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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.
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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
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.
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