrini, 2006). This sort of new social ventures faces the multi-level challenge of survival and competition with constrained resources and premature routines; they suffer from the 'liabilities of newness' (Baum et al., 2000). Previous research on social entrepreneurship, however, tends to decontextualize the empirical institutional setting, and focuses on the context of definition and conceptual approaches of social entrepreneurship (Austin et al., 2006; Dees, 2001; Martin and Osberg, 2007; Weerawardena and Mort, 2006), triggers of social entrepreneurship (Bornstein, 2007; Dees et al., 2001), personality and traits of social entrepreneur (Thompson et al., 2000;

Thompson, 2002), impact and performance of social entrepreneurship (Alvord et al., 2004) and guidelines for future research (Mair and Marti, 2006; Peredo and McLean, 2006). The highly influential 20 publications (Kraus et al., 2013) on social entrepreneurship over the years provided insight regarding definition, differentiation, finance, performance or personalities found within social enterprise. Although empirical research on social entrepreneurship and publications rose significantly in the years 2009 and 2010 significantly, but studies on challenges faced by the social entrepreneurs and development of institutional framework for the creation of social enterprises are surprisingly limited (Kraus et al., 2013).

To date, a few researches on the challenged issues of social entrepreneurship are found done by Salamon (2001), Desa and Kotha (2006). According to Salamon (2001), the four most highlighted and challenged issues of social entrepreneurship identified are- i) legitimacy, ii) effectiveness, iii) sustainability, and iv) collaboration. The ‘legitimacy’ challenges includes issues of not being acknowledged as an “individual sector” according to traditional socio-economic framework and the lack of basic understanding among the policy makers and the people about the sector. The challenge of ‘effectiveness’ contains issues regarding inability to exhibit competency, measuring performance. ‘Sustainability’ challenges include survival, growth and financial solvency related issues of the social venture. The ‘collaboration’ challenges comprises of the inability of the social ventures to merge or associate with other social ventures, inability to alliance with the traditional commercial sector, and inability to associate with the government.

Desa and Kotha (2006) identified that the traditional innovation and entrepreneurship frameworks may not be applicable to the context of social entrepreneurship. They argued that the resources of social entrepreneurs are limited, and the absence of premium financial return discourages the traditional investors like venture capitalist, angel investors, corporate venture funds etc. from investing in social ventures. The positive influence of the institutions on the new venture development and overcoming the challenges is already an established knowledge and (Scott, 2013) argued that institutions pose both as constrain and enabler in new venture creation.

Although resources are considered as the vital requirement in new venture development, but it has become increasingly clear that factors like entrepreneurial culture, academic institutions, legal environment and economic incentives etc. can also affect entrepreneurial success (Litan et al., 2009). Absence of a strong institutional framework can lead to informal barriers which can hinder the growth of new social venture (Capelleras and Hoxha, 2010). Kolodko (2000) also noted that liberalization can encourage the new venture creation to a certain extent, but institutional setting is important for the durable growth. McMillan and Woodruff (2002) argued that in emerging economies new social ventures may be developed without formal institutions and government support; sometimes in early stages of the venture development ineffective government policies pose itself as a barrier.

It can then be argued that an enabling institutional environment is necessary for the new venture development, especially for social entrepreneurial ventures. The aforementioned studies suggest that the impact of institutional activities on the development and success of social ventures has been fully understood. There was a need to understand the challenges faced by the social ventures during their venture development and growth stages to design the institutional framework that can ensure the necessary support for the social ventures. It was therefore expedient to carry out an academic inquiry in order to develop and institutional framework for the social entrepreneurship development in the Malaysian situation.

The second gap is the lack of studies on the social entrepreneurs in Malaysia; although a number of studies in developed countries are directed towards issues like social entrepreneurship process (Perrini, 2006), sustainability issues of social entrepreneurship (Seelos and Mair, 2005b), challenges faced (Desa and Kotha, 2006) etc. At the time of this writing, no studies were found that directly addressing the challenges faced by the social entrepreneurs of Malaysia; which, therefore, addresses a gap in the literature.

Another gap is the lack of application of narrative approaches in social entrepreneurship research to study and analyze the phenomenon. Narrative approaches have been developed to be applied in the fields of humanities and social sciences research (Phelan, 2005) and have recently been applied in the field of entrepreneurship studies with great acknowledgement (Hjorth and Steyaert, 2004) and have also been considered as ‘a new path to the waterfall’ (Gartner, 2010). Although the motives of applying narrative approaches to entrepreneurship studies are similar to those of social entrepreneurship research, still narrative approaches have not yet been exploited as a feasible way to study and analyze the phenomenon (Steyaert and Bachmann, 2012).

These empirical and methodological gaps mentioned above call attention to extend current social entrepreneurship research in two directions: more studies on the challenges faced by the social entrepreneurs in successful establishment of their social venture and use of narrative approaches in social entrepreneurship research.

The social enterprise sector of Asia has cultured to be as vast and diverse as the countries and challenges it spans. The social enterprises address poverty eradication, environmental degradation, food-housing-health care problems, failing educational system etc both within and beyond national boundaries. India, Bangladesh, Philippines, Thailand, Brazil, Kenya and other countries are a fertile ground for social entrepreneurship – and a small part of the credit goes to the government efforts (ADB, 2012). The social ventures were launched by innovative entrepreneurs, and were aided, directly or indirectly; by the government leaders and private sector that helped build an environment that nurture and sustain such entrepreneurial efforts. This sort of entrepreneurship institutional frameworks has become a kind of sacred recipe for governments around the world – in both emerging and developed countries. Many Governments follow the best practices of developing an institutional framework to develop a framework of their own, which are unlikely, as the economic structure and practices of framework partners vary greatly from each other (Isenberg, 2011). Isenberg (2010) also stated that the government and the private sector both shoulder the responsibility of developing a framework. He argued that the corporate sector, academic institutions, professional organizations, labor organizations, financial

institutions, foundations and the entrepreneurs himself should share responsibilities to initiate and finance entrepreneurship education, research and policy advocacy.

Unfortunately, a number of social initiatives in Asia still suffer from financial problem and unable to scale up their efforts to bring systematic change. This is because social enterprise sector of Asia faces barriers to its growth and evolution. ADB (2012) conducted a research regarding the participation of institutional framework partners in Bangladesh, India and Thailand and found country-specific factors affecting the interest of framework partners – growth and scale of the social entrepreneurship market, government regulatory processes and state of financial market. Although positive trend is observed in social entrepreneurship development in all the countries, the important barriers to developing social entrepreneurship institutional framework as identified are lack of knowledge of the framework partners to raise and utilize financing to scale up their impact, information-gap and structural barriers to social venture's capital raising and lack of enabling infrastructure (ADB, 2012).

Despite the challenges identified by the researchers like Salamon (2001), Desa and Kotha (2006), ADB (2012) and Badulescu et al. (2013), today's social entrepreneurs are extra keen in building platforms that will unleash human potential. They not only enable people of every age to think and act like change-makers but also help them to work together powerfully in teams and in teams of teams. It looks to forge stronger associations across cultural and disciplinary boundaries, particularly with business and government, and facilitate the rapid circulation and sharing of solutions. Today's social entrepreneurship is improvising its own framework of supports by stimulating more change making as it grows. These developments are spontaneous without any single leadership or government intervention, but, rather, countless responses to emerging needs and scattered around the globe. Individually these actions and elements may seem irrelevant and small, but they are interconnected and mutually reinforcing. Researchers argued on the importance of creating an institutional framework in order to develop social entrepreneurship (Lee and Phan, 2008) and enable the environment to specialize and allocate structures and resources that can encourage the process of new venture creation (Venkataraman, 2004). Litan et al.

(2009) posited that along with the resources, other factors like culture, legal environment, history and tradition of the society, and economic incentives can also influence entrepreneurial success. They also argued that social entrepreneurship and its benefits can only be developed within a formal institutional framework designed to promote and support social entrepreneurial activity (Fayolle and Matlay, 2010).

The nature of social entrepreneurship research has been changed from the narrow, simplistic vision of new venture creation with social goal to a more complex and sophisticated perception. As the phenomenon gained impetus, it experienced multiplication of definitions and forms. Implicitly, the researchers pointed the importance of developing an entrepreneurial society and institutional or cultural norms that would contribute to shaping social entrepreneurs by influencing their individual behavior. For some researchers, social entrepreneurship is a method, a frame of mind and a new way of identifying and solving unmet social problems. This systematic view is adopted by many researchers in this field of economic activity (Bornstein and Davis, 2010; Fayolle and Matlay, 2010). The new venture creation is seen as an open system that evolves within an environment made up of actors like people initiating new ideas and institutions (or renew old ones) [initiators]; people collaborating in building those institutions [collaborators], and people supporting those issues in different ways [supporters]. So, emphasize should be granted to actor networks, social interactions and exchanges with the institutional environment. The necessity of developing a holistic environment for the social entrepreneurs encouraged the researcher to continue with this research. Developing an institutional framework will not only ensure its recognition as an independent sector but also will result in large financial and human resource investments in the social entrepreneurial ventures and give voice to the Social entrepreneurial ventures (SEVs), thereby supporting and strengthening social entrepreneurs and facilitating capacity building.

This study of social entrepreneurship framework will shed light on the elements inevitable for developing a platform which will encourage the new ventures to come up with innovative ideas and institutions to meet the ever-changing array of unforeseeable and increasingly critical social problems. In doing so, it can also help

explain how change happens and how societies renew themselves. It took unusual confidence and vision to start a social venture only a quarter century back. The role of the social entrepreneurial venture was not defined and not a lot of examples were around then. But today the path is becoming clear. The researcher believes that, in the years ahead, many more responsible social ventures will take the lead in the creation of solutions to social problems and the outcome of this research will play significant role as a 'lighthouse' in this path of development.

1.4 Research Questions

The current entrepreneurship framework reflects the traditional, capital-first economic model which puts profit maximizations over other priorities. The traditional framework considers ecology and society as resources and consumers rather than the context that contains the business (Wood, 2014). This traditional model has obviously got enormous achievements, but also failed simultaneously in achieving United Nation's Millennium Development Goals including poverty reduction, action on climate change and reducing environmental degradation. The current model often brings mistrust among citizens, stakeholders, business and government (Wood, 2014). Social entrepreneurship introduces a new breed of entrepreneurs to challenge this ever-increasing income gap and inequalities through improving the social, environmental and economic outcomes for the community (Badulescu et al., 2013; Mair and Marti, 2006). This new breed of social entrepreneurs is not born, they are being made (Barendsen and Gardner, 2004; Elkington and Hartigan, 2013; Light, 2006). Social entrepreneurs generally build programs and organizations from scratch, rather than refining an existing program or overhauling an organization (Light, 2006). Developing a social venture from the scratch faces a number of challenges like financial, human resources and government regulatory challenges etc. This brings the question: What support programs are needed to foster the development of social entrepreneurship practices? While the challenges abound, there is worldwide effervescence of actions around the development of social entrepreneurship. This research is about identifying

the supporting elements necessary for the development of an institutional framework for social entrepreneurship. The institutional framework consists of the organizations or institutions like government, academic institutions, private sector, financial institutions, legal institutions, private foundations and aid agencies etc. necessary to foster the development of social ventures. These elements are usually referred to as the social entrepreneurship stakeholders. For a framework to be successful and sustainable, all the elements of the framework should be activated in tandem.

This research aims to identify the elements inevitable for developing a social entrepreneurship institutional framework in Malaysian context. These elements are outside the scope of social venture and are conducive to the choice to start a social venture or the probabilities of its success following launch. But due to the direct involvement of the social ventures with this SE institutional framework, it has also placed emphasis on finding out what their experience indicates about the challenges and obstacles faced through the path of social entrepreneurship process. Specifically, this study examines the elements within the theoretical framework in figure- 2.17, as it is displayed in the end of chapter 2.

Main research question of this study: What are the elements necessary to develop an institutional framework for social entrepreneurship development?

Sub questions of this study:

- How social entrepreneurship differs from traditional and civic entrepreneurship and NGO's?
- What role the government institutions play in the social entrepreneurship institutional framework?
- How does supporting institutions like financial institutions, accounting and legal firms, private sector CSR initiatives, academic and research

institutions etc. be instrumental in the social entrepreneurship institutional framework?

- What are the challenges faced by the social ventures of Malaysia in their venture development process?

1.5 Research Objectives

The study investigates into the existing literature of social entrepreneurship and identifies the obstacles and challenges faced by the social entrepreneurs and thus attempt to introduce a ‘social entrepreneurship institutional framework’ model that will encourage and assist the social entrepreneurs in the social venture development process. Thus, the objectives of the study are:

- i. To differentiate social entrepreneurship from its counterparts like traditional and civic entrepreneurship, Non-Governmental Organizations etc.
- ii. To investigate the role of government institutions in success of social entrepreneurship.
- iii. To identify the role of supporting institutions like accounting and legal firms, private sector CSR initiatives, academic and research institutions in the institutional framework.
- iv. To reveal the obstacles and challenges faced by the social ventures in their venture development process.
- v. To introduce a ‘Social Entrepreneurship Institutional Framework’ model.

1.6 Significance of the Study and Justification of the Research

The qualitative phenomenological study research aims at making conceptual, methodological and practical contributions to the field of social entrepreneurship and SE Institutional framework. The cognitive merit of the research lies in extending a more thorough and interdisciplinary insight into the various fields of practice and literature which were rarely considered simultaneously: social entrepreneurship, involvement of government and corporate sector (the role of government and private sector in the pursuit of social value creation), and institutional framework.

The broader impact of the research entails contribution of distinct, pertinent knowledge regarding ‘institutional framework’ as a tool for social entrepreneurship development, and the origination of new knowledge to improve the government and private sector initiatives and the stakeholder reverberate and networking.

The study contributes new evidence that will enable better understanding regarding social entrepreneurs of Malaysia, challenges faced, and support required. In the light of continued growth of social entrepreneurship worldwide, the need to better understand the triggers and aspirations of the social entrepreneurs, challenges faced, and support required etc. becomes obvious.

This study focuses on understanding experiences and enables the researcher to relate to and use the social entrepreneur’s stories to answer the research questions. The outcome of the study will help to develop support services, training and assistance programs for the social entrepreneurs of Malaysia. The result of the research will be made available (through publications and presentations) for the different audiences in the fields of social entrepreneurship, government and corporate community; not only for the academic and theoretical interest, but also for the practical application. The results of the research will also be helpful for the academicians of entrepreneurship

education, governmental agencies, policy makers and pressure groups, funding agencies to evaluate their role in developing social entrepreneurship in Malaysia.

1.7 Scope of the Research

The study focuses mainly on the social entrepreneurial ventures of two states of Malaysia – Selangor, and Johor including Government agencies Malaysian Technology Development Corporation (MTDC) and Majlis Amanat Rakyat (MARA) and academic institution e.g. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM). The sample size is 13 comprising of social ventures and representatives from each element of the proposed framework. The research attempts to identify the challenges faced by the social entrepreneurs of Malaysia and thus tries to develop an institutional framework to foster the development of social entrepreneurship in Malaysia.

1.8 Summary and Outline of the Study

In sum, the research attempts to explore how social entrepreneurial ventures are developed and challenged in the early stages of their venture development process. It adds new knowledge to the entrepreneurship research in the context of new and emerging social ventures. It also increases the knowledge of institutional framework regarding fostering social venture creation and deepens the understanding of the elements inevitable for social venture development incorporating insights from the social entrepreneurs.

The study uses a qualitative phenomenological study approach to identify the elements of social entrepreneurship institutional framework. The research demands an initial understanding of the wide range of existing knowledge and issues related to the research subject. This is presented in Chapter – 2: Literature Review. Subjects reviewed include an overview of the literature pertaining social entrepreneurship, social vs Commercial entrepreneurship, triggers of social entrepreneurship, social venture development process. A theoretical model combining the key elements of the social entrepreneurship framework is developed to provide the basis for the empirical data collection interview schedule.

Chapter -3: Methodology and Research Design describes the methodology used in the research and research design, specifying how the qualitative approach will be operationalized. Methods and techniques used during the study are described with rationale behind choosing certain research instruments to conduct the study.

The fieldworks conducted for the research are presented in Chapter – 4: Fieldwork Findings through the means of rich descriptive findings from the interviews with the social ventures of Malaysia. Outcomes of the constant comparison analysis of these fieldwork findings adopted during the data collection stage of the research form the structure of this Chapter. Emerging Themes: This section of the chapter discusses the experiences told by the social ventures and look for evidence by linking their experiences with issued prior identified in the literature review.

In Chapter – 5: Findings, the interaction of the emerging themes and the potential influence of them on the proposed Social Entrepreneurship Framework have been discussed. Lastly the chapter concludes with recommendations for a plan of action and further study.

The main issues included in this Chapter-1 are:

- Introduce the research problem, the research questions and the research objectives.
- The significance of the study and justification of the research.
- Define the terms used in the research
- To offer an outline of the research chapter by chapter.

REFERENCES

- Abor, J., and Quartey, P. (2010). Issues in SME development in Ghana and South Africa. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 39(6), 215-228.
- Ahlstrom, D., and Bruton, G. D. (2001). Learning from successful local private firms in China: Establishing legitimacy. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 15(4), 72-83.
- Ahlstrom, D., Bruton, G. D., and Yeh, K. S. (2008). Private firms in China: Building legitimacy in an emerging economy. *Journal of world business*, 43(4), 385-399.
- Aidis, R., Estrin, S., and Mickiewicz, T. M. (2012). Size matters: entrepreneurial entry and government. *Small Business Economics*, 39(1), 119-139.
- Aldrich, H. E., and Fiol, C. M. (1994). Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of management review*, 19(4), 645-670.
- Allen, D., and McCluskey, R. (1990). Structure, policy, services, and performance in the business incubator industry. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 15(2), 61-78.
- Alter, K. (2004). Social enterprise typology. *Virtue Ventures LLC*.
- Alter, S. K. (2006). Social enterprise models and their mission and money relationships. *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change*, 205-232.
- Alvarez, C., and Urbano, D. (2011). Environmental factors and entrepreneurial activity in Latin America.
- Álvarez, C., Urbano, D., and Amorós, J. E. (2014). GEM research: achievements and challenges. *Small Business Economics*, 42(3), 445-465.

- Alvarez, S. A., and Barney, J. B. (2007). Discovery and creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic entrepreneurship journal*, 1(1-2), 11-26.
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., and Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(3), 260-282.
- Amis, D., and Stevenson, H. (2001). *Winning Angels: The 7 Fundamentals of Angel Investing*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times, Prentice Hall
- Aparicio, S., Urbano, D., and Audretsch, D. (2016). Institutional factors, opportunity entrepreneurship and economic growth: Panel data evidence. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 102, 45-61.
- Armstrong, J. S. (1985). *Long Range Forecasting : From Crystal Ball to Computer*. Wiley, New York.
- Asian Development Bank. (2011a). Market Intermediaries in Asia and the Pacific : Developing A Regional Social Investment Exchange Initiative, *Target Intermediaries*. Philippines: Asian Development Bank.
- Asian Development Bank. (2011b). Market Intermediaries in Asia and the Pacific : Developing A Regional Social Investment Exchange Initiative, *Country Profiles*. Phillipines: Asian Development Bank.
- Asian Development Bank. (2011c). Market Intermediaries in Asia and the Pacific : Developing A Regional Social Investment Exchange Initiative, *Market Intermediaries in Asia and the Pacific*. Philippines: Asian Development Bank.
- Asian Development Bank. (2011d). Market Intermediaries in Asia and the Pacific: Developing a Regional Social Investment Exchange Initiative, *Prospective Role of Market Intermediaries on Impact Investment Platforms*. Phillipines: Asian Developement Bank.
- Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., and Delamont, S. (2003). *Key themes in qualitative research: Continuities and changes*: AltaMira Press.
- Austin, Wei-Skillern, J., Leonard, H., and Stevenson, H. (2007). *Entrepreneurship in the Social Sector*. Paper presented at the Meeting the Collaboration Challenge Workbook.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., and Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different or Both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1-22.

- Badulescu, A., Sipos-Gug, S., and Borza, A. (2013). *Environmental Obstacles and Support Factors of Social Entrepreneurship*. Paper presented at the Proceedings for the 8th European Conference on Innovation and Entrepreneurship: ECIE 2013, 52.
- Baldwin, A. (2009). *Creativity, Social Benefit and Job Creation: The Potential for Social Entrepreneurship in Ontario*: Martin Prosperity Institute.
- Bangladesh Enterprise Institute. (2010). *Bangladesh Social Enterprise Project (BSEP)*: Bangladesh Enterprise Institute. Document Number)
- Barendsen, L., and Gardner, H. (2004). Is the social entrepreneur a new type of leader? *Leader to leader*, 2004(34), 43-50.
- Baron, D. P. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 16(3), 683-717.
- Bartlett, W., Cuckovic, N., and Xheneti, M. (2005). *Institutions, entrepreneurship development and SME policies in South East Europe*. Paper presented at the 6th International Conference on Enterprise in Transition", University of Split, Split.
- Baum, J. A., Calabrese, T., and Silverman, B. S. (2000). Don't go it alone: Alliance network composition and startups' performance in Canadian biotechnology. *Strategic management journal*, 21(3), 267-294.
- Baumol, W. J. (1993). Formal entrepreneurship theory in Economics: Existence and Bounds. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(3), 197-210.
- Baumol, W. J., Litan, R. E., and Schramm, C. J. (2007). Good capitalism, bad capitalism, and the economics of growth and prosperity.
- Bentz, V. M., and Rehorick, D. A. (2008). Transformative phenomenology. *Transformative phenomenology*, 1.
- Berglund, H. (2007). Researching entrepreneurship as lived experience. *Handbook of qualitative research methods in entrepreneurship*, 75-93.
- Bhidé, A. V. (2003). *The origin and evolution of new businesses*: Oxford University Press.
- Blackwood, A. (2012). *The Nonprofit Sector in Brief: Public Charities, Giving and Volunteering*, 2012.
- Bloomberg, L. D., and Volpe, M. (2008a). *Completing Your Qualitative Dissertation: A Roadmap from Beginning to End*: London: Sage Publications.

- Bloomberg, L. D., and Volpe, M. (2015b). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end*: Sage Publications.
- Bloor, M., Thomas, M., Robson, K., and Frankland, J. (2001). *Focus groups in social research*: Sage Publications Limited.
- Blumberg, B. F., Cooper, D. R., and Schindler, P. S. (2014). *Business research methods*: McGraw-hill education.
- Bogdan, R. C., and Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research in education. An introduction to theory and methods*: ERIC.
- Bornstein, D. (1998). Changing the world on a shoestring. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 281(1), 34-39.
- Bornstein, D. (2007). *How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Bornstein, D., and Davis, S. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship: What everyone needs to know*: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Borožan, D., Barković, I., and Maliszewska-Nienartowicz, J. (2005). *Government policies supporting SME development: Croatian and Polish perspective*. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on “Enterprise in Transition” Proceedings, 1455-1476.
- Boschee, J. (2008). A key lesson business can teach charities. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 18, 41–43.
- Boschee, J., and McClurg, J. (2003). Toward a better understanding of social entrepreneurship: Some important distinctions. Retrieved October, 9, 2008.
- Bradach, J. (2003). “Going to Scale: The Challenge of Replicating Social Programs. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Spring, pp.1-8.
- Bradbury, H., and Reason, P. (2003). Action Research An Opportunity for Revitalizing Research Purpose and Practices. *Qualitative Social Work*, 2(2), 155-175.
- Bruton, G. D., Ahlstrom, D., and Li, H. L. (2010). Institutional theory and entrepreneurship: where are we now and where do we need to move in the future? *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 34(3), 421-440.
- Bryman, A. (2015). *Social research methods*: Oxford university press.
- Bygrave, W., and Minniti, M. (2000). The social dynamics of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(3), 25-36.
- Bygrave, W. D. (2007). The entrepreneurship paradigm (I) revisited. *Handbook of qualitative research methods in entrepreneurship*, 17-48.

- Byrne, M. M. (2001). Understanding life experiences through a phenomenological approach to research. *AORN journal*, 73(4), 830-832.
- Capelleras, J.-L., and Hoxha, D. (2010). Start-up size and subsequent firm growth in Kosovo: the role of entrepreneurial and institutional factors. *Post-Communist Economies*, 22(3), 411-426.
- Casson, M. (1995). *Entrepreneurship and Business Culture*. Andershot: UK: Edward Elgar.
- Catford, J. (1998). Social entrepreneurs are vital for health promotion - but they need supportive environments too. *Health Promotion International*, 13(2), 95-97.
- Certo, S. T., and Miller, T. (2008). Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts. *Business Horizons*, 51(4), 267-271.
- Cho, J., and Trent, A. (2006). Validity in qualitative research revisited. *Qualitative research*, 6(3), 319-340.
- Christie, M. J., and Honig, B. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: New research findings. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 1-5.
- Clamp, C. A., and Alhamis, I. (2010). Social Entrepreneurship in the Mondragon Co-operative Corporation and the Challenges of Successful Replication. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 19(2), 149-177.
- Clark, V. P., and Creswell, J. W. (2011). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. Retrieved on July, 25, 2014.
- Cohen, D., and Crabtree, B. (2006). Qualitative research guidelines project.
- Collins, L. A., Smith, A. J., and Hannon, P. D. (2006). Applying a synergistic learning approach in entrepreneurship education. *Management learning*, 37(3), 335-354.
- Conklin, T. A. (2007). Method or madness phenomenology as knowledge creator. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 16(3), 275-287.
- Cooper, A. C., Folta, T. B., and Woo, C. (1995). Entrepreneurial information search. *Journal of business venturing*, 10(2), 107-120.
- Covin, J. G., and Slevin, D. P. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 16(1), 7-24.
- Craimer, S., and Dearlove, D. (2004). *Financial Times handbook of management*: Pearson Education.
- Creswell. (2007a). Five qualitative approaches to inquiry. *JW Creswell, Qualitative inquiry & research design: choosing among five approaches*, 53-84.

- Creswell. (2007b). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (2nd Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*: Sage.
- Cruz, A. D., Hamilton, E., and Jack, S. L. (2012). Understanding entrepreneurial cultures in family businesses: A study of family entrepreneurial teams in Honduras. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 3(3), 147-161.
- Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., and Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1203-1213.
- Dahle, C. (2004). Social capitalists: the top 20 groups that are changing the world. *Fast Company*, 78, 45-50.
- Davidsson, P. (2004). *Researching entrepreneurship*: Springer.
- Davidsson, P., and Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of business venturing*, 18(3), 301-331.
- Davis, D. (2005). Busienss research for decision making-6/E.
- De Soto, H. (2000). *The mystery of capital: Why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else*: Basic Civitas Books.
- Debrah, Y. A., and Mmieh, F. (2009). Employment relations in small-and medium-sized enterprises: Insights from Ghana. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(7), 1554-1575.
- Dees, G. (1999). The meaning of social entrepreneurship (Publication.:
- Dees, J. G. (1998). Enterprising nonprofits. *Harvard business review*, 76, 54-69.
- Dees, J. G. (2001). The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship *Duke University, Durham, NC, available at www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees_dedef.pdf (accessed on January 4, 2009)*
- Dees, J. G. (2003). Social entrepreneurship is about innovation and impact, not income. *Social edge*.
- Dees, J. G. (2007). Taking social entrepreneurship seriously. *Society*, 44(3), 24-31.
- Dees, J. G., Emerson, J., and Economy, P. (2001). *Enterprising nonprofits: A toolkit for social entrepreneurs*: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Desa, G., and Kotha, S. (Eds.). (2006). *Technology Social Venture and innovation: Process at Benetech*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

- Desai, M., Gompers, P., and Lerner, J. (2003). *Institutions, capital constraints and entrepreneurial firm dynamics: Evidence from Europe*: National Bureau of Economic Research. Document Number)
- Dey, P., and Steyaert, C. (2012). Social entrepreneurship: critique and the radical enactment of the social. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 8(2), 90-107.
- Dhesi, A. S. (2010). Diaspora, Social entrepreneurs and community development. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 37(9), 703-716.
- Dickson, P. H., and Weaver, K. M. (2011). Institutional Readiness and Small to Medium-Sized Enterprise Alliance Formation. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 126-148.
- DiMaggio, P., and Powell, W. (1991). Introduction to the new institutionalism in organization studies. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*.
- Drayton, W. (2002). The Citizen sector: Becoming as entrepreneurial and competitive as business. *California Management Review*, 44(3), 120-132.
- Drayton, W. (2006). Everyone a changemaker: social entrepreneurship's ultimate goal. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization*, 1(1), 80-96.
- Drew, N. (2008). The primacy of intersubjectivity. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 31(1), E74-E80.
- Drucker, P. F. (1985). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Drucker, P. F. (2002). The discipline of innovation. *Harvard business review*, 80, 95-104.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., and Jackson, P. R. (2015). *Management and business research*: Sage.
- Eckhardt, J. T., and Shane, S. A. (2003). Opportunities and Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3), 333-349.
- Edquist, C. (1997). *Systems of innovation*: Pinter.
- Elkington, J., and Hartigan, P. (2013). *The power of unreasonable people: How social entrepreneurs create markets that change the world*: Harvard Business Press.
- Engle, R. L., Schlaegel, C., and Delanoe, S. (2011). The role of social influence, culture, and gender on entrepreneurial intent. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 24(4), 471-492.
- Evers, J. C. (2011). *From the past into the future. How technological developments change our ways of data collection, transcription and analysis*. Paper

presented at the Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research.

- Fang, T. (2010). Asian management research needs more self-confidence: Reflection on Hofstede (2007) and beyond. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(1), 155-170.
- Fayolle, A., and Matlay, H. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: a multicultural and multidimensional perspective. *Handbook of Research on Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-11.
- Fernandez, R. S., and Griffiths, R. (2007). Portable MP3 players: innovative devices for recording qualitative interviews. *Nurse researcher*, 15(1), 7-15.
- Fiet, J. O. (2002). *The systematic search for entrepreneurial discoveries: ABC-CLIO*.
- Finlay, L. (2008). Introducing phenomenological research. Accessed on 09/08/2013.
- Foreman-Peck, J., and Zhou, P. (2013). The strength and persistence of entrepreneurial cultures. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 23(1), 163-187.
- Fowler, A. (2000). NGOs as a moment in history: Beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation? *Third world Quarterly*, 21(4), 637-654.
- Franke, R. H., and Kaul, J. D. (1978). The Hawthorne experiments: First statistical interpretation. *American sociological review*, 623-643.
- Fraser, N., and Gordon, L. (1994). A genealogy of dependency: Tracing a keyword of the US welfare state. *Signs*, 19(2), 309-336.
- Freeman, I., and Higginson, N. (2007). Microcredit through the feminist lens: toward a more equitable approach to social entrepreneurship. *Advances in International Management*, 20, 171-191.
- Freireich, J., and Fulton, K. (2009). Investing for social and environmental impact: A design for catalyzing an emerging industry. *The Monitor Group*.
- Fuller, T., and Tian, Y. (2006). Social and symbolic capital and responsible entrepreneurship: an empirical investigation of SME narratives. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67(3), 287-304.
- Gaglio, C. M., and Katz, J. A. (2001). The psychological basis of opportunity identification: Entrepreneurial alertness. *Small business economics*, 16(2), 95-111.
- Gartner, W. B. (1988). Who is an entrepreneur? is the wrong question. *American journal of small business*, 12(4), 11-32.

- Gartner, W. B. (2010). A new path to the waterfall: A narrative on a use of entrepreneurial narrative. *International Small Business Journal*, 28(1), 6-19.
- Gawell, M., Johannisson, B., and Lundqvist, M. (2009). Entrepreneurship in the name of society *Stockholm: Knowledge Foundation*.
- Germaine, K. (2008). Creating social value - Irish Business Review. *Irish Independent*, October.
- Giddens, A. (1997). *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity press.
- Gimeno, J., Folta, T. B., Cooper, A. C., and Woo, C. Y. (1997). Survival of the fittest? Entrepreneurial human capital and the persistence of underperforming firms. *Administrative science quarterly*, 750-783.
- Gordon, A. (2006). Essential qualities of an entrepreneur [Electronic Version]. <http://ezinarticles.com/?Essential-Qualities-Of-An-Entrepreneur&id=398886> (accessed on October 28, 2009)
- Grunert, K. G., Harmsen, H., Meulenbergh, M., Kuiper, E., Ottowitz, T., Declerck, F., et al. (1997). A framework for analysing innovation in the food sector. In *Products and Process Innovation in the Food Industry* (pp. 1-37): Springer.
- Guclu, A., Dees, J. G., and Anderson, B. B. (2002). 'The process of social entrepreneurship : Creating opportunities worthy of serious pursuit'. *Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship, The Fuqua School of Business*.
- Guerrero, M., and Urbano, D. (2012). The development of an entrepreneurial university. *The journal of technology transfer*, 37(1), 43-74.
- Hafenmayer, W. (2012). Impact Forum 2012: The State of Social Enterprises in Asia. In A. Saleh (Ed.), *Impact Forum 2012*.
- Hall, R. H. (1996). *Organizations: Structures, Processes and Outcomes*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Harding, R., and Cowling, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship monitor. *London Business School, Global Entrepreneurship Monitor*.
- Harman, J. (2008). Successful Social Entrepreneurship: the Case of the Eaglehawk Recycle Shop. *Journal of Services Research*, 201-203.
- Harris, J. P. (2016). How Social Benevolence Motivates Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability*, 11(1), 47.
- Haugh, H. (2005). A research agenda for social entrepreneurship. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 1(1), 1-12.

- Haverkamp, B. E., and Young, R. A. (2007). Paradigms, purpose, and the role of the literature formulating a rationale for qualitative investigations. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35(2), 265-294.
- Hayek, F. A. (1959). The meaning of competition. *Individualism and Economic Order*, 92-106.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I., and Bailey, A. (2010). *Qualitative research methods*: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Hernández-Cánovas, G., and Koëter-Kant, J. (2010). The institutional environment and the number of bank relationships: an empirical analysis of European SMEs. *Small Business Economics*, 34(4), 375-390.
- Hessels, J., and Terjesen, S. (2010). Resource dependency and institutional theory perspectives on direct and indirect export choices. *Small Business Economics*, 34(2), 203-220.
- Hessels, J., Van Gelderen, M., and Thurik, R. (2008). Entrepreneurial aspirations, motivations, and their drivers. *Small Business Economics*, 31(3), 323-339.
- Hibbert, S. A., Hogg, G., and Quinn, T. (2002). Consumer response to social entrepreneurship: The case of the Big Issue in Scotland. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(3), 288-301.
- Hjorth, D., and Steyaert, C. (2004). Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship: a second movements in entrepreneurship book. *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship*.
- Hockerts, K., Mair, J., and Robinson, J. (2007). *Social Entrepreneurship*: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hockerts, K., and Wüstenhagen, R. (2010). Greening Goliaths versus emerging Davids—Theorizing about the role of incumbents and new entrants in sustainable entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5), 481-492.
- Hoepfl, M. C. (1997). Choosing qualitative research: A primer for technology education researchers. *Journal of Technology Education*, 9(1), 47-86.
- Holland-Noronha, N. (2010). Economic and socio cultural experiences of female entrepreneurs in Brazil and the United States: an exploratorial and empirical analysis.
- Holstein, J., and Gubrium, J. F. (2003). *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns*: Sage.

- Hsu, C. (2005). Entrepreneur for Social Change (Publication. Retrieved Access 22/05/2010:
<http://www.usnews.com/usnews/news/articles/051031/31drayton.htm>
- Hsu, D. H., and Lim, K. (2005). Knowledge Bridging by Biotechnology Start-ups. Available at SSRN 755944.
- Ireland, R. D., Kuratko, D. F., and Morris, M. H. (2006). A health audit for corporate entrepreneurship: innovation at all levels: part I. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 27(1), 10-17.
- Isenberg, D. J. (2011). How to start an entrepreneurial revolution. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(6), 40-50.
- Ismail, K. B., Soheli, M. H., Kohar, U. H. A., and Ramliy, M. (2011). Can Austin's Model of Social Entrepreneurship Ensure Success in Asian Perspective? *Australian Journal of Basic & Applied Sciences*, 5(12).
- İyigün, N. Ö. (2015). What could Entrepreneurship do for Sustainable Development? A Corporate Social Responsibility-Based Approach. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195, 1226-1231.
- Jackson, T. (2015). Entrepreneurship training in tertiary education: Its development and transfer. *Local Economy*, 0269094215589143.
- Jeffs, L. (2006). *Social entrepreneurs and social enterprises: Do they have a future in New Zealand*, 18-21.
- Jennings, P. L., Perren, L., and Carter, S. (2005). Guest editors' introduction: Alternative perspectives on entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(2), 145-152.
- Jiao, H. (2011). A conceptual model for social entrepreneurship directed toward social impact on society. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 7(2), 130-149.
- Johnson, S. (2000). Literature review on social entrepreneurship. *Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship*, 16.
- Jones, O., Macpherson, A., and Thorpe, R. (2010). Learning in owner-managed small firms: Mediating artefacts and strategic space. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 22(7-8), 649-673.
- Jones, R., and Noble, G. (2007). Grounded theory and management research: a lack of integrity? *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 2(2), 84-103.

- Kang, E., and Uhlenbruck, K. (2006). A process framework of entrepreneurship: from exploration, to exploitation, to exit. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 12(1), 47-71.
- Karamchandani, A., Kubzansky, M., and Frandano, P. (2009). Emerging markets, emerging models: Market-based solutions to the challenges of global poverty. Online at http://www.mim.monitor.com/downloads/emergingmarkets_full.pdf (accessed August 16, 2011).
- Karlan, D., and Valdivia, M. (2011). Teaching entrepreneurship: Impact of business training on microfinance clients and institutions. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(2), 510-527.
- Keh, H. T., Foo, M. D., and Lim, B. C. (2002). Opportunity evaluation under risky conditions: The cognitive processes of entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 27(2), 125-148.
- Kirby, D. A. (2006). Creating entrepreneurial universities in the UK: Applying entrepreneurship theory to practice. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31(5), 599-603.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Entrepreneurship and competition*: Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1997). Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: An Austrian approach. *Journal of economic Literature*, 35(1), 60-85.
- Kolodko, G. W. (2000). Transition to a market and entrepreneurship: the systemic factors and policy options. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 33(2), 271-293.
- Kraus, S., Filser, M., O'Dwyer, M., and Shaw, E. (2013). Social Entrepreneurship: An exploratory citation analysis. *Review of Managerial Science*, 1-18.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews. An introduction to qualitative research writing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. J., Dalton, M., Ernst, C., & Dea global context. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership., MK, & Whitney, DJ (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 114-121.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., and Vishny, R. W. (1997). Legal determinants of external finance. *Journal of finance*, 1131-1150.
- Lahti, T. (2012). The value-added contribution of advisors in the process of acquiring venture capital. *International Small Business Journal*, 0266242612453932.

- Langer, E. J. (1989). Minding matters: The consequences of mindlessness—mindfulness. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 22, 137-173.
- Lasprogata, G. A., and Cotten, M. N. (2003). Contemplating" Enterprise": The Business and Legal Challenges of Social Entrepreneurship. *American Business Law Journal*, 41(1), 67-114.
- Lee, S., and Phan, P. (2008). *Initial thoughts on a model of rural entrepreneurship in developing countries*. Paper presented at the World entrepreneurship Forum.
- Lee, W. (2012). Impact Forum 2012: The State of Social Enterprises in Asia. In A. Saleh (Ed.), *Impact Forum 2012*.
- Leedy, P. D. (2005). *Practical research: Planning and design(8th Ed.)*: Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
- Leedy, P. D., and Ormrod, J. E. (2005). *Practical research: Planning and Design (8th ed.)*: Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
- Lehtonen, O., and Lahti, T. (2009). The role of advisors in the venture capital investment process. *Venture capital*, 11(3), 229-254.
- Leibenstein, H. (1968). Entrepreneurship and Development. *American Economic Review* 58, 72-83.
- Lichtman, M. (2012). *Qualitative Research in Education: A User's Guide: A User's Guide*: Sage.
- Light, P. C. (2006). Reshaping social entrepreneurship. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 4(3), 47-51.
- Litan, R., Baumol, W., and Schramm, C. J. (2009). *Good capitalism, bad capitalism, and the economics of growth and prosperity*. Paper presented at the Law and Economics Workshop.
- López de Silanes, F., Djankov, S., La Porta, R., and Shleifer, A. (2002). The Regulation of Entry. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118, 1-37.
- Lundstrom, A., and Stevenson, L. A. (2006). *Entrepreneurship policy: Theory and practice* (Vol. 9): Springer Science & Business Media.
- Maclea, M., Harvey, C., and Gordon, J. (2013). Social innovation, social entrepreneurship and the practice of contemporary entrepreneurial philanthropy. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(7), 747-763.
- Mair, J., and Marti, I. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship: What are We Talking about? A framework for future research. Unpublished Working paper. IESE Business School, University of Navarra

- Mair, J., and Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization science*, 2(1), 71-87.
- Marshall, C., and Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research*: Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Marshall, C., and Rossman, G. B. (2014). *Designing qualitative research*: Sage publications.
- Martin, R. L., and Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: the case for definition. *Stanford social innovation review*, 5(2), 29–39.
- Mason, M. (2010). *Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews*. Paper presented at the Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research.
- Massarsky, C. W., and Beinhacker, S. L. (2002). Enterprising nonprofits: Revenue generation in the nonprofit sector. *Yale School of Management-The Goldman Sachs Foundation Partnership on Nonprofit Ventures for The Pew Charitable Trusts*.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach (2nd Ed.)*: Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- McAdam, M., and McAdam, R. (2006). The networked incubator: The role and operation of entrepreneurial networking with the university science park incubator (USI). *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 7(2), 87-97.
- McMillan, J., and Woodruff, C. (2002). The central role of entrepreneurs in transition economies. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(3), 153-170.
- Mesquita, L. F., and Lazzarini, S. G. (2008). Horizontal and vertical relationships in developing economies: Implications for SMEs' access to global markets. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2), 359-380.
- Mesquita, L. F., and Lazzarini, S. G. (2009). Horizontal and vertical relationships in developing economies: Implications for SMEs' access to global markets. In *New Frontiers in Entrepreneurship* (pp. 31-66): Springer.
- Meyer, J. W., and Rowan, B. (1991). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American journal of sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.

- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*: Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Mintzberg, H. (1991). The effective organization: forces and forms. *Sloan Management Review*, 54.
- Mohiuddin, M., Parveen, R., Rahman, M. I., and Mazumder, M. N. H. (2013). Entrepreneurial Motivation and Social Enterprises: An Empirical Analysis on Founders of Social Ventures in Bangladesh. *Transnational Corporation Review*, 5(2), 77-92.
- Moon, M. J. (1999). The pursuit of managerial entrepreneurship: Does organization matter? *Public Administration Review*, 59(1), 31-43.
- Mort, G. S., Weereawardena, J., and Carnegie, K. (2003). Social Entrepreneurship: Towards Conceptualization. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(1), 76-88.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*: Sage Publications.
- Moustakas, C. (1996). *Phenomenological research methods*: Sage Publications.
- Mueller, P. (2007). Exploiting entrepreneurial opportunities: The impact of entrepreneurship on growth. *Small Business Economics*, 28(4), 355-362.
- Munhall, P. L., and Chenail, R. J. (2008). *Qualitative research proposals and reports: A guide*: Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Murphy, P. J., and Coombes, S. M. (2009). A Model of Social Entrepreneurial Discovery. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87, 325-336.
- Neill, J. (2007). Qualitative versus quantitative research: Key points in a classic debate. URL: <http://wilderdom.com/research/QualitativeVersusQuantitativeResearch.html#Features>.
- Nelson, R. R., and Rosenberg, N. (1993). Technical innovation and national systems. *National innovation systems: a comparative analysis*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1-18.
- Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. US: Pearson Education. Inc. 連結
- Nicholls, A. (2006). *Social entrepreneurship: new models of sustainable social change*: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Nissanke, M., and Sindzingre, A. (2006). Institutional Foundations for Shared Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa. *African development review*, 18(3), 353-391.

- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*: Cambridge university press.
- Nundy, N. (2012). Impact Forum 2012: The State of Social Enterprises in Asia In A. Saleh (Ed.), *Impact Forum 2012*.
- Olivares, O. J., Peterson, G., and Hess, K. P. (2007). An existential-phenomenological framework for understanding leadership development experiences. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28(1), 76-91.
- Osborne, S. P., and Flynn, N. (1997). Managing the innovative capacity of voluntary and non-profit organizations in the provision of public services. *Public Money and Management*, 14(4), 31-39.
- Oster, S. M. (1995). *Strategic management for nonprofit organizations: Theory and cases*: Oxford University Press.
- Ostrander, S. A. (2007). The growth of donor control: Revisiting the social relations of philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(2), 356.
- Pacheco, D. F., Dean, T. J., and Payne, D. S. (2010). Escaping the green prison: Entrepreneurship and the creation of opportunities for sustainable development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5), 464-480.
- Patton. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation* (Vol. 4). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Patton. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd Ed.)*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, inc.
- Patton. (2001). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*: Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (3rd Ed.)*: Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, inc.
- Peredo, A. M., and McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56-65.
- Peredo, A. M. A., and Chrisman, J. J. (2006). Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. *The Academy of Management Review ARCHIVE*, 31(2), 309-328.
- Perrini, F. (Ed.). (2006). *The New Social Entrepreneurship: What Awaits Social Entrepreneurial Ventures?* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

- Perrini, F., and Marino, A. (2006). The basis for launching a new social entrepreneurial venture. *The New Social Entrepreneurship: What Awaits Social Entrepreneurial Ventures*, 46-64.
- Peterson, M. (2015). Social enterprise for poverty alleviation in an era of sector convergence. *Journal of Ethics & Entrepreneurship*, 5(1), 5.
- Petty, J. (2000). Harvesting firm value: process and results. *Entrepreneurship*, 71-98.
- Phan, P. H. (2004). Entrepreneurship theory: Possibilities and future directions. *Journal of business venturing*, 19(5), 617-620.
- Phelan, J. (2005). Narrative Judgments and the Rhetorical Theory of Narrative: Ian McEwan's *Atonement*. *A companion to narrative theory*, 322-336.
- Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., and Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 6(4), 34-43.
- Polak, P. (2008). *Out of poverty*. Berrett-Cochler Publishers Inc.
- Porter, M. E., and Kramer, M. R. (2011). The Big Idea: Creating Shared Value. How to reinvent capitalism—and unleash a wave of innovation and growth. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1-2).
- Portes, A., and Smith, L. D. (2008). Institutions and development in Latin America: A comparative analysis. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 43(2), 101-128.
- Prabhu, G. N. (1999). Social entrepreneurship leadership. *Career Development International*, 4(3), 140-145.
- Priest, H. (2003). An approach to the phenomenological analysis of data. *Nurse Researcher*, 10(2), 50-63.
- Rajabi, A., and Daraei, M. R. (2014). Analytical Investigation of the Role and Position of “Entrepreneur Organization” In Progress of Twenty First Century's Organizations. *Asian Journal of Research in Marketing*, 3(2), 108-127.
- Reed, D. (Ed.). (2003). *Revitalising depleted communities in the new economy: The role of social capital and community business entrepreneurship*. Sydney, NS: Tompkins Institute: UCCB Press.
- Reis, T. K., and Clohesy, S. J. (1999). *Unleashing new resources and entrepreneurship for the common good: A scan, synthesis, and scenario for action*: WK Kellogg Foundations.
- Reynolds, L. (1981). Foundations of an institutional theory of regulation. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 15(3), 641-656.

- Roberts, D., and Woods, C. (2005). Changing the world on a shoestring: The concept of social entrepreneurship. *University of Auckland Business Review*, 7(1), 45-51.
- Roy, W. G. (1999). *Socializing capital: The rise of the large industrial corporation in America*: Princeton University Press.
- Rudestam, K. E., and Newton, R. R. (2014). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*: Sage Publications.
- Rwigema, H., and Venter, R. (2004). Advanced entrepreneurship 1/e. *South Africa: Oxford University Press*.
- Salamon, L. M. (2001). *The third sector and volunteering in global perspective*. Paper presented at the Presentation to the 17th Annual International Association of Volunteer Effort Conference, Amsterdam.
- Salamon, L. M., Sokolowski, S. W., and List, R. (2003). *Global civil society: An overview*: Center for Civil Society Studies, Institute for Policy Studies, The Johns Hopkins University.
- Saleh, A. (2012). Impact Forum 2012: The State of Social Enterprises in Asia. In W. Hafenmayer (Ed.), *Impact Forum 2012*.
- Sampson, H. (2004). Navigating the waves: the usefulness of a pilot in qualitative research. *Qualitative research*, 4(3), 383-402.
- Say, J. B. (1835). *Catéchisme d'économie politique, ou Instruction familière qui montre de quelle façon les richesses sont produites, distribuées et consommées dans la société*: Aimé-André.
- Schein, E. (2009). *Helping: How to offer, give, and receive help (in one-to-one, group and organisational relationships)*: San Francisco: Koehler Publishers.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle. *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship*.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Socialism, capitalism and democracy*: Harper and Bros.
- Schumpeter, J. A., and Fels, R. (1939). *Business cycles* (Vol. 1): Cambridge Univ Press.
- Schuyler, G. (1998). Social entrepreneurship: profit as a means, not an end. *Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership Clearinghouse on Entrepreneurial*

- Education (CELCEE) website (www. celcee. edu/products/digest/Dig98-7html) 3p.*
- Scott, W. R. (2013). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities*: Sage Publications.
- Seelos, C., and Mair, J. (2005). *Sustainable Development: How Social Entrepreneurs make it happen*. Unpublished manuscript, Barcelona, Spain.
- Seelos, C., and Mair, J. (2005a). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business Horizons*, 48(3), 247-252.
- Seelos, C., and Mair, J. (2005b). Entrepreneurs in service of the poor - Models for business contribution to sustainable development. *Business Horizons*, 48(3), 247-252.
- Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*: Teachers college press.
- Seymour, R. G. (2012). *Handbook of research methods on social entrepreneurship*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Shane, S. (2000). Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization science*, 11(4), 448-469.
- Shane, S., and Venkatraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Shepherd, D. A., and DeTienne, D. R. (2005). Prior knowledge, potential financial reward, and opportunity identification. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 29(1), 91-112.
- Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., and Lumpkin, G. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic entrepreneurship journal*, 3(2), 161-194.
- Shujog. (2016). Impact Investment Exchange Asia Case Study 2016, *Mobilizing Capital for Development*. Singapore: Impact Investment Exchange (Asia) Pte. Ltd.
- Simha, A., and Carey, M. R. (2012). The Encyclical Letter (Caritas in Veritate)—A Shout-out to Social Entrepreneurship? *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 21(1), 1-23.
- Singh, R. P. (2001). A comment on developing the field of entrepreneurship through the study of opportunity recognition and exploitation. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 10-12.

- Smith, J., Flowers, P., and Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research*. London: Sage.
- Stake. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stenbacka, C. (2001). Qualitative research requires quality concepts of its own. *Management decision*, 39(7), 551-556.
- Stevenson, H. H. (1983). A perspective on entrepreneurship: Harvard Business School Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Stevenson, H. H., and Jarillo, J. C. (1990). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: entrepreneurial management. *Strategic management journal*, 11(5), 17-27.
- Stevenson, H. H., Roberts, M., and Grousbeck, H. I. (1989). Business ventures and the entrepreneur. *Irwin, Homewood, IL*.
- Stevenson, L., and Lundström, A. (2002). *Beyond the rhetoric: Defining entrepreneurship policy and its best practice components*.
- Steyaert, C., and Bachmann, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Listening to narratives*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Stokols, D., Misra, S., Runnerstrom, M. G., and Hipp, J. A. (2009). Psychology in an age of ecological crisis: from personal angst to collective action. *American Psychologist*, 64(3), 181.
- Strong, T., Pyle, N. R., Devries, C., Johnston, D. N., and Foskett, A. J. (2008). Meaning-making lenses in counselling: Discursive, hermeneutic-phenomenological, and autoethnographic perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Counselling*, 42(2), 117.
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of management review*, 20(3), 571-610.
- Sundin, E. (2011). Entrepreneurship and social and community care. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 5(3), 212-222.
- Swinton-Douglas, V. (2010). *A Phenomenology Study of Employee Engagement in the Workplace: The Employee Perspective.*, University of PHOENIX.
- Tan, W. L., Williams, J., and Tan, T. M. (2005). Defining the 'social' in 'social entrepreneurship': Altruism and entrepreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1(3), 353-365.
- Thake, S., and Zadek, S. (1997). Practical people, noble causes. *London: New Economics Foundation*.

- Thompson, J., Alvy, G., and Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship—a new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, 38(5), 328-338.
- Thompson, J. L. (2002). The world of the social entrepreneur. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 15(5), 412-431.
- Trivedi, C. (2010). Towards a social ecological framework for social entrepreneurship. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 19(1), 63-80.
- Trivedi, C., and Stokols, D. (2011). Social enterprises and corporate enterprises: Fundamental differences and defining features. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 20(1), 1-32.
- Troilo, M. (2011). Legal institutions and high-growth aspiration entrepreneurship. *Economic Systems*, 35(2), 158-175.
- Ucbasaran, D., Westhead, P., and Wright, M. (2006). *Habitual entrepreneurs*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Urban, B. (2010). *Frontiers in Entrepreneurship*: Springer Verlag.
- Urbano, D., and Guerrero, M. (2013). Entrepreneurial universities socioeconomic impacts of academic entrepreneurship in a European region. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 27(1), 40-55.
- Van Auken, H. E., and Neeley, L. (2000). Pre-launch preparations and the acquisition of start-up capital by small firms. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 5(2), 169.
- Van de Ven, A. H., Sapienza, H. J., and Villanueva, J. (2007). Entrepreneurial pursuits of self and collective interests. *Strategic entrepreneurship journal*, 1(3-4), 353-370.
- Van Gelderen, M., Thurik, R., and Bosma, N. (2005). Success and risk factors in the pre-startup phase. *Small business economics*, 24(4), 365-380.
- VanSandt, C. V., Sud, M., and Marmé, C. (2009). Enabling the original intent: Catalysts for social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90, 419-428.
- Venkataraman, S. (2004). Regional transformation through technological entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business venturing*, 19(1), 153-167.
- Venkataraman, S. (Ed.). (1997). *The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research* (Vol. 3). Greenwich: CT: Jai Press.
- Von Hagel Jr, W. J. (2009). *Precipitating events leading to voluntary employee turnover among information technology professionals: a qualitative phenomenological study*. University of Phoenix.

- Walker, W. (2007). Ethical considerations in phenomenological research. *Nurse Researcher, 14*(3), 36-45.
- Wallace, S. L. (1999). Social entrepreneurship: The role of social purpose enterprises in facilitating community economic development. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, 4*(2), 153-174.
- Weerawardena, J., and Mort, G. S. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business, 41*(1), 21-35.
- Wei-Skillern, J., Austin, J. E., Leonard, H., and Stevenson, H. (2007). *Entrepreneurship in the social sector* (Vol. 13): Sage Publications, Inc.
- Wei, Y. S., O'Neill, H., Lee, R. P., and Zhou, N. (2013). The impact of innovative culture on individual employees: The moderating role of market information sharing. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 30*(5), 1027-1041.
- Weinreich, N. K. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative methods in social marketing research. *Social Marketing Quarterly*(Winter).
- Wellard, S., and McKenna, L. (2001). Turning tapes into text: Issues surrounding the transcription of interviews. *Contemporary Nurse, 11*(2-3), 180-186.
- Welsh, E. (2002). *Dealing with data: Using NVivo in the qualitative data analysis process*. Paper presented at the Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research.
- Welter, F. (2011). Contextualizing entrepreneurship—conceptual challenges and ways forward. *Entrepreneurship theory and Practice, 35*(1), 165-184.
- Whyte, W. F. (1996). Qualitative sociology and deconstructionism. *Qualitative Inquiry, 2*(2), 220-226.
- Willig, C., and Stainton-Rogers, W. (2007). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology*: Sage.
- Wilson, P. (2008). *Fostering entrepreneurship and innovation through business incubators: a comparative analysis of the role of European business and innovation centres*. Newcastle University.
- Wojnar, D. M., and Swanson, K. M. (2007). Phenomenology an exploration. *Journal of holistic nursing, 25*(3), 172-180.
- Wood, M. W. (2014). *Addressing Sustainability in an Entrepreneurship Ecosystem: A Case Study of a Social Incubator in Mexico*. ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY.

- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (Vol. 5): Sage publications, INC.
- York, J. G., and Venkataraman, S. (2010). The entrepreneur–environment nexus: Uncertainty, innovation, and allocation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5), 449-463.
- Yunus, M. (1998). *Banker to the Poor*: Penguin Books India.
- Zahra, S. A., Rawhouser, H. N., Bhawe, N., Neubaum, D. O., and Hayton, J. C. (2008). Globalization of social entrepreneurship opportunities. *Strategic entrepreneurship journal*, 2(2), 117-131.