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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores various entrepreneurial strategies available to manage emerging organisations. Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship and Social-Community Entrepreneurship have traditionally existed within organisations in partial or ‘piece-meal’ approaches. While the concept of Entrepreneurship dates back hundreds of years, however in theoretical concepts there is limited evidence to suggest it being used as a ‘driving-integrated and sustainable strategy’. Academic/empirical research has neglected/has limited applications of holistic-integrated approaches of entrepreneurship. Till now, Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship has focused mainly on ‘commercial’ missions; and Social-Community Entrepreneurship has primarily concentrated on ‘social’ missions. Hence these two approaches in a majority of the cases have been adopted in isolated frameworks. Within this study, the research addresses three questions: i) What are viable entrepreneurial strategies for future organizations? ii) Under what conditions are these entrepreneurial strategies most effective? & iii) What are the frameworks for utilising such strategies in a global settings?

As part of this study, the author was personally involved in several groups of companies; and the author and his wife- Lily Meewella co-founded Aspire Solutions Group – a real-life organization pursuing strategic global entrepreneurial directions. Data was collected using: case study methodology, observation, anthropological style research and unstructured questionnaires. Findings indicate that integrated approaches are better advocates in managing emerging organisations, operating within business, not-for-profit and governmental domains. It is argued that the lack of ‘integrated’ organisational models in literature as well as its application empirically in the contemporary global context is to some degree a result of mis-conceptualization, misunderstanding, and problems with implementation rather than with the actual principle concepts of Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship and/or Social-Community Entrepreneurship. Strategic Global Entrepreneurship combines the strengths of both commercial and social missions in an integrated holistic framework. SGE is presented as the way forward for stakeholders operating within business, not-for-profit and governmental domains.
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Chapter One - Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the Research

This dissertation explores emerging entrepreneurial strategies to better manage organisations. Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship and Social-Community Entrepreneurship have traditionally existed within organisations in partial or ‘piece-meal’ approaches. While the concept of Entrepreneurship dates back hundreds of years in theoretical concepts, there is limited evidence to suggest it being used as a ‘driving-strategy’ and ‘sustainable strategy’.

Research in both academic literature as well as real-life organisations; empirical evidence had neglected/ has limited applications of entrepreneurship in a holistic manner within organisations. Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship within the academic and empirical literature has focused mainly on ‘commercial’ missions; whilst Social-Community Entrepreneurship has primarily concentrated on ‘social’ missions. Hence these two approaches in a majority of the cases have been adopted as an isolated framework.

In more recent years, businesses which primarily are operating under commercial drivers have increasingly taken part in social missions as well. However, these social missions were conducted in addition to and with relatively secondary importance/ priority and embedded within the profit seeking and commercially competitive arenas. Reasons for getting involved in social missions have ranged from utopian self-interested goals such as goodwill, recognition as a ‘favoured organization’ within the community and thus becoming less prone to boycotting and long term survival benefits.

For-profit businesses within a context of Business-Commercial setting in general are driven primarily by their ‘bottom-line/ profits’. In some cases, organizations tend to ignore the overall impact of business decisions on the macro environmental factors. Sustainability issues, global warming, increased wage gaps, pollution and various other factors have often been attributed to as by-products of adverse business decision making. Stakeholder involvements, i.e. ‘Green’ approaches and discussion forums have to some degree contributed to minor improvements within this field.
On a global scale however, a longer term view prevails, nevertheless its impact is less obvious. In this struggle for future global sustainability businesses, charities, and governmental agencies are trying to co-exist and co-compete within a highly competitive and aggressive macro global environment. Often there is a struggle for resource sharing and prioritization and thus only a handful ‘truly achieve’ mutually beneficial outcomes.

*For-profit* organizations in this context has arguably taken advantage of the situation and prospered economically; yet have caused serious damage to physical environments, societies, nations and sustainability. There has been numerous cases of organizations dumping harmful waste into rivers; advocating less than human working conditions for communities; executing very short term corporate strategies with long term negative repercussions globally.

Whilst many organizations have ‘got away’ with this type of unsustainable and damaging actions; the pressure against such behaviour has been mounting globally. There have also been rapid increases of competition; technological developments; and advancements of communication infrastructure. This has enabled the community to become well informed and unite against such corporate action. Organizations have also faced various other challenges in terms of globalization, for example, convergence of nations, cultures and increased diversity within the workplace and marketplace.

Awareness and education of the consumers along with fierce competition and the intensity of rivalry in the contemporary business environment have made it very difficult for organizations to differentiate and create unique value. In lot of cases, the *power of the buyers* have increased within extreme cases resulting in boycotting of products, organizations, and associated partnerships. Organizations that traditionally used to enjoy benefits associated with typical ‘monopolies’ and ‘oligopolies’ are faced with challenges of *monopolistic competition* and *pure competition* (*Michael Porter*).
Not-for-profit charitable organisations on the other hand operate in a context of Social-Community setting and in general tend to depend on public gifts and government funds, to maintain their administration and service functions. Traditionally, much of these Non Governmental Development Organisations (NGDOs) have operated with pure ‘social missions’ and often provide ‘utopian-type’ services to the community.

Due to various global pressures and rapid changes in the current organisational context however; charities are forced to rethink their long-term sustainability. For instance, charities are increasingly competing for volunteers and resources; and are forced to continuously improve efficiency/ productivity ratios; and are expected to depend less on government and public funding.

Hence, charities are faced with a strategic dilemma of maintaining the essence of ‘social mission’; yet, striving to improve productivity, organisational efficiencies and to take measures of ‘self sufficiency’. This seems to challenge the very notion of a ‘charity’ organisation and its boundaries. Much of the research in this context is focused on the ‘social mission’ of charities. There is limited research which identifies charity links to profit, entrepreneurship, strategy, culture, innovation and human resource alignment. This is a significant gap in the literature and encourages research in entrepreneurial opportunity identification for not-for-profit organisations.

Not-for-profit organizations which primarily operate under social drivers have started to take on more ‘business-like’ approaches and in some cases at the expense of social outcomes. Again, majority of these approaches have been taken as a survival technique or due to external intervention resulting in dilution of their social mission. Most of the not-for-profits are continually struggling to attract high calibre employees (due to below market salaries offered) and are continually battling to gain ‘trust’ from their sponsors due to high administrative costs, diminishing funds and lower benefits to recipients. Limited availability of donor funds and increasing number of new charities has resulted in challenging the survival of social organisation and attract volunteers and funds.
Within this research study, an attempt has been made to fill the research gap by developing an integrated-holistic framework for future stakeholders operating in the business, not-for-profit, and governmental organisations. The study integrates both ‘commercial’ and ‘social’ missions as a holistic and inter-dependant model. Unlike Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship (BCE) primarily driven by Commercial Missions and Social-Community Entrepreneurship (SCE) primarily driven by Social Missions: the new framework is intended to incorporates both Commercial and Social Missions simultaneously. The author argues that Business-Commercial and Social-Community Entrepreneurship, used innovatively within an integrated-holistic framework can add enormous ‘value’ to contemporary and future stakeholders in such organisations.

Within contemporary dynamic and complex environmental setting; value for organisations is explored in terms of a multiple stakeholder approach that includes shareholders; customers; managerial and non-managerial staff; community groups; government; media; public pressure groups; industry bodies and various other parties. Current and future global trends in terms of changing environmental, economic, market and human resource complexities are also discussed within a framework of diversity, expatriation-repatriation, and convergence of nations through globalization.

Towards the end of this dissertation, a new concept is introduced as a model which leads to a more holistic approach that enables the integration of Business-Commercial and Social-Community entrepreneurship. Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship is explored within a context of dynamic and complex global environmental setting with increasing competition. Social-Community entrepreneurship is explored within a similar context of continual organizational struggle for survival. The new model is focused towards creating a new breed of for-profit and not-for-profit organisations which are far more flexible, adaptive and radical in their approach in achieving the organizational mission.
This qualitative-inductive case study explored *Entrepreneurial activities* in *Aspire Solutions Group* along with its strategically aligned networks of suppliers, partners, joint ventures and subsidiaries. Numerous senior management staff, middle management staff & supervisory staff were interviewed to establish a firsthand account of entrepreneurial developments.

It is argued that the current research and implementation gaps are to some degree the result of mis-conceptualization, misrepresentation and problems with the implementation process; rather than with the actual principle concepts of *Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship* and/or *Social-Community Entrepreneurship*. Case study experiences from the *Aspire Solutions Group* support this claim of increased sustainability and returns associated with integrating *commercial* and *social* missions. A new model is presented as the way forward for stakeholders operating within all three sectors i.e. *business, not-for-profit* and *governmental* domains.

### 1.2 Justification for the research

Despite the increasing amount of literature focused on entrepreneurship, there is little evidence and case examples of entrepreneurial successes achieved through an integrated approach. *Business Entrepreneurs* in attempting to create *commercial* wealth are faced with sustainable and long-term survival issues. *Social Entrepreneurs* in trying to create *social* value are constantly challenged with market forces beyond their immediate comprehension.

Numerous businesses have been issued fines, warnings, partial-full business closures and boycotted by the consumers. Organizations with favourable goodwill/ image are preferred by the educated consumer of the new century. More and more, organizations are forced to take seriously their *Corporate Social Responsibility Report (CSR)* and *Social Responsiveness* and expected to contribute to the wider global sustainability debate both intellectually and empirically.
Many Non Governmental Development Organisations (NGDOs) have started to charge fees for their services as they are struggling in competing for volunteers, donations, government aid and community support. For most NGDOs community development through local stakeholder involvement along with a strong focus on self-sufficiency is being advocated. Yet, this very notion of self-sufficiency is hard to achieve in most cases and previous studies have provided limited recommendations for self-sufficiency. For example, strategies to minimise the pressures of government on NGDOs policies, to take advantage of market-based opportunities and utilise surplus (profit) into various developmental projects. A framework for NGDOs was developed aligning ‘market disciplines’ with ‘social disciplines’ - mainly in the context of pursuing new opportunities; rapid adaptation; continuous learning and innovation. Emphasis is given on the possibility of NGDOs operating like profit-ventures or commercial organisations, while maintaining their mission of creating and sustaining social value.

Under the emerging context, NGDOs are struggling to minimise the administrative cost of raising funds (where on average it is currently around twenty to eighty per cent). Theoretically one hundred percent donor funds should be distributed to development projects directly. However, due to operational and administrative inefficiencies, this percentage can be as low as twenty percent.

Utilising integrated-holistic approaches, these NGDOs could create above average returns with their existing fund-base by taking radically innovative steps to re-write the rules of ‘charitable’ endeavours. Perhaps, by uncovering the mysteries of entrepreneurship NGDOs are able to be more efficient and effective in their operations. Recent scholars have recognised the need for holistic and entrepreneurial integration within this context as follows. According to Gibb in order to be successful in a globalised environment everyone in the community should become an entrepreneur (2002, p. 234). In other words the need for developing a dynamic community with an entrepreneurial mindset cannot be overemphasised. Lyons & Passey states that there is an absence of a ‘third sector’ as a move away from the traditional left and right wing politics. He emphasises the need for an integrated approach that incorporates both the left (social dimension) and the right (capitalist approach).
Within this context, *Anthony Giddens* presents *The Third Way* as the utopian reality grounded in globalisation advocating for holistic integration and individual empowerment (2001, p. 3). Considered to be the father of *Third Way Politics*, Giddens’s research encourages businesses, non-profits and policy-makers to integrate entrepreneurial practices holistically within the organisation.

Traditional settings and political environments are often argued as affecting community development negatively (*Gittell & Wilder 1999, p. 341*). Naturally, such environments have the tendency to create inefficient and ineffective organisational setting leading to poor organisational performance, resource mismanagement, higher opportunity cost and increased chances of organisational failure. Under these conditions, holistic integration and entrepreneurial links can be a positive catalyst. Numerous scholars such as *Gelach 2004; Azzone 1998; Farrow 2000; Isaak 1997, 1999; Kech 1997; Larson 2000; Lober 1998; Nocci 1998; Pastakia 1998; Petersen 2000; Pettersen 2000; Schaltegger 2000, 2002; Volery 2002; and Welsh 1998* argue the need for holistic integration with entrepreneurship embedded within the organisation innovatively.

### 1.3 The Researcher’s Perspective

The researcher explored *Business-Commercial* and *Social-Community* Entrepreneurship within both academic and practical domains. Within the academic context, the researcher carried out a research study on the subject matter through academic and industry journals. From a practical point of view, the researcher carried out a qualitative extended case study based on – *Aspire Solutions Group*, subsidiaries, suppliers and networks of related organizations.

### 1.4 Aims and Objectives of the Research

Within this study, the research addressed three questions:

- What are viable entrepreneurial strategies for future organizations?
- Under what conditions are these entrepreneurial strategies most effective?
- What are the frameworks for utilising such strategies in global settings?
1.5 Summary

Chapter One – Introduction provided an account of the justification of the research, researcher’s perspective, aims, objectives, limitations and overview of dissertation.

Chapter Two – Literature Review synthesises the major academic and empirical developments in the domain of entrepreneurship. Within this chapter, author points out to the research gaps surrounding the combination of for-profit sectors and not-for-profit sectors globally. This chapter is divided into eight sub-sections: i) introduction/ context; ii) creativity and innovation; iii) business-social entrepreneurship; iv) social-community entrepreneurship; v) entrepreneurial cognition, creativity, innovation & entrepreneurship; vi) strategy; vii) strategy & entrepreneurship; and viii) evolving future entrepreneurial context.

Chapter Three – Research Methodology explains the methodology adapted in conducting the research at Aspire Solutions Group where research was conducted in a qualitative manner, using a field study/ case study approach. This chapter also describes, explains and justifies the research methodology and frameworks adopted within this dissertation.

Chapter Four – Evaluation of Case Studies is a summary of the evolution of entrepreneurial developments surrounding Aspire Solutions Group, the author’s direct experiences and its associated companies, suppliers and subsidiaries. The case studies were selected on the basis of firstly having access to qualitative data relevance to dissertation, availability of key managers in cooperating with the researcher and ability to get access to key insights of the organizations. Since majority of entrepreneurial knowledge base still reside in tacit forms, researcher felt the need to conduct the study using mainly interviews, observations and in some cases be involved in the organization. This type of research is especially effective in anthropological type research settings where the researcher him- herself becomes part of the subject being studied. Various strengths, limitations and approach of research of such methodology were discussed earlier.
Chapter Five – Discussion & Conclusion argues that Business-Commercial Entrepreneurshi and Social-Community Entrepreneurship integrated within holistic and inter-dependent frameworks are more likely to bring forth enormous benefits to all stakeholders involved. Author argues that the new concept (strategic global entrepreneurship) has potential to thrive beyond simply creating ‘social value’ across non-profits, businesses and government; extending its usage to simultaneously creating both ‘social-community’ value and ‘business-commercial’ value within a holistic integrated framework. Such an approach is most suitable for future global organizations, because the traditional boundaries and rules of the ‘formation/establishment’ of ‘non-profits’, ‘businesses’ and ‘government’ are diminishing at a rapid pace.
This chapter is a synthesis of major academic and empirical developments in the domain of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship was explored within a qualitative-inductive context with links to creativity, innovation, business-commercial entrepreneurship, social-community entrepreneurship and strategy. An effort was made to uncover benefits associated in combining both for-profit sectors and not-for-profit sector strategies strategically.

This chapter is divided into six sub-sections: i) introduction/context where history, developments, models and empirical evidence is presented as a preamble to the overall chapter; ii) creativity and innovation – as the process by which the entrepreneur exercises his/her entrepreneurial ventures; iii) business-social entrepreneurship as the type of entrepreneurial activity existent within mainly for-profit businesses, extending beyond simply launching new business/ simply managing a business; and iv) social-community entrepreneurship as the type of entrepreneurial activity existent within primarily the not-for-profit sector, extending beyond simply charities; v) strategy as the means by which organizational goals are planned and executed at corporate level, extending beyond the ‘accidental’, ‘ad-hoc’, ‘piece-meal’, ‘reactive’ approaches to more ‘planned’, ‘formal’, ‘holistic’, ‘organization-wide’ yet ‘agile’ approaches; and vi) overall integration – a discussion of an integrative approach conceptually suitable for both for-profits and not-for-profits; and linked to Business-Commercial and Social-Community entrepreneurship domains. Here, organization sustainability and survival is discussed within a framework of contemporary global society, strategic alignment/fit and the evolving future ‘entrepreneurial context’. To illustrate overall synthesis of literature review author presents Figure 2.1 as an Eight Step Framework.
Chapter Five – Discussion & Conclusion

Figure 2.1: Eight Step Framework

2.1 Introduction/Context
2.2 Creativity and Innovation
2.3 Business-Commercial (BC) Entrepreneurship
   Primarily 'Commercial' Mission
2.4 Social-Community (SC) Entrepreneurship
   Primarily 'Social' Mission
2.5 Entrepreneurial Cognition, Creativity, Innovation & Entrepreneurship
2.6 Strategy
2.7 Strategy & Entrepreneurship
2.8 Overall Integration & Links
   Simultaneously both 'Commercial' & 'Social' Missions

Source: Author


2.1 Introduction/ Context

“You see things and you say ‘why’? But I dream things that never were and I say ‘why not?’” (Shaw 1922 as cited in Gaglio 2004, p. 533). As Gaglio defines – “Dreaming of things that do not yet exist, bringing them into creation and gaining market acceptance are perhaps the most mesmerizing of all entrepreneurial behaviours” (2004, p. 533). Inspired by Shaw and Gaglio’s entrepreneurial spirits, the author embarks on a journey to uncover mysteries of integrated approaches to business-commercial and social-community entrepreneurship.

Schildt et al argue that research within the entrepreneurship domain as ‘fragmented with non-cumulative results’; ‘diverse, fragmented and still being in ferment’ (Gartner 2001; Shane & Venkataraman 2000); handicapping the evolution of its development as a scholarly discipline (2006, p. 399). This so called ‘fragmented’ and ‘non-cumulative’ nature of entrepreneurial literature is a major gap that needs to be filled. Author attempts to fill this gap by firstly researching the academic domains followed by empirical testing in Australia. Chapter Two discusses the theoretical frameworks underlying entrepreneurial domain. Chapter Three discusses the methodology adapted. Chapter Four gives a detailed account of the case studies. Chapter Five contains a discussion and outlines the merits of an integrated entrepreneurial approach.

It can be argued that entrepreneurship aids in national economic performance and sets new directions for public policy. In fact, within the economic domain, entrepreneurship is seen as the fourth addition to traditional elements of land, labour and capital. Audretsch & Keilbach identifies positive links between entrepreneurship capital and regional economic performance (2004, p. 419). In India, growth of private enterprises has been positively linked to productivity of human capital, rapid development and concomitant increase in technology entrepreneurship (Majumdar 2007, p. 853). Current global context is filled with various developmental problems affecting a host of public policy issues; where entrepreneurship may hold the secrets of untangling this mess through its ability to impact productivity, development and thereby affect policies positively.
Entrepreneurship traditionally emerged out of for-profit-organizations. Social entrepreneurship on the other hand traditionally emerged out of not-for-profit organizations. However, the two types are converging due to global contemporary context and future implications. Entrepreneurship is a term loosely used to mean various things: entrepreneurship; innovation; creativity; corporate entrepreneurship/ intrapreneurship/ corporate venturing; social entrepreneurship; women entrepreneurship; small business; business incubation; home based businesses; technology entrepreneurship; venture capital/ angel investors; and numerous other terms.

In its original US context, Joseph Schumpeter – ‘Theory of Entrepreneurship 1934’ – presented entrepreneurs’ central role in economic development as having the ability to “disturb the economic status quo through innovations” (Chell, Haworth & Brearley 1991, p. 22). Hwang & Powell argue entrepreneurship as ‘a modern western institution’ built upon The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (Weber 1930) (2006, p. 179). Here it is reported that the methodical, rational character of Protestantism fostered the growth of capitalism; yet over time became secular, losing its religious underpinnings. Ironically (Lipset 1970 cited in Hwang & Powell 2006) argues that ‘values of family, particularism and patriarchy’ hinders capital accumulation and entrepreneurial behaviour.

Whether religious, family and social variables affect entrepreneurship positively or negatively; and whether entrepreneurship’s impact on religious, family and social variables is positive or negative is debatable. However, it is undeniable that entrepreneurship is here to stay: its impact is felt across multiple industries, disciplines and nations; it is permeating into the global arena challenging the traditional boundaries of intellectual, physical, academic, technological and virtual domains; and it is becoming a strong force that the world needs to reckon-with before it’s too late. This view is supported by Kuratko & Hodgetts in the following quote.
“Entrepreneurship is the most powerful economic force known to mankind! The ‘entrepreneurial revolution’ that captured our imagination during the last decade has now permeated every aspect of business thinking and planning. . . . The process of transforming creative ideas into commercially viable businesses continues to be our major challenge. Successful entrepreneurship requires more than just luck and money. It is a cohesive process of creativity, risk taking, and planning” Kuratko & Hodgetts (2004).

Any ‘powerful economic force’ can have both positive as well as negative effects. Similarly, entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial adaptations can have both positive and negative impacts for for-profit organisations not-for-profit organisations as well as policy makers of contemporary societies. The metaphor of ‘being in control of fire – and utilising its heat, light and energy for productive purposes’; rather than ‘letting the fire control itself – where it becomes a destructive force damaging its environment in unprecedented ways’ is similar to the case of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial spirit need to be carefully studied, analysed and dissected prior to simply harnessing it as a ‘blanket approach’.

The lack of understanding of entrepreneurial spirit, its components, its strengths and weaknesses could potentially lead to harmful results for humanity both within the contemporary global context and for future generations. Eventually such results may even lead to its own demise of not being used as a constructive strategy, discipline and an approach for achieving development, productivity and benefit of humanity. Can entrepreneurship offer solutions to the issues within the contemporary and future global environment? What are the critical factors of entrepreneurship that researchers need to address? – its definitions, role of entrepreneur, application or its ability to create positive change?
According to some researches, a large quantum of entrepreneurial developments have already been identified (2005, p. 577; Reynolds, Hay & Camp 1999). For example, new business incorporations averaged 600,000 per annum; 807,000 new small firms established in 1995 alone; 34 million new jobs created since 1980 cumulatively. Further, 15% of fastest growing new firms – known as gazelles – account for 94% of net job creation; 53% of private workforce accounting for 47% of sales and 51% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), 16% of US firms are in existence for less than a year; and 67% of all new inventions created by smaller firms.

Wikipedia lists the following areas which has made the most contributions and are considered advantages of entrepreneurship (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entrepreneurship):

i) Develop new markets
Here a distinction is made between entrepreneurs and ordinary businesses whereby ordinary businessmen only perform traditional functions of management such as planning, organizing, staffing, leading and controlling (ICFAI). Entrepreneurs on the other hand strive to ‘satisfy customer needs’ and create ‘effective demand’ by using their resourceful and creative talents.

ii) Discover new sources of materials
It is stated that by using their innovative skills, entrepreneurs persist on discovering new sources of materials and enjoy comparative advantages in supply, cost and quality.

iii) Mobilization of capital resources
Entrepreneurs mobilize capital resources – including money, machines, buildings and other physical productive resources – as well as factors of production such as land and labour in creating new businesses and/ or business expansion.

iv) Introduce new technologies
Entrepreneurs often introduce new technologies, new industries and new products by taking advantage of business opportunities and transforming them into profits.
v)  **Create employment**  
It is well known that the largest employer in most countries is the private sector enterprises. Entrepreneurs through their business creations/ expansions tend to create millions of jobs.

vi)  **Self-employment**  
They are also the key contributor to self-employment sector and offer more job satisfaction and flexibility to workforce.

vii)  **Development of more industries**  
Especially in rural areas or regions disadvantaged by economic changes possibly due to globalization effects, entrepreneurs offer opportunities that may be harnessed locally.

viii)  **Encouragement of localisation**  
Hence there is encouragement of the processing of local materials into finished goods for domestic consumption and for export.

ix)  **Income generation**  
Income generation and increased economic growth is considered to be part and parcel of the benefits of entrepreneurship.

x)  **Fosters healthy competition**  
Entrepreneurship tends to foster healthy competition which in turn encourages higher quality products and reasonable market rates.

xi)  **Expanded range**  
Due to the inherent ‘innovative’ and ‘growth’ drives of entrepreneurs’ they naturally tend to contribute to a larger range and volume of goods and services being offered.

xii)  **Market expansion**  
As such entrepreneurs tend to develop new markets and expand existing markets.
xiii) **Technology links to productivity**
They also aid in promoting the use of modern technology in small-scale manufacturing to enhance higher productivity.

xiv) **Encourage research**
Entrepreneurship is expected to encourage increased levels of researches/studies and assist the development of modern machines and equipments for domestic consumption;

xv) **Harnessing the talents of local entrepreneurship**
Entrepreneurship is a key contributor in harnessing the talents of local ‘potential’ entrepreneurs. Development of entrepreneurial qualities and attitudes amongst potential local entrepreneurs is a key factor in bringing about significant changes in the rural areas and thereby aid in national development.

xvi) **Higher independence**
Further, increases in entrepreneurial activities aids in creating freedom from the dependency on the jobs offered by others. This not only reduces the dependency syndromes associated with traditional economic development models; but also is a key motivator for members of society to get involved.

xvii) **Higher aspirations**
Generally, entrepreneurship tends to create higher aspirations amongst participants. In turn, majority of the entrepreneurs are able to achieve great accomplishments and rewards.

xviii) **Talent emigration**
Entrepreneurship creates a two-way learning context and encourages the emigration of talent from other sectors and communities. Hence, it can be argued that positive change can be created through entrepreneurship. Such contributions are invaluable for policy makers, governments and global institutes in creating a ‘better tomorrow’. As the age-old saying goes ‘everything that goes up, must also come down’. So, one needs to ask what is the sacrifice and the risks involved in adapting entrepreneurial strategies and what is the propensity of ‘success’ verses ‘failures’?
This entrepreneurial revolution as Kuratko & Hodgetts identifies it, has been further explained by Joseph R. Mancuso (Centre for Entrepreneurial Management) as ‘doers in the arena’ who ‘fail more than they succeed’; yet appreciate this reality even before venturing out on their own. The concept of ‘failure’ is recognized as ‘a resting place’ – a temporary place by entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurship is considered to be ‘the most potent economic force the world has ever experienced’ (Kuratko 2005, p. 577); where for example United States achieved its highest economic performance during the last decade (Minniti & Bygrave 2004).

It seems that there is a high price to pay for ‘being entrepreneurial’ - ‘Failing more than succeeding’ certainly does not sound too positive or optimistic. It may in fact be very difficult to convince bureaucrats and conservative policy makers of the advantages of such a venture. Yet, as stated above, countries such as United States claim to have mastered the art and few raises the question that perhaps it is this only suitable for super-powers due to their enormous wealth and power to sustain numerous failures? If we stand by this view, then perhaps for developing nations and smaller organizations, entrepreneurship may in fact be destructive and ‘one failure’ may actually mean survival-issues and bankruptcy for most new enterprises.

Corbett et al states that ‘failure is a part of the entrepreneurial process’ (2007, p. 829) with the underlying assumption that it is difficult to exhibit ‘entrepreneurial behaviour’ without experiencing ‘failures’. Thus, it can be argued that under this assumption entrepreneurship is for everyone and suitable for both super-powers and super-powerless; for large conglomerates and for small proprietorships; for corporations and for individuals; for men and for women. The empirical evidence supports this view that entrepreneurship is adapted successfully all across the world and in multiple domains: such as with micro credit revolution of Professor Mohammed Yunus of Bangladesh; no-frills airline revolution of Sir Richard Branson; ‘trading’ ‘market’ redefinition with introduction of eBay by Pierre Omidyar; Software & IT revolution by Bill Gates; rise of women entrepreneurs globally; and various other overwhelming evidences.
While it may be a fact that ‘failure is an inbuilt factor within entrepreneurship’ and hence has potential negative and unintended consequences; ‘failures’ also brings with it many positive aspects such as ‘learning, experience, positive drive, and motivation for highly challenging individuals’ which ultimately tend to help entrepreneurs to grow and develop. It is important to note that entrepreneurs should not – and generally do not – necessarily ‘go after’/ pursue ‘failures’. Failure is accepted as ‘part and parcel’ of the whole experience and treated accordingly.

In the case of Serial Entrepreneurs – entrepreneurs who repeatedly create multiple entrepreneurial ventures – learning from the ‘failures’ could arguably benefit them tremendously. Within serial entrepreneur cases we could almost say that ‘failure’ become their friend in an ever-continuing journey of entrepreneurial pursuits. The domain of entrepreneurship and its developments in academic and empirical fields are becoming extremely ‘rich’; and the proliferation of its various categories expands multiple disciplines. In order to fully understand its vast developments, one has to go back to its beginnings and questions its essence – its definition.

Entrepreneurs are defined as “persons who habitually create and innovate to build something of recognized value around perceived opportunities” (Bolton & Thompson 2000, p. 11); “persons who start and/or operate businesses” (Longnecker et al 2003, p. 766); “individuals with growth goals through innovation and strategic management” (Meggison et al 2003, p. 485). Entrepreneurial opportunity is defined as “value-creating innovation with market potential” (Longnecker et al 2003, p. 767); and “dynamic process of vision, change and creation . . . requiring application of energy and passion towards the creation and implementation of new ideas and creative solutions . . . where entrepreneurs are willing to take calculated risks in terms of time, equity and career” (Kuratko & Hodgetts 2004, p. 30).
‘Management’, ‘Strategic Management’ and ‘Leadership’ discipline partly covers some of the above mentioned definitions. Does that mean entrepreneurs are the same as managers and leaders – or are they fundamentally different? Managers by definition tend to operate with the Planning, Organizing, Leading and Controlling, POLC (Robbins & Coulter 2005) definitions of management. Leaders focus on the third function of management (Leading) and are considered to have certain Traits, Behaviours, and Situational elements, differentiating them from managers (Cole 2005). Entrepreneurs, similar to Leaders are considered to have very unique Traits, Behaviours, and Situational elements; yet seem to operate within a different dimension and a contrasting domain of rules and establishments – within a new paradigm of ‘entrepreneurship’. As such while entrepreneurs may have their origins from management and leadership domains; they are fundamentally a ‘new breed’ operating a ‘new paradigm’ – as illustrated below in Figure 2.2.

**Figure 2.2: Integrative View of Managers, Leaders and Entrepreneurs**

![Figure 2.2: Integrative View of Managers, Leaders and Entrepreneurs](source: Author)
Whilst the evolutionary roots of ‘organizations’ and ‘management’ can be dated back to ancient civilisations such as Egyptians in the making of pyramids with their own strategies, structures, cultures, POLC-planning-organising-leading-controlling frameworks; leadership literature within the management-social-sciences domain evolved into a separate distinctive category of its own. Within this ‘new leadership domain’ there was a proliferation of ‘leadership terminology’ that was unique to its own. The leadership research and applications further developed with several schools of thought such as Trait, Behavioural and Situational (Cole 2005). In the contemporary society, it is widely accepted that ‘managers’ and ‘leaders’ are two very different paradigms (Robbins 2005), each with its unique fundamental underpinnings, as illustrated by Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Managers versus Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for designated functions of</td>
<td>Can influence others within the organisation both formally &amp; informally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisation formally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed to position</td>
<td>Appointed for position and/or emerge from within the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to influence based on the formal</td>
<td>Can influence others to perform beyond the actions directed by formal authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority inherent in the position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All managers are not leaders (ideally should be)</td>
<td>All leaders are not necessarily managers (may lack capabilities and skills needed in other three management functions – e.g. Planning, Organizing and Controlling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most managers are skilled in Planning,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising and Controlling. But may lack Leadership skills;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of Types: Corporate, Business level, Functional level, Regional, Divisional, Departmental, Front-line/ First-line/ Supervisors</td>
<td>Examples of Types: Trait, Behavioural, Situational, Transactional, Transformational, Charismatic, Visionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management: Process of coordinating work activities so that they are completed efficiently and effectively with and through other people</td>
<td>Leadership: Process of influencing a group towards the achievement of goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: Cole, K. 2005 “Management: Theory and Practice”, Prentice Hall, P. 482
Similarly, entrepreneurial revolution has brought within it – its own unique ‘entrepreneurial sub-set’ challenging the existing management and leadership academics’ and practitioners’ understanding of contemporary global society – demanding and almost forcibly creating its own ‘niche’ within education, economics, national policy and various other globally established frameworks. Ireland, Hitt & Serman supports this view, that ‘the entrepreneurial and managerial domains are not mutually exclusive but overlap to a certain extent’: entrepreneurs are more opportunity driven and managers are more resource- and conversation-driven’ (2003 cited in Kuratko 2005, p. 581). Others such as Vega states that there are significant differences between ‘managers’ and ‘entrepreneurs’ (2007 p. 475).

Within the emerging strategic global future context, it is anticipated that a ‘new type’ of entrepreneur will emerge – integrating simultaneously both business-Commercial and Social-Community missions within one business model. The environmental context and the ‘timing’ for such type of entrepreneur are already being incubated as we speak. The contemporary global society is ‘crying out’ once again for another ‘paradigm shift’, moving away from the traditional mainstream entrepreneurship that has in many ways failed to integrate a sustainable and integrated framework for planet’s long term survival. The new type, similar to their ancestor, mainstream entrepreneurs are likely to ‘challenge the unknown’ (Yamin 2008) by recognizing opportunities where others see chaos or confusion.

Entrepreneurs are identified as ‘aggressive catalysts’ for change within the marketplace challenging the unknown and continuously creating the future. Their strong ‘passion and drive’ is said to move the world forwards; and entrepreneurship is said to have ‘revolutionized the way business is conducted at every level and in every country’ (Kuratko 2005, p. 578). However, world demands revolutions in multiple facets of ‘disciplines/ domains’ – not just in ways business is conducted at every level and in every country. Whilst it’s exemplary that entrepreneurship has created such ‘revolutions’ within the business world; it is now time to revolutionise the other aspects of global survival.
As illustrated above in Figure 2.2, to some degree, social entrepreneurs have attempted to ‘revolutionise’ the ‘social’ sector utilising entrepreneurial means and entrepreneurial behaviour. However, to a large degree the relationship between ‘social entrepreneurship’ and ‘mainstream entrepreneurship’ has been one of isolation and subservient behaviour. Social entrepreneurship has followed the mainstream entrepreneurial behaviour and has been a ‘secondary priority’ or a ‘goodwill gesture’ in most cases.

There have also been fundamental flaws within their ‘incorporations’ where mainstream entrepreneurs had adapted primarily business-commercial missions and social entrepreneurs had adopted primarily social-community missions. The contemporary – especially the emerging – strategic global domain does not allow room for isolated and disintegrated business-social relationships. Mere survival of humankind depends on an urgent merger of both of these domains – business-commercial and social-community – within a globally governed policy-framework.

Piece-meal approaches and/or the delay of a global governance system integrating the three sectors – business, social and policy-making can lead to devastating consequences such as rising wage gaps, poverty and poverty-related problems such as terrorism and anti-democratic movements, health and ageing population needs, un-sustainability of systems, energy issues and a host of other reasons. While entrepreneurship itself has been a ‘paradigm shift’ (Thomas Kuhn 1962) of the twentieth century; the world is now ready for another such paradigm shift – to apply the original ‘essence’ of entrepreneurship as it was presented during the 17th & 18th century French context of integrating both business-commercial and social-community context to benefit the humankind forwards.
Within the context of today’s dynamic and complex global environment, there are unlimited potential opportunities for entrepreneurs to transform their ideas into opportunities. Free enterprise has been attributed as the basis of such entrepreneurial activity (Kuratko & Hodgetts, 2004). Much of the recent entrepreneurial developments both within academic research and empirical evidence have emerged from the United States of America. However, the entrepreneurial models that United States of America have adapted so far are continuously being questioned due to US global policy, national policy, rising poverty and poverty-related issues, increasing wage gaps and the weakening United States economic condition itself.

According to Kuratko & Hodgetts, businesses are motivated by either profit or independence, the challenge of developing their own businesses, and actively pursuing ideas and opportunities at a record pace (2004, p.20). Within the US context, there have been tremendous developments in profit-motivated mainstream entrepreneurship: Self-employment grew by 10.5 million people in 1997; From 1966 to 2006, self-employment as a primary occupation increased by more than 50 percent; Home-based business ownership has exploded into the economy and now represents more than 50 percent of all small firms and 10 percent of all revenue; Of the 24.8 million businesses in existence (5.5 million of which are employer businesses), 97 percent are considered small.

Further, approximately 800,000 new employer firms added by 2005; Women’s share of self-employment expected to be about equal to that of men; The percentage of small businesses with access to the Internet nearly doubled from 1996 to 1998 – from 21.5 percent to 41.2 percent, respectively; Online retail marketing is experiencing about 200 percent annual growth, and online traffic has been doubling every 100 days; At least one-third of all business-to-business transactions are performed via e-commerce; (Kuratko & Hodgetts 2004, p. 20).
However, within the emerging global context, United States examples only account for a portion of the accelerating needs of survival. The sheer population growth by volume in countries such as China and India coupled with shifts in demographics, globalization and various other trends have already started to question and challenge the ‘old mindset’ of global governance.

US’s current challenges of dealing with the Gulf War, US policies on terrorism and various other local and international pressures are alarming the global society of the role of entrepreneur in tackling future sustainability of the planet. Yet, to date, the debate of who an entrepreneur is – whether they are born or made; their cognitive, personality and identity characteristics; their behaviour; environmental and contextual factors in the making of entrepreneurs; and various other measures still remains a mystery.

Cunningham & Lischeron – building upon the emerging literature – reports six schools of thought about entrepreneurs: i) great person – intuitive ability, sixth sense, traits and instincts born with; ii) psychological – values, attitudes, needs, drive; iii) classical – innovation; iv) management – organisers; v) leaders – of people; vi) intrapreneurship (2003, p. 78).

Reader (2008) reports nine clusters of entrepreneurial themes as dominating the entrepreneurial research: i) corporate entrepreneurship; ii) economic role; iii) organization change; iv) start ups; v) venture capital; vi) strategy; vii) women-minority-family-business; viii) characteristics; and ix) policy. Schildt et al on the other hand identifies ten themes: i) networks; ii) corporate entrepreneurship; iii) conceptualization; iv) value creation; v) opportunity creation; vi) characteristics; vii) research methods; viii) survival and growth; ix) social entrepreneurship; x) global entrepreneurship; (2006, p. 402).
Kuratko reports ten themes: i) entrepreneurial and managerial domains; ii) innovative financing techniques; iii) corporate entrepreneurship; iv) entrepreneurial strategies; v) types and methods of entrepreneurs; vi) risk and trade-offs of an entrepreneurial career; vii) women and minority entrepreneurs; viii) entrepreneurial spirit around the world; ix) economic and social contributions of entrepreneurs; and x) ethics entrepreneurship (2005, p. 581).

Further fifteen themes are suggested by Schildt et al as most cited within the literature of entrepreneurship: i) social institutions; ii) top management; iii) essence; iv) newness; v) knowledge-based view; vi) trust; vii) risk-taking; viii) environment; ix) statistics; x) technology; xi) leadership; xii) decision-making; xiii) learning; xiv) external triggers; and xv) survival; (2006, p. 406).

Whilst various scholars have no doubt added to the fragmented nature of the entrepreneurial body of knowledge; the debate of entrepreneurs and their role within the emerging global context is continuing. For some, entrepreneurship is very much a positive contributor and must be integrated within all sectors of a nation. Others argue that it has limited applications and that it will remain utilised within specialised fields. There is also a view that entrepreneurship which is considered to be very much misunderstood concept increases the risk levels unnecessarily. Majority remains somewhere in the middle awaiting further clarification on this point.

Given this ‘fragmented’ and ‘embryonic’ nature of the entrepreneurial body of knowledge and its importance within the strategic global context; author embarks on a journey to re-visit the so-called ‘essence’ of entrepreneurship – creativity and innovation. As much as entrepreneurship is largely a misunderstood concept; creativity and innovation itself is used interchangeably by a large majority of the population. However, fundamentally, they are two very different concepts operating within clearly defined boundaries and affecting the role of entrepreneur in two different ways.
2.2 Creativity and Innovation

“The era of intelligent man/woman is almost over and a new one is emerging – the era of the creative man/woman” (Pinchas Noy). “The old adage, that genius is 99% perspiration and 1% inspiration, looks truer than ever of corporate R&D innovation” (The Economist Intelligent Unit 2004). As illustrated by Figure 2.3, this new era of creative entrepreneurial man/women is already here. Genuinely new ideas such as one illustrated in figure below considered breathtakingly simple, yet the stakes are high also.

Majority of us continue to look for the ‘logically shortest path through the maze’; and entrepreneurs ‘rise above the logical, structured and proven paths’ and ‘advances above the maze’. Even when the so called experts boast about the ‘shortest possible path through the maze’, entrepreneurs who think ‘outside the box’ continue to break traditional methods of commercialisation. Thus, lays the mystery of creativity and innovation, considered fundamental in entrepreneurial pursuits. According to a survey conducted by Thomas Astebro encompassing 1,091 Canadian, University of Toronto inventions in 2003; only 75 reached the market; out of these 75, 45 lost money and 6 earned returns above 1,400%. Thus lays the mystery of creativity and innovation within the process of entrepreneurship – where it seem to favour some, but not necessarily others.

Figure 2.3: Entrepreneurial Mindset

Source: The Economist 2008 “Searching for the Invisible Man”
2.2.1 Creativity

In an attempt to clarify the distinguishing natures of both creativity and innovation, it is important to explore how each term relates to entrepreneurs and the role of creativity and innovation within the entrepreneurial process. Creativity is defined as “the ability to combine ideas in a unique way or to make unusual associations between ideas” (Robbins & Coulter 2005, p. 327); “the generation of ideas that result in the improved efficiency or effectiveness of a system; where two important aspects of creativity exist: process and people. The process is goal oriented, designed to attain a solution to a problem. The people are the resources that determine the solution and the approach that the people use will vary” (Kuratko & Hodgetts 2004, p. 138).

According to Whitney et al (2000), the creative process has 2 distinct phases: producing ideas, and then judging their merits. Both are considered important, however in separate contexts. In order to create a positive environment for protecting nascent good ideas it is suggested: never to throw cold water on ideas in public, rather to probe the opinions. Using phrases such as 'what if' and 'what else' to judge the ideas. Whilst no enterprise has the resources to take on every idea that comes along, the ideas should be judged in the context of a clearly understood mission and strategy. Otherwise organisations may face the danger of stopping the flow of future ideas which is detrimental for creating successful organisations.

The creative process is usually broken down into four steps: Phase 1: Background or knowledge accumulation; Phase 2: The incubation process; Phase 3: The idea experience; and Phase 4: Evaluation and implementation; as illustrated in Figure 2.4 (Kuratko & Hodgetts 2004, p. 138). Phase 1: Background or knowledge accumulation is conducted via information gathering means such as reading, casual conversations and joining associations related to the field. When one allows the subconscious mind to mull over and reflect on the vast collection of information already gathered from phase 1, the transition from phase 1 to phase 2 is initiated. In phase 3: idea is discovered and formulation of the solution begins. When the idea is evaluated and is set-up for implementation by perseverance through its challenges, phase 4 is exercised.
2.2.2 Innovation

Innovation on the other hand is ‘ideas, ahead of its time’ and considered to be more than simply a good idea. It is accepted that the origins of the idea as well as creativity in coming up with the ideas are important. However innovation precedes mere speculation extending its scope to having a vision to create good ideas, yet at the same time having the perseverance to follow the idea through to its incubation, development and commercialization. There is an embedded ‘economic potential’ within the innovation process, often conducted in a systematic and logical process context.

Joseph Schumpeter’s (1934) original definition of innovation was “entrepreneurial activity entailing recombination of existing materials and structures”; where he describes five types of innovative activity: i) new products; ii) new methods of production; iii) new sources of supply; iv) new markets; and v) new ways to organize. According to Mintzberg, innovation is “the means to break away from established pattern” and to do things differently (1983 cited in Yamin 2008, p. 19). Kuratko presents innovation as “the specific function of entrepreneurship . . . means by which the entrepreneur either creates new wealth-producing resources or endows existing resources with enhanced potential for creating wealth; process by which entrepreneurs convert opportunities into marketable ideas and the means by which they become catalysts for change” (2004, p. 137).

World’s greatest innovators include Google founders, Larry Page and Sergey Brin; George Lucas, Star Wars inventor; Galileo with sun-centred solar system; Darwin and theory of evolution; and many others. Amongst all of these and other innovators there exists a paradox: ‘the greater the potential of a new idea, the harder it is to find anyone willing to try it’ (Berkun 2007, p. 56). Innovators often hear a large number of negatives of why an idea would not work. Experienced innovators are skilful in anticipating these challenges by understanding the gap between how innovators themselves see their innovations; as opposed to how others see it.

According to Berkun, innovative ideas are rarely rejected for their merits; rather because of how the innovations make people feel in terms of the impact of innovation on: i) ego and envy; ii) pride & politics; iii) fear; iv) priority; v) sloth; vi) security; vii) greed; and viii) tradition (2007, p. 59). In other words, it is important to consider and evaluate the ‘emotional and feeling’ aspects of innovations, prior to presenting them for acceptance. Whilst there is a growing interest and support for corporate entrepreneurship – also known as intrapreneurship/corporate venturing – for trying to mitigate this issue; as a result of this unique characteristics of innovation, innovators often find it difficult to ‘survive’ within mainstream organisations. Naturally, most innovators revert to their own independence through ‘new business creation’; thus existing the linear positive relationship between innovation growth and new business ventures creation.

‘Promoting business principles to reduce poverty’ is considered innovative (Jancloes & Martin 1998, p. 333). Within its broader context, innovation can be: “ability of channelling creativity into useful outcomes such as products, services and work methods” (Robbins & Coulter 2005, p. 327); “a search, discovery, development, improvement, adoption and commercialization of new processes, products, organizational structures and procedures” where it is argued that cognition, culture and motivation are indispensable to innovation (Jorde & Teece 1990 as cited in Kozlowski & Yamin 2007, p. 1). Innovation demands ‘unconventional individuals’ – rather than conventional science or engineering – to ensure success (Steiner 1995, p. 431).
For example, ‘better rat traps’ introduced within the Irula Tribe of Southeast India doubled the productivity and revenue by innovating the traditional ‘rat catching methods’. The old method of catching rats used clay-pots filled with burning straws to ‘smoke-out’ the rats, which had severe health impacts on heart, skin, eye and respiratory disorders. The new method used hand operated steel rat traps. Sethu Sethunarayanan, Director of Non-profit Centre for Development of Disadvantaged People boasts of the project success that was achieved: ‘commercialized the technology’ whilst ‘positively impacting the greatly disadvantaged people’ (Terjesen 2007, p. 953).

It is important to note that innovation can happen at numerous levels of the global society: developed and developing countries; as well as local, provincial, state, regional, global. It is estimated that one third of the world’s population live below poverty line of less than $2 a day. Yet these very same issues of ‘market failure’ (Coase 1974; Dean and McMullen 2006) can be identified as [innovative] ‘opportunities’ for entrepreneurs. India is considered to be the world’s ‘second most entrepreneurially [and thereby innovatively] active country’ with 17.9% of adult population involved in some kind of entrepreneurship (Reynolds, Bygrave, Autio & Hay 2002 cited in Terjesen 2007, p. 955).

With its entrepreneurial roots – especially social entrepreneurial roots – dating back as early as 1980s with the establishment of organizations such as Ashoka. In considering technology transfers (within the domain of technology entrepreneurship), one must take into account the notion of ‘appropriate technology’ in order to avoid negative consequences of excessive and inappropriate technology applications such as human displacement, resource depletion and increased pollution. Schumacher defines ‘appropriate technology’ as ‘technology that is suitable to the environment and culture, which is intended to support and is not excessively mechanized’ (cited in Terjesen 2007, p. 965).
As seen above, radical innovations arguably “transform existing markets, create new markets, and stimulate economic growth” (Marvel 2007, p. 807). However it is also stated that, “Not every idea is a good opportunity; What is interesting and what is commercially viable are two distinct considerations; Opportunities are nested within the realm of ideas, yet unlike simply ideas – opportunities exemplify the tension to make that reality come true/real (Dimov 2007, p. 718). To better understand radical innovation, one needs to deconstruct its processes through creativity.

Following on from the process of creativity, the natural next step is the process of innovation. Kuratko & Hodgetts identify four basic types of innovation – process: i) invention; ii) extension; iii) duplication; and iv) synthesis; as illustrated in Figure 2.5 (2004, p. 150). Inventions are about totally new products, services and/or processes which are ‘novel’ concepts. Extensions refer to expansions of existing products, services and processes. When existing products, services and processes are replicated in such a way to create improvements and changes it is called duplication. Synthesis occurs when both existing and new methods, products, services and processes are integrated together to create innovation.

**Figure 2.5: Four Basic Types of Innovation**

![Four Basic Types of Innovation Diagram](image)

Within this context, Marvel & Lumpkin argues that radical innovation is ‘positively associated with formal education and prior knowledge of technology’ but ‘negatively associated with prior knowledge of ways to serve markets’ (2007, p. 807). Knowledge – prior knowledge – within the empirical context has shown mixed results. Several scholars have argued positive relationships between prior knowledge and opportunity recognition (Corbett 2006; Ko & Butler 2006; Shane 2000; Shepherd & De Tienne 2005). Several others argue that “too much domain knowledge may in fact impede one’s ability to come up with unusual, outside-the-box solutions” (Frensch & Sternberg 1989).

2.2.3 Relationship between Creativity and Innovation

Author argues that too much knowledge is in fact a problem to innovate; jumping in the ‘deep end’ with optimism can sometimes reward positively and aid in the success of entrepreneurs. A study about how individuals innovate, conducted by Shepherd & De Tienne found that individuals with little prior knowledge were highly motivated to identify opportunities; whilst individuals with considerable prior knowledge were less motivated in innovative opportunity identification (2005, p. 106). Therefore within the process of innovation it is mandatory to have ‘just enough’ – rather than too little or too much – knowledge about a certain opportunity. In order to be innovative, both scenarios of ‘jack of all trades, master of none’ as well as ‘analysis by paralysis’ mentality must be discarded.

As illustrated below in Figure 2.6, arguably ‘jack of all trades, master of none’ can be the creative process – where an individual comes up with a vast array of ‘great ideas’ – where the ideas only remain as ideas, high-jacked by practical, financial, timely and various other constraints. Here, there isn’t adequate knowledge and/ or prior knowledge to ‘kick-start’ creativity towards innovation. Within organisations, these types of individuals are the ones who are very quick to come up with new ideas – almost on a daily basis – however are unable to carry it forward with adequate justification and rationale of how it benefits the overall mission.
Traditional ‘manager’ types on the other hand fall into the category of ‘analysis by paralysis’. Here, no matter what idea is being presented, it is analysed to extreme measures, usually taking a considerable amount of time. The outcome is often a host of negative reasons for why a new idea will not work, how expensive it’s going to cost, the unjustifiable risk conditions under which the idea needs to be applied and a host of other ‘well-analysed and rationalised’ factors of not wanting to go ahead. In such contexts, the extensive knowledge and/or prior knowledge also hinder the movement of creativity towards innovation.

Figure 2.6: Knowledge Impact on Creativity, Anti-Creativity and Innovation

In its empirical setting, organisations usually comprise of a mix of these two extremes. The two sides are often separated in such a way (within ‘traditional’ type settings), that neither party seems to understand the integrated nature of the creativity and innovation process. Within the emerging ‘learning organisation’ type settings, primarily operating within the ‘knowledge economy’ – continuous efforts are being made in order to fully integrate the two functions to facilitate the progress of organisations in positive directions by aligning and balancing the need for creativity and innovation together with practical realistic considerations.
However, the evidence to date suggest that most creative ideas are faced by a host of opposing forces, challenging the contemporary organisations’ ability to create and innovate. Most common idea stoppers are identified as “i) Naah; ii) Can’t; iii) That’s the dumbest thing I’ve ever heard; iv) Yeah, but if you did that . . . ; v) We already tried that – years ago; vi) We’ve done all right so far; Why do we need that? Vii) I don’t see anything wrong with the way we’re doing it now; viii) That doesn’t sound too practical; ix) We’ve never done anything like that before; x) Let’s get back to reality; xi) We’ve got deadlines to meet – we don’t have time to consider that; xii) It’s not in the budget; xiii) Are you kidding; xiv) Let’s not go off on a tangent; and xv) Where do you get these weird ideas” (Kuratko & Hodgetts 2004, p. 138).

To move beyond these idea stoppers that hinders creativity and innovation, organisations should emphasise its importance by conducting work shops and case studies – highlighting and role-modelling the ‘feedback’ behaviour without actually using the above mentioned ‘idea stoppers’. A good training exercise would be to conduct focus groups and workshops amongst organisational members: to organise them into smaller groups and encourage each member to come up with ‘new’ ideas; and then discuss within the group in terms of the role of creativity and innovation within the context of opportunity identification. Nature of opportunities are often elaborated as ‘creative products’ where “opportunities are considered to be emerging out of continuous shaping and development of raw ideas”; and “highlights the contextual and social influences that affect the generation and shaping of ideas” (Dimov 2007, p. 713).

The rule of the game should be that everybody else can comment and must comment on each person’s new idea, but without using words or expressions such as the fifteen listed above as ‘idea stoppers’. Scholars have identified various factors as instrumental for understanding individuality of creativity – “i) personality; ii) intrinsic motivation; iii) knowledge; and iv) cognitive skills and abilities” (Amabile 1996; Woodman & Schoenfeldt 1989 & 1990; as cited in Dimov 2007, p. 714). The facilitators of such programs need to be experienced enough to ‘draw out’ the learning aspects and to foster ‘new behaviours’ amongst group members and follow up with further continued reinforcements, ideally to attempt to make ‘cultural impact’. Once such systems are established, organisational members are better equipped to take advantage of ‘opportunities’ that flow on from the creative-innovative processes.
2.3 Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship

“There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, than to take a lead in the introduction of a new order of things, because the innovation has for enemies all those who have done well under the old conditions and lukewarm defenders in those who may do well under the new (Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince). Presenting creativity and innovation as the essence of entrepreneurship, author now embarks on a journey to explore the notion of business-commercial entrepreneurship which tends to be primarily focused on commercial missions, its processes, contextual factors, its development, anticipated challenges, emerging trends and the role of entrepreneur within the future global context. As illustrated below in Figure 2.7, studying entrepreneurs is a complex matter of knowledge, passion and fire – concepts that are very abstract, tacit and unique. To date, entrepreneurship remains a largely degree a misunderstood concept and seems to defy the traditional methods of scientific inquiry.

Figure 2.7: Anatomy of an Entrepreneur

Source: University of Waterloo, Centre for Business, Entrepreneurship and Technology (CBET) 2008 (http://www.cbet.uwaterloo.ca/Prospective_Students/index.html)
2.3.1 Definitions, Explanations, Developments of ‘Entrepreneurship’

The actual recognition of ‘entrepreneurs’ dates as far back as eighteenth-century France, when French economist Richard Cantillon integrated ‘risk-bearing’ activities with the country’s economy (Kuratko & Hodgetts 2004, p. 28). During the same time period, industrial revolution was being taken place in England and entrepreneur started to take a more visible role in risk-taking activities and the transformation of resources. Within its original context, entrepreneurship was associated with economics. According to Kuratko & Hodgetts, until the 1950s the majority of definitions and references in entrepreneurship derived from: French economist Richard Cantillan (1725); renowned French economist Jean Baptiste Say (1803); and twentieth-century economic genius Joseph Schumpeter (1934) (2004, p. 28).

Austin et al argues that the practice of entrepreneurship is dated back to ancient ‘trading between tribes and villages’; however, recent literature has focused on three main streams of research: i) impact and results – how to advance the economy as a whole (Schumpeter 1934); ii) entrepreneur him-herself – psychological and sociological view (Collins & Moore 1964; McClelland 1961); and iii) entrepreneurial management process – how to foster innovation and predict success (Burgelman 1983, 1984; Timmons & Bygrave 1986; Quinn & Cameron 1983; Cooper & Bruno 1975; Dollinger 1984) (2006, p. 4).

The word entrepreneur was originally adapted from French language – entreprendre – which had an original French meaning ‘to undertake’ (Kuratko & Hodgetts 2004, p. 28). Within such context, the concept of entrepreneur was identified as someone who undertakes to organize, manage and take risks of a business. Whilst this original meaning of entrepreneurship was defined quite ‘narrowly’; entrepreneurship as a field has been developing into multiple disciplines. As a result, its original meaning has been expanded and broadened to include the various academic and professional additions. Various authors/ scholars have attempted to define and explain the notion of ‘entrepreneurship’, ‘entrepreneur’ and related attributes as follows.
According to Stevenson, entrepreneurship is ‘the pursuit of opportunity beyond the tangible resources that you currently control’ suggesting that entrepreneurs usually ‘commit quickly, but tentatively’ and are ‘able to re-adjust as new information arises’ (1983 as cited in Austin et al 2006, p. 1). Wikipedia states entrepreneurship as the ‘practice of starting new organizations, particularly new businesses generally in response to identified opportunities’ (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entrepreneurship). Entrepreneurship is seen as a difficult undertaking with vast majority of new businesses failing to succeed. Entrepreneurial activities are identified as substantially different depending on the type of organization that is being started and ranges from a scale from solo projects (even involving the entrepreneur only part-time) to major undertakings creating vast job opportunities.

Contribution to the development/ understanding of much of twentieth century entrepreneurship owes to the work of Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter and Austrian School of Economics (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entrepreneurship). Schumpeter (1950) identified entrepreneur as a person who is willing and able to convert a new idea or invention into a successful innovation. The process of entrepreneurship was explained as a force of ‘creative destruction’ across markets and industries, simultaneously creating new products and business models. This creative destruction was attributed as largely responsible for the dynamism of industries and long-run economic growth.

Entrepreneurship was later expanded to integrate with ‘risk taking’ by Frank H. Knight (1967) and Peter Drucker (1970) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entrepreneurship). The ‘risk taking’ notion here is about entrepreneur’s willingness to put his or her career and financial security on the line and take risks in the name of an idea, where they exercise time, financial and other resources on uncertain ventures. Harding argues that ‘irrespective of national or socio-economic background, entrepreneurs are very distinctive as a group where they innovate, take risks and break rules (2006, p. 6).
Here there is an underlying assumption that entrepreneurs are internally focused (internal locus of control) and it is their attitude and mind-set that differentiates them from other ‘average’ human beings. According to Professor Howard Stevenson and Professor Jeffry Timmons, entrepreneurship is the ‘process of discovering, evaluating and exploiting opportunities, which emerge in the form of new business ventures’; where the entrepreneur is defined as ‘someone who acts with ambition beyond that supportable by the resources currently under his/ her control, in relentless pursuit of opportunity’ (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entrepreneurship).

Robert Sobel (1974) states that entrepreneurship is widely regarded as an ‘integral player in the business culture’ of American life and seen as an ‘engine for job creation and economic growth’. According to Kuratko & Hodgetts, an entrepreneur is ‘an innovator or developer who recognizes and seizes opportunities; converts those opportunities into workable/ manageable ideas; adds value through time, effort, money or skills; assumes the risks of the competitive marketplace to implement these ideas; and realizes the rewards from these efforts’ (2004, p. 28).

Entrepreneur according to Kuratko & Hodgetts is seen as the aggressive catalyst for change in the world of business. Entrepreneurs have emerged within both males and females through the common drive of independent thinkers daring to be different in a background of common events. Within the vast expansion of entrepreneurial research being conducted to date, the following themes are identified as standing out in literature: personal initiative; ability to consolidate resources; management skills; desire for autonomy; risk taking; aggressiveness; competitiveness; goal-oriented behaviour; confidence; opportunistic behaviour; intuitiveness; reality-based actions; ability to learn from mistakes; and human relations/ interpersonal skills.
According to Robert C. Ronstadt, entrepreneurship is the ‘dynamic process of creating incremental wealth, where the wealth is created by individuals who assume the major risks in terms of equity, time and/ or career commitment of proving value for some product or service – where the product or service itself may or may not be new or unique but value must somehow be infused by the entrepreneur by securing and allocating the necessary skills and resources’ (as cited in Kuratko & Hodgetts 2004, p. 28).

The process of entrepreneurship as well as the role of entrepreneur is often considered a ‘mystery’. As seen above there’s also a widely varying context of contrasting definitions within the literature. Amongst its diverse body of entrepreneurial knowledge, Kuratko & Hodgetts have attempted to clarify ten myths as illustrated in Table 2.4: Ten Myths of Entrepreneurship below (2004, p. 28).

As presented in Table 2.2, the entrepreneurial body of knowledge and the industry domains are still clouded with various contrasting and contradicting ideas about who entrepreneurs actually are? The reasons for the above-presented myths to a large degree can be attributed to the ‘fragmented’ and ‘embryonic’ nature of entrepreneurship developments. Entrepreneurs for example do not simply ‘jump into’ action without reflecting and thinking about the consequences. They take on very methodical and systematic approaches in their planning and each step along the way is carefully considered, reconsidered and sometimes abandoned. To consider entrepreneurs as ‘doers’ rather than ‘thinkers’ therefore is a general misunderstanding.
### Table 2.2: Ten Myths of Entrepreneurship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial Myth</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial Reality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs are doers, not thinkers</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs are both doers and thinkers, methodically planning their moves carefully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs are born, not made</td>
<td>Like all disciplines, entrepreneurship can be studied and the knowledge can be acquired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs are always inventors</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs have a complete understanding of innovative behaviour in all forms. E.g. Ray Kroc did not invent the fast-food franchise, but innovative ideas made McDonald’s the largest fast-food enterprise in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs are academic and social misfits</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs are considered heroes and professionals – socially, economically, and academically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs must fit the ‘profile’</td>
<td>There is no accepted standard entrepreneurial profile. The environment, the venture itself, and the entrepreneur have interactive efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>All entrepreneurs need is money</td>
<td>To entrepreneurs, money is a resource but never an end in itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>All entrepreneurs need is luck</td>
<td>What appears to be luck really is preparation, determination, desire, knowledge, and innovativeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ignorance is bliss for entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Careful planning – not ignorance of it – is the mark of an accomplished entrepreneur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs seek success but experience high failure rates</td>
<td>Failure can teach many lessons to those willing to learn and often leads to future opportunities and successes. E.g. 3M Corporation invented Post-it notes using a type of glue that had not been strong enough (had failed) for its intended use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs are extreme risk takers (gamblers)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs usually work on ‘calculated’ risk and are aware of their venture ‘calculations’; it so appears to others that entrepreneurs are careless ‘high risk takers’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entrepreneurs are closely associated with characteristics of trait theories of leadership (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entrepreneurship). However, there are two underlying inherent challenges within Trait Theory: 1. Trait based theories are increasingly called into question; and 2. numerous so called ‘made leaders’ – as opposed to ‘born/ genetical leaders’ – are continually proving to display entrepreneurial behaviours. According to one of America’s leading management thinkers – Peter F. Drucker – ‘Most of what you hear about entrepreneurship is all wrong. It’s not magic; It’s not mysterious; and it has nothing to do with genes. It’s a discipline, and just as any other discipline, it can be learned and taught’ (as cited in Kuratko & Hodgetts 2004, p. 20). These opportunities and developments in the field of entrepreneurship are expected to grow not only in the United States; but also within other parts of the world.

Building upon the Trait theories of management/ leadership arena, there is a common perception that entrepreneurs are born, and not made – suggesting that characteristics of entrepreneurs cannot be taught or learnt. This idea of entrepreneurs having innate traits genetically passed on from birth such as aggressiveness, initiative, drive, willingness to take risks, analytical ability, and human relation skills; while important and positive in accomplishing their dreams – can also be attained through a process of education, practice and observation.

Similar to various other disciplines such as chemistry, agriculture, management, leadership, mathematics and medicine: entrepreneurship can be learnt. Universities, vocational education frameworks, secondary schools and industry bodies all around the world has already accepted entrepreneurship as a formal academic discipline and it is being integrated into the overall social educational frameworks. As such, it is argued that entrepreneurship can be taught, learnt and practiced by individuals – regardless of their inborn talents and mindsets.
A significant portion of – but not necessarily all inventors – are entrepreneurs. When an individual who has come up with a revolutionary new design (an invention) decides to follow the invention through concept testing, market testing and commercialise the invention through the contemporary business context and patent frameworks: the roles of inventor and entrepreneur are both borne by the same individual. However entrepreneurs can simply buy, lease or adapt existing inventions and create ‘entrepreneurial ventures – without necessarily having the capacity/ will/ and drive to invent.

Inventions and innovations are in fact two very contrasting concepts as illustrated in Figure 2.8. Inventions are simply one type (partially complete) innovation, the possibility of the birth of new additions, without necessarily having an immediately foreseeable ‘benefit’ attached to it. For an invention to pass through the innovation stage, it must be integrated through the ‘process by which entrepreneurs convert opportunities into marketable ideas and the means by which they become catalysts for change’ (Kuratko & Hodgetts, 2004, p. 137). In other words, entrepreneurs may or may not be the original inventors, rather ‘entrepreneurs become the innovators of the invention’.

If we consider the example of McDonalds Corporation, Ray Kroc did not invent the fast food concept or the fast food franchise – it was already invented earlier. However, Ray Kroc through his innovative ideas did innovate the existing invention of ‘fast food franchises’ and commercialised this particular innovation to be the world’s largest fast-food enterprise. Hence a contemporary understanding of entrepreneurship covers more than mere invention.

As illustrated in Figure 2.9, Bolton & Thompson argue that entrepreneurs differ from ‘inventors’, ‘leaders’, ‘managers’ and ‘followers’ (2000, p. 45). It is stated that, within the context of entrepreneurs’ well of talent are ‘buried at different levels and emerge as external catalysts or through internal needs to exploit. Inventor talent is considered as the most deeply buried of all talents. Follower talent is considered to be the least buried and most easily tapped. Within these two extremes lie managers – enterprising, project champions, and leaders. Entrepreneurs are then presented as the next level.
Figure 2.8: Inventors, Innovators and Entrepreneurs
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Figure 2.9: Entrepreneurs’ Talent, Temperament, Technique
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There are numerous cases where individuals having dropped out of education systems; and consequently becoming world’s greatest examples of successful entrepreneurs. For example, Bill Gates dropped out of Harvard University to give birth to Microsoft; and Sir Richard Branson could not even read or write, yet gave birth to the Virgin Empire. However this neither means: that dropping out of education systems make entrepreneurs; nor that all entrepreneurs drop out of school. The result of several entrepreneurs becoming successful as stated above – especially in the earlier generations of 1980s and 1990s – is a result of the ‘temporal context’ of the entrepreneurial developments.

During the 1980s till the millennium, entrepreneurship was not well-recognised as a formal academic discipline; and the entrepreneurial body of knowledge was pretty much non-existent or at most was presented in the form of only tacit knowledge. Much has changed since then, where in the contemporary global context, entrepreneurship is being developed and is becoming well established academically and is seen as a career plan for many. The knowledge itself is also becoming a mix of both tacit and explicit knowledge. Today’s entrepreneurs are no longer considered academic misfits and/ or social misfits. On the contrary, they are considered professionals and heroes who contribute significantly to society, academia and economics.

Whilst numerous scholars such as Kuratko & Hodgetts have attempted to present checklists and characteristics of successful entrepreneurs (Appendix One – Entrepreneurial Quotient), there is no standard entrepreneurial profile as such. It is generally accepted that the environmental context, the venture itself, the industry, entrepreneurs’ interactive efforts and a whole host of other reasons as contributing factors in entrepreneurial developments and successes. Thus, a range of varying types of entrepreneurial profiles ranging from high-growth, technology, academia, small business, corporate and others have proliferated across both the academic body of knowledge as well as the practical domains.
Another misunderstood entrepreneurial concept is that ‘all entrepreneurs need is money’. Whilst it is true that ‘money’ is important in business ventures and entrepreneurs by an large seems to have more means of access to and resources in terms of actual funds and potential funds; entrepreneurs are not directly motivated or driven by money alone. As illustrated by the following Figure 2.10 - a survey conducted by Oxford University found that money only motivated twelve percent (12%) of high tech entrepreneurs; whereas independence (39%) and challenge (30%) coupled with a host of other factors (19%) were the main motivators (Oxford University 2008 – http://www.1000ventures.com/business_guide/crosscuttings/entrepreneur_main.html).

Figure 2.10: Main Motivations for High-Tech Entrepreneurs

A large number of business failures are also due to inadequate financing; where these ‘money problems’ are more to do with managerial incompetence, lack of financial competence and poor planning. Whilst it is true that ‘money’ seems to follow entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs tend to have a ‘lot of it’; entrepreneurs view money as the means or the resources to become ‘successful’ rather than as the ends in itself. Similarly, entrepreneurs do not rely on ‘luck’. For entrepreneurs, luck is ‘when preparation meets opportunity’, where they promptly seize the opportunity when it arises. This opportunistic behaviour coupled with preparation, determination, desire, adequate and appropriate knowledge often seems as ‘luck’ for others observing them. It’s just that that entrepreneurs are often ‘at the right place at the right time’ as a result of the creativity and innovation process; which distinguishes them from other categories – rather than being lucky.

Within the context of ‘money’ and ‘entrepreneurs’, venture capital is a type of ‘private equity capital typically provided by professional, outside investors to new, growth businesses’ (Wikipedia http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Venture_capital). Increases in Initial Public Offerings (IPOs) are often associated with the ‘dot com’ phenomenon (Daily et al 2003, p. 271). Within this domain, ‘networks’ and other informal institutions are replacing formal institutes of funding (Ahlstrom & Bruton 2006, p. 299). Agency Theory and Stewardship Theory are identified as theories that explain individual behaviour in ‘Venture-Capitalist Entrepreneur’ domain (Arthurs & Busenitz 2003, p. 145).

Several authors support the need for ‘localizing’ venture capital process. For example, Bruton, Fried & Manigart argue that venture capitalists in each country are subject to different institutional frameworks and forces (2005, p. 737). This idea is further elaborated by Cumming where it is argued that there are significant differences between countries based on ‘the variety of securities; instruments used; stage of development; type of industry; and capital requirements (2006, p. 155).
‘Optimal portfolio size’ (Jaaskelainen, Maula & Seppa 2006, p. 185); ‘Cross boarder aspects of venture capital’ (Makela & Maula 2006, p. 273); are considered an important aspect of venture capital decisions. Clercq & Sapienza identifies ‘Venture Capital Fund Learning’ and ‘Venture Capital Fund Trust’ as important aspects of venture capital decisions (2005, p. 517).

Signalling Theory states that New Venture Teams (NVT) can “communicate to venture capitalists and other potential investors both a value signal and a commitment signal, based on the level of personal investment in a venture (Busenitz et al 2005, p. 1). Based on Financial Theory implications, ‘value adding benefits’ through risk sharing, portfolio diversification and access to larger deals are considered important determinants of ‘venture capital syndication’ (Manigart 2006, p. 131).

Governance systems inbuilt within the venture capital domain are considered to be positively associated with entrepreneurial firm’s financial performance (Wijbenga et al 2007, p. 257). Wright, Pruthi & Lockett argue that institutional contexts, especially the role of social networks and cultures as an under-researched, yet important factor within the domain of venture capital funding (2005, p. 135).

Contrary to several scholars view, entrepreneurs could not be ‘ignorant’. Assessing venture strengths and weaknesses and careful strategy formulation are needed traits of entrepreneurs. It is the careful planning, analysis, follow up and control – rather than the ignorance of it – that makes entrepreneurs successful. During this journey of thriving towards success, entrepreneurs do tend to experience high ‘failure’ rates. However, for entrepreneurs’ ‘failures mean steps closer to success, where they learn many lessons through so called ‘failures’ and re-embark on their entrepreneurial pursuits; while others may decide to ‘give up’. Considering the example of 3M Corporation’s ‘failure’ of a ‘glue’ that had not been strong enough for its originally intended use; however was ‘innovatively’ commercialised as Post-It Notes; ‘failure’ does not always mean failure. It is very much a perceptive concept, whereby entrepreneurs tend to see a more positive and opportunistic slang, contributing to their success.
Risk taking – extreme risk taking such as in the cases of gamblers – is also (incorrectly) associated with entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs are not gamblers; rather ‘calculated’ or ‘moderated’ risk takers. As explained earlier, they follow through a systematic and carefully identified series of strategies to arrive at their intended destinations.

For the external observer, it may appear as if the entrepreneurs are taking ‘extreme risks’; the entrepreneur on the other hand sees it as an intelligent undertaking of a business-opportunity where resources, risk and return are integrated through the decision making process. In fact, entrepreneurs are different from that of gamblers as they attempt to minimise the risk involved in a particular situation as ‘best as possible’; try to control the unintended consequences of the ventures; and even formulate several secondary ‘back up’ plans to mitigate the negative potential consequences.

Building upon the arguments presented within Section 2.1, author presents the following synthesis as further elaboration to the differences amongst managers, leaders and entrepreneurs. Whist there is little evidence to contrast amongst traits, behaviours and contingency factors of entrepreneurs, leaders and managers; it seems that there are significant differences between entrepreneurs/leaders and managers. Managers as opposed to entrepreneurs/leaders are said to be very methodical/rational and less prone to risk-taking.

It is often argued that literature within the domain of entrepreneurship is: ‘young, formative, in its infancy’ (Paulin et al 1982; Perryman 1982; Peterson & Horvath 1982; Sexton 1982); and with ‘no generally accepted definitions’ (Churchill & Lewis 1986). Cunningham & Lischeron in an attempt to provide clarification on the ‘fragmented and highly controversial’ nature of entrepreneurship presents the following thematic summary of its developments – as illustrated by Table 2.3: Thematic Summary of Entrepreneurial Developments.
Table 2.3: Thematic Summary of Entrepreneurial Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘Great Person’ School</th>
<th>Psychological Characteristics School</th>
<th>Classical School</th>
<th>Managemen t School</th>
<th>Leadership School</th>
<th>Intrapreneur ship School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central focus/ purpose</strong></td>
<td>Sixth sense; Born instinct; Traits;</td>
<td>Unique values, attitudes, needs drive them;</td>
<td>Innovation;</td>
<td>Organizers of economic ventures;</td>
<td>Leaders of people;</td>
<td>Within organizations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td>Born only;</td>
<td>Satisfying needs;</td>
<td>Doing than owning;</td>
<td>Can be trained within mgt ‘functions’;</td>
<td>Need to depend on others;</td>
<td>Adapt to survive;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviour and Skills</strong></td>
<td>Intuition, vigour, energy, persistence, self-esteem;</td>
<td>Personal value, risk taking, Need for achievement;</td>
<td>Innovation, creativity, discovery;</td>
<td>Production planning, People organizing, Budgeting;</td>
<td>Motivating, directing, leading;</td>
<td>Alertness to opportunity, Maximise decisions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situations</strong></td>
<td>Start-up;</td>
<td>Start-up;</td>
<td>Start-up, Early growth;</td>
<td>Early-growth, Maturity;</td>
<td>Early-growth, Maturity;</td>
<td>Maturity, Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td>Extraordinary achievers;</td>
<td>Founder, Control over production;</td>
<td>Make innovations – ‘creative destructive’</td>
<td>Creating value, Management skills;</td>
<td>‘Social architect’, Value promotion &amp; protection;</td>
<td>Pull together to promote innovation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td>Personal principles, histories, experiences</td>
<td>Locus of control, tolerance of ambiguity, need for achievement</td>
<td>Decision making, Opportunity spotting, Creativity;</td>
<td>Expertise, technical knowledge &amp; plans;</td>
<td>Attitude, style; Management of people;</td>
<td>Decision making;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As presented above, entrepreneurship is being developed through six main ‘schools’: i) great person school; ii) psychological characteristics school; iii) classical school; iv) management school; v) leadership school; and vi) intrapreneurship school. Great person school is directly related to trait theories earlier in the chapter. ‘Born traits’ alone are suggested as creating ‘entrepreneurs’. This view has been criticised and abandoned by majority of the contemporary scholars. Psychological characteristics school on the other hand emphasise on the unique values, attitudes and needs of entrepreneurs as driving behaviour. Here the assumption is that entrepreneurs ‘do what they do’ as a direct result of their ‘need satisfying behaviour’. Classical school focuses on innovation aspects of entrepreneurship within the ‘creative destructive’ process while management school presents entrepreneurs as organisers of economic ventures. Finally leadership school presents them as leaders of people in comparison to intrapreneurship school focusing on entrepreneurial behaviour displayed within internal organisation boundaries.

While it is well-accepted that ‘trait theory’ is inadequate in explaining entrepreneurial behaviour; there is a growing interest amongst the scholars regarding particular traits such as that of ‘personality characteristics. However, the types of ‘personality characteristics’ discussed here do not necessarily need to be ‘genetical’; rather ‘traits’ that individuals are able to develop over time through education, practice and reflection.

These characteristics of entrepreneurs are debatable and the body of knowledge in this regard is also still in its developmental stages. Characteristics of entrepreneurship are generally identified as follows: i) enthusiastic vision, driving force of an enterprise; ii) vision supported by an interlocked collection of specific ideas not available to the marketplace; iii) blueprint to realize vision is clear, yet details may be incomplete, flexible and evolving; iv) promotes vision with enthusiastic passion; v) through persistence and determination, develops strategies to change vision to reality; vi) takes the initial responsibility to cause a vision to become a success; vii) takes prudent risks – by assessing costs, market/customer needs and persuade others to join and help; viii) usually a positive thinker and a decision maker (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entrepreneurship).

Some other scholars have taken a ‘de-constructionalist’ view of entrepreneurship where they try to ‘break the whole of ‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘entrepreneurs’ into pieces’/ sub-categories. For example, Bolton & Thompson in their entrepreneurial triangle, (Figure 2.11) divides the process of entrepreneurship into four broad activities: i) creating ideas; ii) going for opportunities; iii) building support; & iv) doing (2000, p. 38). Here, Opportunity Spotting is introduced as the creation of ideas and going for opportunities; Project-championing is introduced as building support and doing. Overall the triangle shows the uniqueness of entrepreneur as the integration of ‘creativity combined with ability’ to identify and pursue opportunities in a focused way. ‘Building support’ is identified as important, but not necessarily unique to the entrepreneur.

It is said that “the essence of entrepreneurship lies in the perception and exploitation of new opportunities in the realm of business . . . it always has to do with bringing about a different use of resources in that they are withdrawn from their traditional employ and subjected to new combinations” (Schumpeter 1928 cited in Filion 1997). The ability/inability withdraw from this ‘traditional employ’ can therefore be detrimental to entrepreneurial success or failure.
Figure 2.11: The Entrepreneurs’ Triangle


Kuratko & Hodgetts, have identified various pitfalls in selecting new ventures: lack of objective evaluation; no real insight into the market; inadequate understanding of technical requirements; poor financial understanding; lack of venture uniqueness; and legality (2004, p. 400). One distinctive element of entrepreneurship is the recognition and exploitation of opportunities where opportunities are defined as “future situations that the decision-makers deem personally desirable and feasible – within their control and competence” (Keh, Foo & Lim 2002, p. 125).

De Carolis & Saparito suggest entrepreneurial behaviour as ‘the result of interplay of environments (social networks) and cognitive biases in entrepreneurs; where both of these external and internal factors affect some and not others to exploit opportunities (2006, p. 41). ‘Recognition and exploitation of opportunities’ (De Carolis & Saparito 2006, p. 41) are identified as valuable within the entrepreneurial dimensions/ establishment of new ventures.
The question of why some individuals take advantage of opportunities, whilst others do not is a continuous debate among entrepreneurial literature. Psychological traits, identity, personality, demographic factors and various other internal and external factors are being researched in order to clarify further – the process by which entrepreneurs ‘identify opportunities and manage growth’. De Carolis & Saparito conclude that both external (social capital) and internal (cognition) affect why some exploit opportunity and others do not. The basis for this argument is primarily derived from social cognitive theory (Augoustinos & Walker 1995; Fiske & Taylor 1984; Bandura 1986; Wood & Bandura 1989, as cited in De Carolis & Saparito 2006).

Experiential learning theory has also been discussed as an important aspect of learning within entrepreneurs. According to Corbett, to get a more holistic understanding of the entrepreneurial process, researchers must take into account how individuals learn and how different modes of learning influence opportunity identification and exploitation (2005, p. 473). Within this context, connections between knowledge, cognition, creativity and ‘learning asymmetries’ were developed.

The literature on entrepreneurship and organizational learning is divided between two contrasting views: Schumpeterian and Kirznerian (Dutta & Crossan 2005, p. 425). Schumpeterian view is defined as “opportunities emerging out of the entrepreneur’s internal disposition to initiate changes in the economy through a process of creative destruction” (Dutta & Crossan 2005, p. 425). Here the notion is that entrepreneurs do not actually create and/ or discover opportunities; they simply take advantage of innovation.

Kirznerian view on the other hand is about “understanding of how individuals secure profits on the basis of knowledge and information gaps that arise between people” (Dutta & Crossan 2005, p. 430). Here, entrepreneurs are seen as ‘arbitrageur/ price adjuster’ who capitalizes on knowledge and/ or information asymmetries. Research within the opportunity domain include ‘learning styles’ (Dimov 2007; Lumpkin & Lichtenstein 2005);
As seen above, entrepreneurial body of knowledge is still in its developmental stages. Majority of the contributions to both academia and practice of entrepreneurship has occurred within mostly isolated and disintegrated contexts. However, more recently around 2004 – there’s growing discussions and initiatives of trying to integrate entrepreneurship globally such as in the case of Three-day Conference on ‘Entrepreneurship’ held in September 2003 at the Centre for Entrepreneurship of Durham Business School (2004, p. 413). Another body called Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) attempts to centralise much of the entrepreneurial movements and standardise the definitions, frameworks, explanations and measure entrepreneurial activities around the world.

Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) – the largest global entrepreneurial research consortium broadly defines entrepreneurship as follows: “any attempt at new business or new venture creation, such as self-employment, a new business organization, or the expansion of an existing business by an individual, teams of individuals, or established business” (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2005, p. 7). GEM measures global entrepreneurial activity using a standardised set of telephone questionnaire survey covering randomly selected adult population between the ages of 18-64.

As illustrated in Figure 2.12 (within this broader framework), GEM identifies four main categories of entrepreneurial activity in the world: i) Potential – dormant stage; ii) Nascent – start-ups between 0-3 months; iii) Baby – those active between 4-42 months; and iv) Established – active for more than 42 months (GEM Report 2007, p. 6).

Several other scholars have attempted to categories entrepreneur activities based on industrial type of work activities being conducted. Mosey & Wright for instance identifies three types of academic entrepreneurs with differing levels of entrepreneurial experience as i) nascent – dormant, not-yet-recognized talent; ii) novice – new, amateurs; and iii) habitual – experienced, serial entrepreneurs (2007, p. 909).
Entrepreneurship is often viewed as a ‘mind-set’ contrasting to simply carrying out a business and/or operating a business – beyond merely creating and executing businesses. According to Kuratko & Hodgetts entrepreneurial mindsets comprise of ‘characteristics of seeking opportunities, taking risks beyond security and having the tenacity to push an idea through to reality’ (2004, p.3). The entrepreneurial mindset can be exhibited inside or outside organizations both in profit as well as not-for-profit ventures. This mindset – as opposed to ‘simply operating businesses’ – is expected to revolutionize the way business is conducted at every level and in every nation. In order to explore this ‘entrepreneurial mind set’ further, author presents a synthesis of various ‘categories’ of the body of entrepreneurial literature within upcoming sections. Each of the following sections are also discussed in more detail in Chapter Five, as an integrated approach.
2.3.2 Small-to-Medium Enterprises (SMEs)

Entrepreneurship has a direct link with the *Small-to-Medium Enterprises (SMEs)* sector of organisations. The notion of ‘small’ and ‘medium’ in relation to *Small-to-Medium Enterprises (SMEs)* are debated within both the academic and industry contexts. Both qualitative and quantitative factors are considered to be important within this classification. Quantitative factors may involve the number of individuals employed by the organization; annual turnover of sales revenue; and various other statistical/numerical factors. Qualitative measure on the other hand could include the owner-management independence; capital being supplied by one/few individual(s); local proximity of operation; relative ‘smallness’ in comparison to large businesses; and various other subjective measures.

A small business is defined as an “independently owned and operated business, which is unlikely and not dominant in its field – and doesn’t engage in new or innovative practices” (Megginson et al 2003, p. 11); “independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field of operations” (US Congress, Small Business Act 1953). A small business owner is “someone who establishes a business primarily to further personal goals, including making a profit (Megginson et al 2003, p. 11). However entrepreneurs and goals of entrepreneurial ventures by contrast include “intensions of growth through innovation and strategic management” (Megginson et al 2003, p. 11).

In *Australia*, small businesses account for about 97 per cent of all private sector businesses and about 51 per cent of private sector employment (Australian Bureau of Statistics, ABS 1996 as cited in Johnson & Kells 1997, p. 215). The important fact to recognize here is that not all ‘small’ businesses are considered to be ‘entrepreneurial’ ventures. However, small sized ‘entrepreneurial ventures’ could be classified as a ‘small business’. As per Megginson’s definition above, a small business ‘does not necessarily engage in new or innovative practices’.
Research within the SME context include: Social networks (Bartholomew & Smith 2006); Entry Mode & Performance (Brouthers & Nakos 2004; Julien & Ramangalahy 2003; Nakos & Brouthers 2002); Governance (Dewald, Hall, Chrisman & Kellermanns; Fiegener 2005; Gabrielsson 2007); Education (Newby, Watson & Woodliff); Human Capital (Rauch, Frese & Utsch 2005); Knowledge Management (Thorpe, Holt, Macpherson & Pittaway 2004); and Growth (Wiklund, Davidson & Delmar 2003).

As illustrated by Table 2.4, the US Small Business Administration classifies businesses into four categories – very small, small, medium & large.

Table 2.4: US Small Business Administration – Business Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of employees employed</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20-employees</td>
<td>Very small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-99 employees</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-499 employees</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 or more employees</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Small Business Administration 2008

In recent years, due to globalization and related intensity of competition, more and more ‘small businesses’ are struggling to survive in their ‘niche’ ‘local’ markets. Small businesses which used to be ‘small’ by traditional definition are in a constant battle to become ‘entrepreneurial’ as a desperate attempt to become more globally active. In an era where we are entering a ‘one world market’ (Megginson et al 2003, p. 18), ‘small businesses’ need to differentiate themselves and defend their strategic positions in order to move forward.
2.3.3 Family-Controlled-Owned-Businesses (FCB/ FOB)

Literature within the Family Owned-Operated Businesses (FOBs)/ Family Controlled Businesses (FCBs) span across multiple dimensions: Agency costs, Strategic Management and conceptual issues (Chrisman, Chua & Sharma 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006; Corbetta & Salvato 2004; Dyer 2003; Ensley 2006; Ensley & Pearson 2005; Habbershon 2006; Heck 2004; Kellermanns 2005; Klein, Astrachan & Smyrnios 2005; Morck & Yeung 2003); Social justice within family firms (Carsrud 2006; ); Family influence (Cliff & Jennings 2005); Family Business Education (Hoy 2003; Steier & Ward 2006); Conflict and Control (Kellermanns & Eddleston 2004; Morck & Yeung 2004); Corporate Entrepreneurship within Family Firms (Kellermanns & Eddleston 2006); Competition and competitive advantage (Le Breton-Miller & Miller 2006; Lockwood 2007); Managing Resources (Sirmon & Hitt 2003); Organizational Culture (Zahra, Hayton & Salvato 2004); and Altruism (Karra, Tracey & Phillips (2006).

A family business is defined as “a company in which two or more members of the same family share ownership or work together in its operation” (Longnecker et al 2003, p. 768). Generally, family business ownership is passed on from one generation to another. As illustrated by Figure 2.13, family businesses are introduced as encompassing ‘three main circles/ aspects’.

Figure 2.13: The Three Circles Model of Family Business

Kesner & Sebora (1994); Le Breton-Miller, Miller & Steier (2004); Sharma & Irving (2005) attribute ‘Succession research’ to industry, social and family context; thereby integrating the ‘social’ and ‘family’ elements. Various authors (Le Breton-Miller, Miller and Steier 2004 as cited in Bagby (2004, p. 330); Nordqvist 2005; indicates that succession is more critical in family business-owned businesses (FOBs) due to the limited pool of incumbents inherent in FOBs. Barnett & Kellermanns states that ‘level of family influence impacts the justice perceptions of non-family employees primarily through its effect on the human resource (HR) practices within family firms (2006, p. 837). Their study found that high levels of family influence tend to have negative effects on the fairness of HR decision processes and outcomes.

*Family-owned businesses* are said to have ‘governance advantages’ in their propensity for ‘value creation’ (Carney, M. 2005, p. 855). Drawing upon the ‘resource based view’ of firms, these governance advantages are linked to firm ‘competitive advantage’ within a context of facilitating the creation and utilization of ‘social capital’. Carney further states that there are severe ‘social and economic constraints on families that limit their growth and longevity’ (2005, p. 260). Carney concludes that ‘social capital of entrepreneurs with high reputation may be associated with increasing returns’ (2005, p. 261).

### 2.3.4 Women Entrepreneurs

Women consist of 30% (6.7 million) of all private firms in US; own 50% share (10.1 million) of such enterprises; generates revenue in excess of 1.2 trillion; and employs 19.1 million employees (Centre for Women’s Business Research, 2004). Whilst it is true that women in most countries are starting businesses at a lower rate than men (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor – GEM 2004; Langowitz & Minniti 2007;), women participation on average is greater than 30% (Minitti, Arenius & Langowitz 2005 as cited in Bruin et al 2006). Overall, entrepreneurship is still considered a ‘male field’ (Wilson et al 2007, p. 387).
Within this ‘male field’, it is recommended that partnering with a male counterpart is likely to provide female entrepreneurs with ‘increased legitimacy, access to a large number of resources and a stronger, more diverse social network’ (Godwin et al 2006). According to Langowitz & Minniti, women tend to ‘perceive themselves and the entrepreneurial environment in a less favourable light than men across all countries’ regardless of their intrinsic entrepreneurial motivation/ drive (2007, p. 341). Hence the ‘perception’ aspect of entrepreneurship is considered to be significant within the domain of male-female entrepreneurship and related gender-bias.

Similarly, ‘expectancies’ – based on expectancy theory and social psychology – is considered an important factor whereby women arguably have ‘differing socialization experiences’ and ‘conceive of their new venture growth differently’ (Manolova et al 2007, p. 407). Whilst there is an underlying assumption of the need for a ‘male counterpart’ for women business success, various other authors suggest that there are only marginal differences between male and female investors and hence limited validity of previous theorists (Harrison & Mason 2007, p. 445).

Research within the domain of women entrepreneurs has showed tendency to ‘recreate the idea of women as being secondary to men and of women’s businesses as being of less significance or, at best, as being a complement’ (Ahl 2006, p. 595). It is suggested that new research directions within this domain should capture and represent richer aspects of women entrepreneurship, rather than to reproduce subordination. A survey based on 95 senior undergraduate students, 189 entrepreneurs in two high-technology industries found that although men and women utilize fundamentally different approaches and processes to identify opportunities, neither process is inherently superior (De Tienne & Chandler 2007, p. 365).
Several authors suggest the need to bridge the ‘practice of entrepreneurship’ with ‘body of theory’ (Bruin, Brush & Welter 2007). Alsos et al suggests of ‘possible funding gaps’ for women entrepreneur domain; Women in general tend obtain significantly less financial capital to develop their new businesses; this low financial capital base is associated with lower early business growth (2006, p. 667). Watson contradicts this view of women business ‘failures’ suggesting that high failure rates among women entrepreneurs – once controlled for the effects of industry/industry bias – is marginal/non significant (2003, p. 262). Carter et al states that women-owned businesses experience both ‘lower levels of overall capitalization’ and ‘lower rations of debt finance’ (2007, p. 427).

Marlow & Patton suggests that ‘women entrepreneurs entering self-employment are disadvantaged’ within both informal and formal business funding domains (2005, p. 717). Orser, Riding & Manley contradicts – or at least moderates – this view and states that women business entrepreneurs are “equally likely as men to seek all types of external financing, except for external equity capital” (2006, p. 643). Within the corporate governance context, women tend to have limited participation as directors, Chief Executive Officers (CEO) and Board Chairs. Within high-growth and high-technology organizations there is ‘significantly less’ women participation (Nelson & Levesque 2007, p. 209).

Yet, there are numerous examples of successful women entrepreneurs all over the globe. For example, Radha Jalan of ElectroChem, Inc. – President of a global supplier of fuel cell technology – turned around a near-impossible mission into a very profitable venture. Within ten years, in 2002, Radha had ‘decreased the company’s large debt, freed herself from the failed angel investor relationship, achieve four consecutive years of profits and generated revenue in excess of $2 million in 2001 (Amatucci & Coleman 2007, p. 971). Interestingly and admirably, Radha had also managed to balance her personal/family life whereby her daughters also graduated with University degrees.
Cynthia Riggs – Founder/CEO of Making It Big (MIB), manufacturer of large sized clothing for women – generated sales in excess of $2.3 million with an average yearly increase of 12 percent per year over 10 years (Winn 2004, p. 487). Monika Forejtova – Founder of one of Czech Republic’s reputable law firms – grew a home based practice into one with 13 employees, 4 lawyers and a full time receptionist (Winn 2006, p. 715).

A study based on eight European nations (European Community Household Panel Survey for 1994-1999) indicates that ‘caring for children significantly reduces the duration of self-employment ventures, for both males and females – and recommends improvements to child care policies at industry level’ (Williams 2004, p. 467). Radha’s success as discussed above is extraordinary and arguably challenges ‘suggested women’s inferiority within the entrepreneurship domain’ such that she had in fact continuously displayed ‘pure entrepreneurial’ behaviours of ‘relentlessly pursuing new opportunities’.

Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) research states that countries with ‘higher overall levels of entrepreneurial activity’ tend to create ‘higher relative proportions of female participation’ (Baughn et al 2006, p. 687). This suggests that as entrepreneurial activity grows within a country, there is a higher chance of ‘gender balance’ and more opportunities for women than traditional means.

Overall, whilst there’s mixed evidence for success and failure rates of women entrepreneurs; Wilson, Kickul & Marlino offers ‘entrepreneurship education’ as an ‘equalizer’ that has potential to ‘reduce the limiting effects of low self-efficacy and ultimately increase the chances of successful venture creation’ within the women entrepreneurship domain (2007, p. 387).

2.3.5 International Entrepreneurship

International entrepreneurship is defined as: “a combination of innovative, proactive, and risk-seeking behaviour that crosses national boarders and is intended to create value in organizations” (McDougall & Oviatt 2000); “business organizations that, from inception seek to derive significant competitive advantage from the use of resources and the sale of outputs in multiple countries” (Oviatt & McDougal 1994).
Oviatt & McDougall identified various influences on the speed of entrepreneurial internationalization: enabling technology; opportunity; competition; knowledge; and relationships (2005, p. 537). It is suggested that ‘entrepreneurs need to broaden their strategic thinking’ (Cloninger & Oviatt 2007, p. 233). Whilst younger, newer firms are adapting ‘internationalization strategies’ for their ventures; they may be overlooking the influence of broader strategic thinking to include both product and service content on internationalization.

2.3.6 Home-Based Businesses

U. S. Census Bureau defines homemakers as “individuals who perform duties at a place of residence that include keeping house (making beds, doing laundry, washing dishes) and preparing meals” (Singh & Lucas 2005, p. 79). Here it is stated that there is no real “unique profile of successful entrepreneurs”: they basically “come in all shapes and sizes”. Research within the domain of home based businesses is very limited (Sing & Lucas 2005, p. 79). The study concludes that activities within the domain of homemaker entrepreneurs are increasing due to technology, changing socio-cultural-demographic values and rising female educational levels.

Within the entrepreneurial context, home-based businesses have increased due to various reasons: increased participation of women in the workforce; as a solution for individuals looking for a work-life balance; increased awareness and success stories of home based entrepreneurs and their start-up ventures; and a host of other factors.

The following are identified as important issues to consider in deciding to set up a Home Based Business: difficulty is separating work and family life in home-office; space adequacy and appropriateness to accommodate both domestic and business needs in the physical premises – home; home business owners are not taken ‘seriously’ by clients; physical, emotional and domestic continuous interruptions in carrying out ‘business’ activities at home; lack of privacy; strain on family relationships; excessive work, leading to ‘burn outs’; feeling of ‘isolation’; issues of self-discipline and self-management; and ‘red tape’ around home-based business set up, rules, policies and procedures imposed by governments (http://www.powerhomebiz.com/vol14/topten.htm).
'Dos’ of home based businesses are suggested as the following: Specializing in a single product or service; Getting family involved in the intended business; Installing a credit card purchasing function on the website; Preparing written business plans before starting; Preparing 12-month cash flow projections before actual commencement; Taking classes on shortcomings; Starting small to gain credentials and experience; Building search engine placement rankings; Starting tax deferred retirement plans (http://www.2minutecommute.com/).

‘Do nots’ of home based businesses are suggested as the following: Don’t quit existing job; If there’s a real need to quit, at least hold off ‘quitting’ till all preparations are complete; Don’t compete with current employer; Don’t conduct business on employers ‘time’; Don’t sign any agreements without expert advice and representation; Don’t initiate importing without expert advice; Don’t be in a rush to get started, use a start-up check-off list; Don’t incur unreasonable liabilities in financial obligations and dealings; Don’t think it’s too late to start; Don’t overlook business insurance and health insurance (http://www.2minutecommute.com/).

According to a survey of 172 home based businesses in a rural Midwestern USA, rural home-based businesses are mainly owned and operated by females (Carter, R. B., Van Auken, H. E. & Harms, M. B. 1992, pp.245-257). The study concluded that female-owned home-based businesses are larger than those owned by males—suggesting an increased growth in business ownership-operation.

Carter et al (1992) suggests that the business ownership in the majority of female owned-operated ventures tend to be ‘sole proprietorships’ in ‘craft’ related businesses, where it is argued that personal savings account for most of the start-up capital in female owned-operated businesses. Another study conducted by Barbara R. Rowe, George W. Haynes and Marion T. Bentley (1993) of 620 home-based businesses showed financial success. This financial success was attributed to personal and family characteristics of the owner-operators of the businesses. Home-Based Enterprises (HBE) are recognized as one of the main components of national economy. According to a study conducted by Strassmann (1987) in Peruvian, Sri Lankan and Zambian home-based-enterprises: HBEs were found to be effective resource mobilizers and tend to increase gross national product (GNP).
According to a study conducted by Edwards & Field-Hendrey (2002), fixed costs of working at home are less than the fixed costs of working on-site. Women who have small children; women with disabilities; women in rural areas; and women in industries where fixed costs of starting-up/ operating a business is high are most likely to contribute to the growth in home-based businesses (Edwards & Hendrey et al 2002).

Home based businesses in U.S. contribute to in excess of 10% of all receipts of the small-business sector (Phillips, B. D. 2002). Interestingly, firms that gross $1 million have employees working from home. Working from home is increasingly becoming very convenient and feasible for Americans for many reasons. According to Link Resources’ National Work-at-Home Survey (as cited in Soldressen et al 1998), the number of Americans working full time or part time from home grew from 23 million in 1988 to 41.1 million in 1993.

According to Soldressen et al (1998) more people are turning to home-based businesses in order to have more control in their lives in both work and leisure activities. Mass production, modern technology, and the rise of large corporations are identified as having created ‘isolation’ and ‘im-personalization’ among employees.

2.3.7 Corporate Entrepreneurship/ Intrapreneurship

Corporate entrepreneurship is considered to be ‘an important segment’ (Dess, Lumpkin & McGee 1999; Hisrich 1990; as cited in Corbett & Hmieleski 2007, p. 103); where it is defined as ‘type of proactive behaviour through which organizations seek several outcomes such as the creation of a new organization, instigation of innovation, and strategic renewal’ (Sharma & Chrisman 1999 as cited in Kuratko et al 2005, p. 709). Corporate entrepreneurship is also referred to as Intrapreneurship. According to Pinchot (1985), intrapreneurship is ‘entrepreneurial-like activities inside organizations and government; ‘practice of entrepreneurial skills and approaches by or within an established organization; whereby employees may be engaged in a special project within a larger firm and behave as entrepreneurs’ (Wikipedia http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entrepreneurship).
 Whilst the roots of intrapreneurship said to date back to 1976, the term’s original usage was by Burgelman in 1983 followed by Gifford Pinchot in 1985. Corporate Venturing – defined as ‘entrepreneurial efforts in which established businesses invest in and/ or create new businesses (Sharma & Chrisman 1999)’ – is another term used to identify corporate entrepreneurship (Covin & Miles 2007, p. 183). Within the context of the above definitions, corporate entrepreneurship relies on the resources and capabilities of an existing organization, yet try to move traditional-static organizations to be more competitive, agile and market based. Intrapreneurs focus on creativity and innovation just as mainstream entrepreneurs in their pursuits of transforming ideas into opportunities and then to successful ventures through commercialization.

3M is often identified as an intrapreneurial company where through increased freedom, flexibility and empowerment, its employees are encouraged to be creative, innovative and nurtured to commercialize new ideas. Google is also an example of an intrapreneurial organization pursuing similar strategy. Within the pharmaceutical corporations’ entrepreneurial ventures, the failure rates tend to be very high – where it is estimated that only one out of five thousand initiations actually reach commercialization (Evans & Varaiya 2003, p. 87). These failure rates however are arguably industry-specific and are the results of various factors, rather than merely problems associated with corporate entrepreneurship.

On the contrary, corporate entrepreneurship is often identified as the natural extension and a ‘long-term survival strategy’ (Hoy 2006, p. 831); considered ‘essential for profitability and growth’ (Zahra et al 2006, p. 541); suggesting renewal through innovation to avoid decay of organizations. In order to achieve these organizational goals, Kuratko et al links ‘middle-managers entrepreneurial behaviour’ with Corporate Entrepreneurship (2005, p. 699). Based on agency theory, equity theory and expectancy theory, the involvement of middle managers are of paramount importance in corporate entrepreneurship. Middle managers acting as the ‘agents’ between owners, senior managers, first line managers and workers are crucial in exhibiting entrepreneurial behaviours within organizations.
Arguably, entrepreneurial behaviour is growing within the large *Multi-National Enterprises* (*MNE*), moving away from the traditional, centralized, hierarchical set up of little decision-making capability at subsidiary level (Williamson 1985); where modern *MNEs* are adapting corporate entrepreneurship to cater for ‘differentiated networks’ (Rugman & Verbeke 2003) and dynamic-complex global environments. *MNEs* continue to dominate the world economy with annual global sales in excess of $18 trillion, providing employment to over 53 million individuals (UNCTAD 2003) – where the largest 500 *MNEs* account for over 90% of *Foreign Direct Investments* (*FDI*) and world trade (Rugman 2000 cited in Verbeke et al 2007, p. 585).

*M Marvel et al suggest five conditions for supporting corporate entrepreneurship: i) rewards; ii) management support; iii) resources including time; iv) macro organizational structures; and v) risk acceptance (2007, p. 753). Creating a culture of ‘intrinsic motivation to innovate’ can be attributed to high levels of innovative behaviours and consequent corporate entrepreneurial endeavours. *Shepherd & Krueger* extends these conditions in terms of ‘group’ and ‘individual’ context, where they argue that both team as well as individual considerations are necessary for corporate entrepreneurial developments (2002, p. 167).

### 2.3.8 Summary of ‘entrepreneurial’ evolution. Growth, Survival

Entrepreneurship has an inherent risk element that sometimes can cause the venture to move towards destruction. Various aspects such as external/ internal environmental conditions, personality and identity of entrepreneurs themselves as well as a host of other direct/ indirect factors are identified as the causes of such destruction. *Christine Nazarenus* faced one such experience where she described her frustration as having ‘so many things seemed outside her control’ (Bell & Winn 2003, p. 173). *Community Web* is an example of an internet start-up firm which struggled to survive due to ‘tech wreck of April 2000’ and various other economic and competitive factors (Kuratko & Mathews 2004, p. 291). They had experienced heavy financial pressures and legal problems, crippling the organization and following the legacy of so many internet firms who experienced similar problems during this time period.
At Razorfish – an organization which originally achieved global success within 5 years – was faced with increased competition, declining demand and conditions relating to economic recession and threatened the mere existence and survival (Forbes & Pavone 2006, p. 561). In another similar case, John Webley, Founder/Chairman of Turin Networks faced challenges of ‘increasing shortage of skilled technical talent’, ‘lawsuits over intellectual property’; where he commented about the challenges as ‘The game is just beginning and people don’t know what’s coming’ (Gilinsky, Jr 2002, p. 77). As entrepreneurial ventures grow, they may need new – possibly external – management to drive the businesses forward. At Proceedo organization in a similar context, the Founders searched for a new CEO to push the next levels of growth (Koning & Maravanyika 2004, p. 249).

Regional differences are identified as a factor for new business creations. A study based in the United Kingdom between 1994 to 2001 found that ‘regional differences account for: i) variations in industrial structure; and ii) variations across regions’ (Johnson 2004, p. 431). ‘Past experiences’ are considered to have an impact on entrepreneurial behaviour and leadership styles (de Vries & Florent-Treacy 2003, p. 299). Stability and growth of ventures – especially in the case of Small to Medium Enterprises (SMEs) are linked to firm’s ‘strategic orientation’ (Liao et al 2003, p. 63). Within turbulent environments, ‘well developed external knowledge acquisition capability’ and ‘proactive-prospector strategies’ are considered to be positively linked to survival and growth.

‘Behavioural integration’ of entrepreneurial management teams is identified as a moderator in overall firm growth (Reuber & Fischer 2002, p. 29). In its practical application, arguably, SMEs in global multi-domestic industries should only consider ‘internationalization strategies’ with full top management support and effective integration. ‘Extraordinary high growth’ however is often associated negatively – or at least neutral to – firm survival and profitability. A study based on 500 Inc. listed companies found that ‘extraordinary high growth – in terms of sales and number of employees – was not related to firm profitability’ (Markman & Gartner 2002, p. 65). Here, extraordinary high growth was identified as “sales growth rates of 500 percent to 31,000 percent over five years”.
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‘Virtual embedded-ness’ – the “establishment of inter-organizational connections through use of electronic technologies” is considered to be positively associated to firm survival and “decrease the liabilities of newness associated with a new venture’s need to create and manage new roles and systems” (Morse et al. 2007, p. 139). “Collective cognition mediates between individual cognitions and firm actions and performance” (West 2007, p. 77). Within the context of business behaviour, “trust is based on a perception of the probability that other agents will behave in a way that is expected” (Gambetta 1988 as cited in Welter & Smallbone 2006). ‘Dissatisfaction with life’ and ‘Dissatisfaction with the way democracy works’ considered to ‘influence self-employment’ (2004, p. 447).

Enterprise education programs are considered to have a positive impact on the success of new ventures. For example, a study conducted on Young Achievement Australia (YAA) program in Australia reported ‘significantly higher perceptions of both desirability and feasibility’ as a result of the educational component of the program (Peterman & Kennedy 2003, p. 129). Within the context of entrepreneurial learning, Politis identifies three main components, i) career experience; ii) transformation process; and iii) entrepreneurial knowledge; (2005, p. 399). Contrary to the majority view, Schjoedt suggest that it is not necessarily the ‘dissatisfied employees’ who leave their employment in order to commence new ventures; it is actually the happy, satisfied employee who do (2007, p. 748).

As presented within Section 2.3: Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship is being developed rapidly in the global context spanning its categories within academic and industry sectors. The social implications of entrepreneurship are often referred to as Social Entrepreneurship (SE). Next, author presents a synthesis of social entrepreneurial literature including its definitions, explanations, developments and relevance to the contemporary global context.
2.4 Social-Community Entrepreneurship

“Managers who fail to provide proper leadership and to institute systems that facilitate ethical conduct share responsibility with those who conceive, execute, and knowingly benefit from corporate misdeeds” (Lynne Sharp Paine, Managing for Organizational Integrity, Harvard Business Review). This section presents a synthesis of social entrepreneurship – creating social change; and social entrepreneurs – individuals tackling primarily social issues with entrepreneurial spirits. This field was originally developed from organizations other than for-profits and government sector – typically known as non-profit, not-for-profit, non-governmental-development-organisations (NGDOs), charities, social ventures and community-led-social-ventures. Whilst the average person may not differentiate amongst these terms, as illustrated below in Table 2.5, Haugh argues that there are fundamental differences within them: i) charities; ii) social ventures; and iii) community-led social venture (2007, p. 161).

Charities are considered to be the most basic form of non-profits with a narrower focus consisting of individual projects to help specific target groups on a micro level. Social ventures on the other hand, fundamentally intend to generate social, economic and environmental value through trading. Community-led-social-ventures focus on the local community – at the same time maintaining their overarching ‘social goals’ through community projects. Another clear distinction between ‘charities’ and ‘social ventures’ are such that ‘charities’ rely on simply philanthropy, donations, grants and sponsorship; whereas ‘social ventures’ extend their sources of capital to include commercial debt and retained profits.

Musa introduces a NGO Continuum where NGOs are categorised as: i) fully NGOs; ii) semi-NGOs; iii) semi-governmental organizations; and iv) fully governmental organizations (2001, p. 1). These four types are further expanded through its geographical proximity/ influence: local, provincial, national, regional and international; where it is argued that non governmental organizations are gaining increased momentum and influence in world affairs.
### Table 2.5: Comparison of Social Entrepreneurial Ventures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For-profits</th>
<th>Charities</th>
<th>Social Ventures</th>
<th>Community-led Social Ventures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td>Market driven, Economy value, Financial surplus</td>
<td><strong>Charitable</strong> purpose</td>
<td>Economic, <strong>social</strong> and/or environmental value</td>
<td>Economic, social and/or environmental value for <strong>local</strong> community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Market</strong></td>
<td>Market demand, Individual benefit</td>
<td>Disadvantaged individuals, community and/ or society</td>
<td>Disadvantaged individuals, community and/ or society</td>
<td>Disadvantaged individuals, community and/ or society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of capital</strong></td>
<td>Commercial debt, equity, VC, retained profit</td>
<td>Philanthropy, donations, grants, sponsorship</td>
<td>Philanthropy, donations, grants, sponsorship, <strong>Commercial debt</strong>, <strong>Retained surplus</strong></td>
<td>Philanthropy, donations, grants, sponsorship, <strong>Commercial debt</strong>, <strong>Retained surplus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrepreneurial Activities</strong></td>
<td>Trading to generate profit</td>
<td><strong>Individual projects</strong> to achieve mission</td>
<td>Trading to achieve mission and generate surplus</td>
<td>Community projects and trading to achieve mission and generate surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources</strong></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Employees and volunteers</td>
<td>Employees and volunteers</td>
<td>Employees and volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Resources</strong></td>
<td>Purchased at market rate</td>
<td>Purchased at market rate, below market rate and/ or donations</td>
<td>Purchased at market rate, below market rate and/ or donations</td>
<td>Purchased at market rate, below market rate and/ or donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance Structure</strong></td>
<td>Owners, executive board</td>
<td>Board of trustees</td>
<td>Board of trustees</td>
<td>Board of trustees, Representatives of <strong>community stakeholders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>Board of directors, Shareholders</td>
<td>Board of trustees, stakeholders</td>
<td>Board of trustees, stakeholders</td>
<td>Board of trustees, community stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Haugh, H. 2007 “Community Led Social Venture Creation”, *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Baylor University, p. 166
Traditionally two views of social responsibility exist: i) classical view of maximising profits; and ii) socioeconomic view of protecting and improving society’s welfare. Later developments expanded these two views into three categories: i) social obligation; ii) social responsiveness; and iii) social responsibility. More recently, the *Greening of Management* approach presents four types: i) legal; ii) market; iii) stakeholder; and iv) activist (Robbins & Coulter 2005, p. 100).

Due to the increasing number and complexity of global environmental problems as well as the ‘white water rapids context’ – where organizations are continuously struggling to ‘manoeuvre their ventures in uncertain rapids’ – overly structured/ slow firms are finding it hard to survive. Arguably, this type of environment was common to firms within ‘technology based’ and ‘high growth’ industries. However, in today’s context, all organizations: small and large; new and established; local and global; are facing ‘white water rapid’ environments. In order to survive these chaotic and dynamic world conditions, organizations are expected to innovate, adapt, and be flexible.

*Social Entrepreneurship (SE)* – similar to *Mainstream Entrepreneurship* – is also a generally misunderstood concept. The concept of social entrepreneurship ‘means different things to different people’: i) ‘not for profit alternatives in search of alternative funding strategies or management schemes to create social value’ (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skinner 2003; Boschee 1998); ii) ‘socially responsible practice of commercial businesses engaged in cross-sector partnerships’ (Sagawa & Segal 2000; waddock 1988); and iii) ‘alleviate social problems and catalyse social transformation’ (Alvord et al 2004) cited in (Dees 1998).

Peredo & McLean state that social entrepreneurship is ‘not a tidy concept’ (2006, p. 63); ‘currently lacks awareness and credibility due to still being in its infancy stage’ (Roberts & Woods 2005, p. 45). Social entrepreneurship is often related to *Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)*, where CSR is defined as “a concept whereby companies integrate social environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis” (Prieto-Carron et al 2006, p. 977).
Objectives of social economy enterprise is seen as ‘giving support and services to the members of the society’ (Martins 2007, P. 86) – helping to find responses to social change. Here social entrepreneurship is seen as a new way of dealing with existing dynamic and complex social problems. Nicholls argues ‘triple bottom line’, ‘social auditing’ and ‘balanced score cards’ as having associations with social entrepreneurship (2005, p. 8).

Social Entrepreneurship is defined as “ethical obligations to customers, employees, and the general public” (Longnecker et al 2003 p. 774); “rapidly growing number of organizations that have created models for efficiently catering to basic human needs that existing markets and institutions have failed to satisfy, combining the resourcefulness of traditional entrepreneurship with a mission to change society” (Seelos & Mair 2005, p. 1). Examples of social entrepreneurial organizations include The Institute for One World Health, first US based non-profit pharmaceutical company; and Sekem, an Egyptian based poverty eradicating organization.

Social Entrepreneurship is sometimes referred to as Civic Entrepreneurship – especially within the context of municipalities (Leadbetter 1997; Osborne & Gaebler 1992; Timmons 1989; Young 1997; cited in Korosec & Berman 2006, p. 448). Municipalities are reportedly helpful to social entrepreneurs in providing services such as: increased awareness of issues; helping acquire resources; coordinating/ networking with other stakeholders; and through implementation.

Social entrepreneurs are defined by Dees (1998) more broadly as: i) “adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value); ii) recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that market; iii) engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning; iv) acting boldly without being limited to resources currently on hand; and v) exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created”.
Chapter Five – Discussion & Conclusion

As illustrated by Table 2.6, Weerawardena & Mort presents a summary of social entrepreneurial literature in chronological order (2006, p. 23).

Table 2.6: Summary of Social Entrepreneurship Literature (chronological order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Focus or objective(s) of the paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Roberts (1987)</td>
<td>Impact of public sector entrepreneur;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddock &amp; Post (1991)</td>
<td>Defines who SEs are &amp; what they do;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell (1997)</td>
<td>Prescription for developing new social-purpose businesses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henton et al. (1997)</td>
<td>Contribution of civic entrepreneurs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadbeater (1997)</td>
<td>Use of SE to provide services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall (1998)</td>
<td>Social impact of entrepreneurs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dees (1998a)</td>
<td>Defining SE; SE’s role as change agents;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dees (1998b)</td>
<td>Strategies for NFPs to obtain funding;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabhu (1998)</td>
<td>Concept of SE;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan (1999)</td>
<td>Impact of the entry of large for-profits;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace (1999)</td>
<td>Role of social purpose enterprise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borins (2000)</td>
<td>Two sets of entrepreneurial public leaders;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Review of private sector SE;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship (2001)</td>
<td>General review of SE;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibbert et al (2001)</td>
<td>Attitude towards SE, measurement of consumers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallbone et al. (2001)</td>
<td>SE in UK;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Dodds &amp; Mitchell (2002)</td>
<td>Idea that SE can replace welfare state;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Comprehensive review of SE;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson (2002)</td>
<td>Scope of SE; Who SEs are;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Austin et al identifies four unique theoretical propositions as guiding the research within the social entrepreneurship domain: i) market failure – emergence when commercial markets do not meet social needs (Weisbrod 1975, 1977) or in contract failure (Nelson & Krashinsky 1973); ii) mission – fundamental distinguishing features of underlying reasons for existence – social mission; iii) resource mobilization – fundamental difference in managing financials and human resources; and iv) performance measurement – greater complexity of managing measurement relationships (Kanter & Summers 1987) due to intangibility (2006, p. 2). Whilst four categories are proposed, they are inter-dependent and to some degree mutually exclusive, hence raise questions of their adaptation and sustainable development in isolation in empirical and public policy settings.

Sustainable Development (SD) is defined as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987). This definition also fits within the United Nations’ Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) adopted by the General Assembly in September 2000 – comprising of eight specific goals for development and poverty eradication intended by 2015 (Seelos & Mair 2005, p. 2). Sustainability is more closely associated with Social Entrepreneurship than Mainstream Entrepreneurship in its global context.

According to Arthur Cole, entrepreneurship in general – at least in all non-authoritarian societies – ‘constitute a bridge between society as a whole, especially the non-economic aspects of that society, and the profit-oriented institutions established to take advantage of its economic endowments and to satisfy, as best as they can, its economic desires’ (1959, pp.27-28). According to Albert Shapero, in entrepreneurship, there is ‘agreement that we are talking about a kind of behaviour that includes: i). initiative taking; ii). organizing or revolutionizing of social economic mechanisms to turn resources and situations to practical account; and iii). acceptance of risk failure (1975, p.187). In more recent years, there has been an increased awareness and attention given to social entrepreneurship. Organisations have been more encouraged to balance their self-interested survival and profit goals with wider macro environmental sustainability issues.
Gray introduces ‘social enterprises’ as enterprises that balance economic concerns with social missions (2003, p. 147). In contrast, Greve & Salaff defines entrepreneurs as “ones who own, launch, manage and assume risks of economic ventures, including people who take over an existing business” (2003, p. 1). Overall, social entrepreneurship is defined by various authors broadly or narrowly. Austin et al records a categorical list of its broader definitions as follows: ‘innovative activity with a social objective in either the for-profit sector, such as in social-purpose commercial ventures (Dees & Anderson 2003; Emerson & Twersky 1996); ‘in corporate social entrepreneurship’ (Austin, Leonard, Reficco & Wei-Skillern 2004); ‘in the non-profit sector, or across sectors, such as hybrid structural forms which mix for-profit and non-profit approaches (Dees 1998).

Austin et al records the narrower definitions as: ‘phenomenon of applying business expertise and market-based skills in the non-profit sector such as when non-profits develop innovative approaches to earn income’ (Reis 1999; Thompson 2002). ‘Drive for creating social value, rather than simply personal and shareholder wealth’ (Zadek & Thake 1997), ‘activity characterised by innovation, or the creation of something new rather than simply replication’ (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern 2006) are considered to be common factors within both the broader and narrower definitions.

Hartigan clarifies that social entrepreneurs certainly desire money and lots of it; however, unlike in the case of mainstream entrepreneurs – social entrepreneurs’ intentions are to utilise the ‘money’ to transform societies (2006, p. 43). Critical views of ‘social entrepreneurship’ include Mair & Martin where they argue that social entrepreneurship is not necessarily ‘an expression of altruism’ – suggesting ‘personal fulfilment’ as an ulterior motive (2006, p. 38). It was further argued that mainstream entrepreneurship also has a ‘social element’, raising questions of fundamental interdependencies within the two domains – mainstream and social entrepreneurship. By conducting academic research followed by empirical testing, author attempts to clarify this gap existing within the entrepreneurial literature.
Many of government and philanthropic efforts seem to fall short of stakeholder expectations. Dees argues that Social entrepreneurship [by way of a solution] combines the passion of a social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation, and entrepreneurial-determination” (1998). Majority of the literature on social entrepreneurship in the past has recommended that social entrepreneurship ‘stays away from market based disciplines’. It is suggested that market based disciplines ‘do not work for social entrepreneurs’. Author however argues that certain market indicators in conjunction with social indicators can be used for measure the effectiveness of social entrepreneurs. For example, Non-governmental-organizations (NGO) may charge an administration fee in delivering donor-funds to poor countries – this admin-percentage can be used to measure the efficiency and effectiveness of these organizations.

Entrepreneurs in the business world are seen as drivers of innovation and growth who acts as engines of growth, harnessing opportunity and innovation to fuel economic advancement (www.skollfoundation.org). In a similar manner, social entrepreneurs act in a lifelong pursuit of finding solutions within inequitable systems. It can be argued that when the business (commercial) entrepreneur seeks value in creating new markets; the social (community) entrepreneur attempts to transform disadvantaged communities.

A study by Korosec & Berman found that ‘perceptions’ for social entrepreneurs within communities to be very favourable: at least 80% agreed/strongly agreed that social entrepreneurs ‘develop programs addressing social problems/ causes’; and ‘find creative, innovative approaches to address social problems’; ‘act with the interest of the community in mind’; ‘work effectively with government officials’; ‘run effective and efficient programs’; and ‘provide a high level of accountability’ (2006, p. 454).

Bill Drayton, CEO, Chair and Founder of Ashoka, a global non-profit organization devoted to developing social entrepreneurship comments “Social entrepreneurs are not content just to give a fish or teach how to fish. They will not rest until they have revolutionized the fishing industry” (www.ashoka.org). Entrepreneurs are seen as high energy, charismatic individuals who bring forth exponential business growth and business success.
While some social entrepreneurs do achieve business success, the social entrepreneur’s main goals lie in bringing forth social changes. They act as change agents or catalysts and are motivated to change societies for the better. However, both business entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs act within a paradigm of innovation, where they continuously pursue new and improved ways of solving problems.

The origins of Social Entrepreneurship dates back to a few centuries. However it was mostly operated in the form of charities and not-for-profits and has gained renewed interest in the recent years. The high wage gap between the rich and the poor as well as the increasing occurrences of natural disasters leads to higher levels of impoverished communities. This naturally calls in for social entrepreneurs. It can be argued that social entrepreneurs are solution-minded and practical people who are committed in helping the world’s poor and the needy. According to Skoll Foundation, characteristics of typical social entrepreneurs include the following: ambition; mission driven; strategic; resourcefulness; and result orientation (www.skollfoundation.org).

As illustrated below in Figure 2.14, Ashoka Foundation in India has developed a model that introduces three critical social entrepreneurial interventions: individual, group, and the sector. First, individual level (social entrepreneurship) is about investing in and helping leading social entrepreneurs to achieve maximum social impact. Here the focus is customised and tailored to fit one person’s need.

Secondly, group level (group entrepreneurship) is about accelerating and spreading social impact by engaging communities, developing patterns of effective collaborations and establishing networks of social entrepreneurs. Here, the focus shifts to more community and collective type approaches. Third, infrastructure for the citizen sector is about global networks, delivering sustainable social solutions, infrastructure, social financing and similar frameworks for partnerships (www.ashoka.org).
Similarly, *The Skoll Foundation* created by *Jeff Skoll* in 1999 pursues the vision of a world where all people, regardless of geography, background or economic status, enjoy and employ the full range of their talents and abilities. Jeff Skoll, who was the first employee and first President of *eBay*, believes that strategic investments in the right people can lead to lasting social change (www.skollfoundation.org). *Social Edge* is a program launched by the Skoll Foundation in June 2003 with a mission to connect people with shared passions. It is a global online community where social entrepreneurs and other practitioners of the social sector connect to network, learn, inspire and share resources. *Social Edge* has an audience of tens of thousands of social entrepreneurs around the world; it is particularly targeted at social entrepreneurs with limited access to other local resources and practitioners due to the nature of their work (e.g., international development) or their location (e.g., developing countries or in rural areas) (www.socialedge.org).
Another classic example of a social entrepreneur is Professor Muhammad Yunus, recipient of the 2006 Nobel Peace Prize. He began offering micro-loans to impoverished people in Bangladesh in 1976, thereby empowering them to become economically self-sufficient and proving the micro-credit model that has now been replicated around the world. This revolutionary economic model in Bangladesh was known as Grameen Bank – meaning the ‘Village Bank’ (www.skollfoundation.org).

Interestingly, majority of the very-low interest micro-loans are offered to women in order to commence home/small businesses in agriculture, craft and service industries. According to Grameen Bank, there are more than 2,422 branches, employing more than 20,000 staff and has executed in excess of six billion dollars. Contrary to many sceptics, Grameen Bank proved very high financial success; where since its operation more than 30 years ago, the bank has been operating profitably more than 27 years. Grameen Bank is a system that empowers the poor by helping them to become entrepreneurs/social entrepreneurs (www.grameen-info.org).

Within the context of family business, Social Entrepreneurship is linked with the concept of Altruism. Altruistically driven organizations by default are more likely to benefit from social network and community based partnerships. According to a study conducted by Karra, Tracey & Philips, altruistic behaviour can be transferred beyond family firms to build ‘quasi families’ expanding to non-biological ties (2006, p. 874). Within such networks, social capital can be identified as one form of social entrepreneurial interventions by organizations. Bourdieu defines social capital as “the aggregate of the actual and potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (1983, p. 248). Social capital is arguably shared among large numbers of individuals, rather than within one individual.

This shared identity can facilitate cooperation and increase levels of ‘mutuality, trust and respect’ (Lester & Cannella 2006, p. 758) within organizations. Based on this philosophy, community-led and community-based enterprises can be formed. Within such enterprises the members may be ‘glued together by clan, ancestry, and common history’ (Peredo 2003, p. 399), thus creating intra-inter organizational social capital.
Elements of social entrepreneurship can also play a part in ‘community cultures’ (Sharma & Manikutty 2005, p. 293), where firm-community culture and family structures play a major part in strategic decision making. Similarly, long-term reciprocity within the context of *Anthropological kinship theory* (Stewart 2003, p. 383) reflects ‘morality of society as a whole’, where kinship integrates social fields more readily than more specialized orders like markets. Similar to SMEs, *Family Owned Businesses* (FOBs) and *Family Controlled Businesses* (FCBs) can also benefit from *Social Entrepreneurship* (SE).

Several studies have linked *social entrepreneurial* intentions as the basis for home-based business growth. One such study by *Barbara Rowe, George Haynes & Kathryn Stafford* states that ‘many rural and urban residents have turned to home-based self-employment as a means of providing for themselves and their families (1999). Here, home-based businesses were considered as forms of ‘community development’ and was becoming popular due to its usage as an alternative and supplementary income potential.

Several other social entrepreneurial efforts include *Bunker Roy & CAMFED*. *Bunker Roy* created the *Barefoot College* in rural communities in *India* with a vision to train illiterate public. Today *Barefoot College* graduates include teachers, health workers and architects who are improving communities across *India*, including 450 "barefoot" engineers who have installed and maintain solar-electrification systems in 547 villages that reach nearly 100,000 people (www.skollfoundation.org).

*Ann Cotton* started the *Campaign for Female Education (CAMFED)* in 1993 to support education for young girls in *Africa*. By establishing a sustainable model that provides community support for girls to go to school, start businesses and return to their communities as leaders, *CAMFED* has broken the cycle of poverty for hundreds of thousands of young women in *Zimbabwe, Ghana, Zambia* and *Tanzania*. In 2006 alone, more than 300,000 children benefited from education programs supported by a network of more than 5,100 young women who have themselves benefited from *CAMFED*-supported education and microfinance programs (www.skollfoundation.org).
**Hull House** is another successful *Social Entrepreneurial* program founded by *Jane Addams* in 1889 to improve conditions in a poor immigrant neighbourhood in *Chicago, USA*. As a result of his social entrepreneurial project, protective legislation for women and children in the *USA* was established (www.skollfoundation.org). In 1906, *Maria Montessori*, the first female physician in *Italy*, created a revolutionary education method to support individual children to realize their own potential in early childhood education. The participating children showed increased levels of social skills, emotional growth and physical coordination.

*Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation* – a social entrepreneurial organisation focused on improving health, wealth and social well-being around the world – comments that ‘giving back to society’ must start from our ‘inner core values’. The implementation of such values need to be guided by ‘key underlying principles’ such as: i). concentrate on few areas of giving to find out about how best to give in order to make the highest impact later; & ii). Utilising the power of science and technology in an attempt to improve people’s lives globally (www.gatesfoundation.org/default.htm).

According to *Bill & Melinda*, over 1,000 children die from measles daily; and the cost of giving measles vaccine is only 15-cents USD. Daily average wage for three billion people globally is estimated at less than $2 USD. Even in the so-called developed countries such as the *USA*, only one-third of the ninth grade students will actually graduate from high school and follow on to college and work (www.gatesfoundation.org). According to the *Global Health Program* operated by *Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*, deadly diseases such as tuberculosis and malaria that is almost extinct in ‘rich’ countries continue to kill people in ‘poor’ countries in millions; majority of the five million infections of *AIDS* victims belong to ‘poor’ countries (www.gatesfoundation.org/deafault.htm).
Therefore ‘science’ and ‘technology’ may have a part to play in bridging the gap between the ‘have’ and have not’. Majority of the advances in science and technology including biotechnology commercialisations, medical breakthroughs, information technology improvements, telecommunication expansion, supply chain and logistical innovations are not enjoyed by the ‘poor’ countries. However, there are more positive examples of cases where technology actually does help local communities. For example, Opportunity International helps by distributing “smart cards.” These cards are similar to our ATM cards where they allow women to keep bank accounts with thumbprint scanners. These Smart cards are so popular in Malawi that they’re now regularly given as gifts at wedding showers.

According to Malawi customs, when a male dies, the parents and siblings inherit the possessions. With average male life expectancy of about 37-years, this puts the women and children of Malawi under extreme hardship. In an attempt to reduce the development gap between the ‘rich’ and the ‘poor’, Global Development Program and Opportunity International have set up a joint social entrepreneurial project to help women in Malawi. As part of the project, “smart cards” – similar to ATM cards of the western world – allow Malawi women to safeguard their wealth. The funds are accessed only through thumbprints. These ‘smart cards’ have become so effective

A fuller, widely accepted definition of ‘Social Entrepreneurship’ offered by Dees (1998) is presented as follows:

“Social entrepreneurs play the roles of change agents in the social sector, by:

- Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value);
- Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission;
- Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning;
- Acting boldly without being limited to resources currently in hand; and
- Exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created”.
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i) **Change agents in the social sector**
Social entrepreneurs are the reformers and revolutionaries described by Schumpeter, but with a social mission. They try to make fundamental changes in the way things are done by attacking the causes of problems, rather than simply treating the symptoms. They seek to create systematic changes and sustainable improvements. While social entrepreneurs may act locally, their actions and ideas have the potential to stimulate global improvements.

ii) **Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value)**
This is essentially the classic difference between social and business entrepreneurs. For Social entrepreneurs, the social mission is fundamental, where the mission cannot be reduced to creating private benefits (financial returns or consumption benefits) for individuals. Social impact itself, rather than profits, wealth or customers becomes the gauge – where they look for more than a ‘quick-hit’; wanting to create lasting improvements.

iii) **Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission**
Where others see problems, entrepreneurs see opportunity. It is important to note that social entrepreneurs are not simply driven by the perception of social need or by their compassion, rather they have a vision of how to achieve improvement and they are determined to make their vision work. Persistence combined with willingness to make adjustments is a key element of social entrepreneurs.

iv) **Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning**
Entrepreneurs are also innovative – break new ground, develop new models, and pioneer new approaches. While innovation can include inventions (inventing something wholly new), entrepreneurs often take advantage of others’ inventions in innovative ways. Hence it is not just a one-time burst of creativity, rather a continuous process of exploring, learning, and improving. Entrepreneurs have a high tolerance for ambiguity and treat failure as a learning experience rather than a personal tragedy; hence seem to have the ‘gift’ of managing the inherent uncertainties and risks associated with innovation quite well.
v) *Acting boldly without being limited to resources currently in hand and*
Social entrepreneurs are skilled at doing more with less by attracting resources from others; by using scarce resources efficiently; by drawing in partners and collaborations; by exploring all resource options, from pure philanthropy to the commercial methods of business sector. They are certainly not bound by sector norms or traditions; and can develop resource strategies that are likely to support and reinforce their social missions. They also understand the risk tolerance of their stakeholders and use this to spread the risk to those who are better prepared to accept it; hence take calculated risks and manage the downside, so as to reduce the harm resulting from potential failure.

vi) *Exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created”*
Social entrepreneurs seek a sound understanding of the constituencies they are serving by correctly assessing the needs and values of the people and having close connections with the communities in which they operate. They also understand the expectations and values of their ‘investors’ (people who invest money, time, and expertise) and try to provide attractive (social/financial) return to their investors. Their accountability therefore extends to a fit between *investor value* and *community need*. Sometimes they create market-like feedback mechanisms to reinforce this accountability – E.g. NGO ‘X’ where 89.3% of donor money is directly invested in local communities seems more efficient than NGO ‘Y’ where only 61.4% of donor money is invested. Essentially NGO ‘X’ has administrative outgoings of about 10.7% compared to NGO ‘Y’s 38.6%. It is important to note that Social entrepreneurs should not be classified or included solely into business entrepreneur groups, charities, social change organizations or charities. They are a unique type and a special breed and they should be recognized as such.
2.5 Entrepreneurial Cognition, Creativity, Innovation & Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurial cognition is often linked to entrepreneurs and the process of entrepreneurship. Baron & Ward presents several variables – reaction time, priming, measures of working memory and measures of creative cognition – as important elements of entrepreneurial cognition (2004, p. 553). A survey based on 159 owner-managers examining associations between individual characteristics showed relationships of cognition to individual outcomes of satisfaction and intentions to exit (Brigham et al 2007, p. 29).

How entrepreneurs learn is often a matter of debate within both the academic and practical domains of entrepreneurship. Cope suggests of an ‘entrepreneurial lens’ to explain the complex, interactive learning relationship that exist between the entrepreneur and, his/ her enterprise and the wider micro-macro environments (2005, p. 373). This ‘entrepreneurial lens’ is presented through the concepts of ‘metamorphosis, discontinuity and change’ rather than ‘stability, consistency, and predictability’. Thus entrepreneurship is resembled to ‘chaos theory’ and David Kolb’s experiential learning model. Corbett further enhances this body of knowledge by integrating entrepreneurs into four ‘learning styles’ – i) accommodator; ii) diverger; iii) assimilator; and iv) converger (2005, p. 481).

Further, Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy (ESE) is identified as ‘the degree to which individuals believe they are capable of performing the tasks associated with new-venture-management; whereby it is argued that ESE enhances firm performance’ (Forbes 2005, p. 599). Positive feedback – regardless of actual ability – individuals receive about their entrepreneurial ability is considered to be positively correlated to new business creations (Gatewood et al 2002, p. 187). Over-trust – the tendency to trust more than what is warranted – is found to be neither positively nor negatively correlated with entrepreneurial success rates (Goel & Karri 2006, p. 477). It is suggested that ‘over-trust’ is part of the overall risk that entrepreneurs assume in their entrepreneurial pursuits.
Personality is also associated with creativity and innovation. Personality is about personality traits and has a direct link with trait theories. Whilst trait theory – at least within the leadership and management context – has been criticised heavily; it remains important within the entrepreneurial domain (Baum, Locke & Smith 2001; Rauch & Frese 2000 as cited in Dimov 2007, p. 715). Intrinsic motivation – “desire for independence, innovation, personal achievement – is seen as a significant factor in explaining people’s entry into the entrepreneurial process” (Carter, Gartner, Shaver & Gatewood 2003; Rauch & Frese 2000; Utsch, Rauch, Rothfuss & Frese 1999 as cited in Dimov 2007, p. 716).

Cognitive skills and abilities are about entrepreneurs’ competency in absorbing and processing information different to others; and about their sensitivity to some opportunities but not others. This view is based on the argument that “entrepreneurs form unique mental representations of the world” (Baron 2004; Mitchell et al 2002; Shaver & Scott 1991 as cited in Dimov 2007, p. 717). Arguably entrepreneurs are only able to achieve this so-called ‘unique mental representations’ as a direct result of their creative and innovative practices.

In other words, the basis of and what allows the entrepreneurs to see the ‘unique world representations’ is primarily dependant on their natural and/ or trained competencies governing the creative-innovative process – which ultimately make them different to that of ‘average’ individuals, ‘managers’ and ‘leaders’. Even-though it is argued that cognitive skills are important within the individual entrepreneur domains; the process of innovation must transcend the cognitive domains of individuals to the arena of organisational innovation. This is an area where new firms often become the victims where innovation fails to transcend the individual boundaries.

Bolton & Thompson argue that the interplay between talent, temperament and technique as important in studying entrepreneurs (2000, p. 11). Through a metaphor of a ‘three-legged stool’ Bolton & Thompson, presents entrepreneurs’ talent, temperament and technique – in a ‘tripartite approach’. It is stated that entrepreneurs come in ‘all sizes and shapes’ and that it is important to understand the ‘make up’ of entrepreneurs. As illustrated by Table 2.7, talent is initially expanded through ‘creativity, opportunity-spotting and courage’. Talent within this context is defined as ‘innate ability’ (Woods
1998); ‘strengths’ (Clifton and Nelson 1996); ‘expertise’ (Ericsson and Smith 1991); and ‘exceptional abilities’ (Howe 1990).

Table 2.7: The Entrepreneur, among others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>The Entrepreneur</th>
<th>‘Entrepreneurial’ Behaviour</th>
<th>The inventor</th>
<th>The leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talent</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Probably not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity-spotting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperament</td>
<td>Urgency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk-taking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ego drive</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Financial skills</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning skills</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal skills</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Temperament is initially expanded through ‘urgency, risk-taking and ego-drive’ where it is explained as ‘moods that typify our emotional life’ given at birth genetically. Here the idea is that entrepreneurs’ emotional lessons either amplify or mute innate predispositions (nature/temper). Technique, similarly, is expanded through ‘financial, planning and personal skills’. Role of technique is identified as training talent and temperament to work jointly towards the achievement of excellence. Entrepreneurs are identified as individuals who are able to exert their mental energy and control both concentrated and relaxed simultaneously. Bolton & Thompson further expands talent, temperament and technique to include specific traits and behaviours, as illustrated by Figure 2.15 (2000, p. 42).
Therefore, according to \textit{Bolton and Thompson}, entrepreneur is a ‘person who habitually creates and innovates to build something of recognized value around perceived opportunities’ (2000, p. 11). As illustrated by Figure 2.16, it is suggested that entrepreneurs must ‘develop talent’, ‘manage temperament’ and ‘impart technique’ through both unstructured learning experiences as well as structured learning experiences such as formal education and training.
New firms often have challenges in becoming creative and innovative. They often lack the resources and know-how needed to compete. Kirchhoff, Newbert, Hasan & Armington suggests that new firms should rely on ‘spill overs to fuel their own innovative efforts’ (2007, p. 543); suggesting that resource inadequacy is not an excuse for the need to create and innovate. Productivity improvements have often been a motivator for adapting creativity and innovation within organizational frameworks. Harding argues there is a ‘misleading conception of how productivity and innovation are linked through’ (2001, p. 170); leading to less-than favourable innovative outcomes. Again, whilst creativity and innovation has the capability of making firms more productive; the process of creativity and innovation must be well-understood first, in its application of individual, group and organisational domains.
In the future context of dynamic and complex organisational environments demanding fast-moving, agile and competent individuals, groups and organisational models operating within the globally integrated knowledge based economy; there is even more need to fully understand the processes of creativity, innovation; rather than to simply adapt the name as the ‘new buzz word’. The Economist Intelligence Unit identifies three forces that are likely to shape the world of R&D and innovation in future: i) responsiveness to the market – market pressures to keep up with competitors’ innovations and to satisfy increasingly demanding customers; ii) globalization – competition for talent, new technologies and easier market access accelerated such as in the cases of India and China hosting significant volumes of R&D globally; and iii) customer collaboration – working more closely with customers in developing new products and services (2004, p. 2).

Various other forces are also identified as impacting the ‘managers role’ within contemporary context: i) changing technology or digitization – boundaries, virtual-ness, mobility, flexibility and empowerment; ii) increased threats to security – risk management, balance, restructuring, discrimination, employee assistance; iii) emphasis on organizational and managerial ethics – values, trust, accountability; and iv) increased competitiveness – customer service, innovation, efficiency (Robbins & Coulter 2005, p. 14). Further the organization itself is changing as illustrated by Table 2.8.

Unlike the traditional types where the environmental context was relatively stable, inflexible and job focused; the ‘new organisation context is becoming more dynamic and flexible in nature requiring a more skill-focused approach. Further, the contemporary context is more task, team, involvement and customer oriented – as compared to previous individual-rule-hierarchical orientations and permanency of jobs. The diverse workforce today is expected to work anywhere, anytime with no real time boundaries; whereas the homogeneous workforce of the past worked around designated work hours, usually from nine to five.
As a method of fitting-in to this ‘new’ context, organizations can foster creativity, innovation & entrepreneurship as illustrated by Figure 2.17. It is important to note here that an output expectation of the function of creativity is mere new idea creation. When these new ideas are expressed in the form of a prototype, patent and/or business plan, then we can call it innovation. Finally when new products, services and/or processes emerge through commercialization/ execution of creativity & innovation, it can be labelled ‘entrepreneurship’.
It is equally important to also remember that Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship are ever-continuing and ever-evolving notions. It would not make sense to stop the creativity and innovation, once the new products, services and processes are in place. Due to the dynamic nature of the external environment and knowledge-based-economy, organizations need to keep improving – within a mindset of continuous learning, creativity and innovation, as illustrated by Figure 2.18.
Figure 2.18: Entrepreneurial IPO (Idea, Plan, Outcome) Framework


The process of creativity and innovation therefore is embedded within the process of entrepreneurship in such a way as to continuously incubate new products, new services and new processes as part of the governing cultural applications, supported through the organisational strategic and structural frameworks. Such organisations are more likely to ease into the emerging future context; where creativity and innovation become the essence of entrepreneurship.

Building upon Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship and Social-Community Entrepreneurship, author now presents a synthesis on ‘Strategy’ and ‘Strategy formulation’—integrating benefits and challenges of entrepreneurship to be used as a corporate strategy/success strategy within organisations.
2.6 Strategy

Originating from the Greek word ‘stratos’, used within the military domain of the past – meaning ‘to conquer the enemies surrounding a certain empire, with the given manpower on hand’ – the role of strategy has not really changed much in today’s context. Organizations in their constant market-driven battles of ‘aggressive, defensive and reactive endeavours’ are continuously formulating, implementing and re-visiting strategy in a complex and dynamic environment of ‘survival’.

Various scholars such as Michael Porter, Mintzberg, Herzberg, Taylor and various others from multiple disciplines have over the years contributed to the larger macro domain of strategic literature. Similarly, industry-based organizations such as Boston Consulting and McKinsey Consulting have further enriched this field by adding various models into the literature.

Strategy as a discipline is very well established and has become part of the mainstream educational system of numerous disciplines expanding to, but not limited to: general management (strategic management); marketing (strategic marketing); human resources (strategic human resource management); decision making (strategic-corporate decision making); organizational change (strategic change); and more recently into the arena of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship.

Due to the ‘general, enriched and broadly accepted’ nature of ‘strategy’; author limits the discussion of ‘strategy’ within this dissertation to components and developments of strategy most relevant to creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship. However a brief account of several definitions and models are presented initially as a way of initiating the discussion.
Strategy is defined as “A conceptualization, expressed or implied, by management of i) long-term purposes of the organization, ii) the broad constraints and policies that restrict the scope of the organization’s activities; and iii) the set of plans and near-term goals that have been adopted in the expectation they will contribute to the attainment of the long-range strategic objectives” (Harrison, E. F. 1999, p. 501); “three types: i) corporate level – what business to be in”; ii) business level – how to compete in each business unit (SBU); and iii) functional level – to support business level strategies (Robbins & Coulter 2005, p. 194).

Strategic Management is defined as “six step process of managerial decisions and actions that determines the long-run performance of an organization: i) identifying current mission, goals and strategies; ii) external analysis – opportunities and threats; iii) internal analysis – strengths, weaknesses; iv) formulating strategies; v) implementing strategies; and vi) evaluating results” (Robbins & Coulter 2005, p. 180); “the continuous process of effectively using the capabilities of an organization to capitalize on the opportunities and to repel the threats in the external environment” (Harrison, E. F. 1999, p. 501).

Strategic gap is defined as “a comparison of the organization’s objectives, strategy, and resources against the opportunities and threats in its external environment” (Hofer & Schendel 1978, p. 47). Here there is an underlying assumption of imbalance between current strategic position and desired strategic position. This strategic gap – based on the relationship between an organization’s current capabilities and its most significant external environment variables can be illustrated using the following diagram, Figure 2.21.
This model based on the original *PEST Analysis* model is further expanded to reflect on the contemporary global context to elaborate further about the positive and negative strategic gaps. *Harrison* defines positive strategic gap as ‘the sum of internal capabilities clearly greater than the total of significant factors’ (1999, p. 334). One could argue that the more the internal capabilities of an organization – and the higher the positive gap – then the better and stronger the organization is in terms of its strategic positioning. However, a closer look will reveal that actually the relationship between ‘organizational capabilities’ and ‘external environment’ is *curvilinear*, rather than *linear*.

As illustrated in *Figure 2.19*, an organization could have a very high level of a positive gap between its internal capabilities and various other external environment factors such as *technology* and *knowledge base*. However, if the positive gap is too high – it means that the organization is comprised of *underutilized management, technology* and *valuable resources* – with potential negative consequences for the organizations such as ineffective resource utilization, under-capacity mobilization of production; ultimately leading the organization being less competitive in comparison with their competitors.

Entrepreneurs arguably are less prone to ‘under-utilization’. If anything, they are over-utilizing – in some cases ‘bluffing’ their way through – strategies based on resources currently not even held within their control. In line with *Dee’s* (1998) definition of ‘acting boldly without being limited to resources currently on hand’, ‘engaging in a process of continuously innovating, adapting and learning’ and ‘recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to service their mission [strategy]’; entrepreneurs are constantly ‘shifting paradigms’ in the contemporary strategic-global context.
Figure 2.19: Extended PEST Analysis

The concept of ‘paradigm’ is defined by Thomas Kuhn (1962) – considered to be the father of paradigm shifts – as “a pervasive way of thinking about a branch of science that includes all of the assumptions and theories that are accepted as true by a group of scientists” (cited in McBurney 2001, p. 23). Kuhn further states that new paradigms are accepted when it accounts for more ‘successes’ through empirical data than did the old paradigm; hence priority given to the ‘empirical context’ of qualitative, subjective, tacit knowledge where one starts with no knowledge as such, but have questions to explore.

Later scientists such as Larry Laudan (1977) disagree with the above original proposition, arguing that one should actually ‘start with knowledge and try to prove or disprove’ using objective, quantitative, explicit methods. The basis of Laudan’s argument is that theories are developed to solve both empirical and conceptual problems and ‘conceptual problem’ is a legitimate criterion for evaluating a theory. Kuhn in contrast to this view believes that fundamentally, ‘only the empirical data’ can be used to evaluate theories.
Regardless of the variations of the ‘paradigm shifts’ by Kuhn & Laudan, entrepreneurs do ‘shift paradigms’ within the external environment context of the contemporary society: politics; legal; economics; society; culture; religion; technology; energy-ecology; physical environment; sustainability; knowledge-based-economy; trends; globalization; demographics; and competitive context.

Negative gap is defined as a state when ‘significant environment factors are greater than the internal capabilities of the organization’ – necessitating prompt and effective correction action (Harrison 1999, p. 335). ‘Action’ within this context can be referred to as: organizational restructuring, new technology introduction and reallocation of resources. Daily part of a managers’ job is involved in doing exactly this, usually within a given ‘paradigm’ and ‘context’. However, entrepreneurs are not limited to operate within such frameworks, rather in a lot of the cases go beyond, above or away from their current pre-determined operational mind-sets.

In a lot of the cases, entrepreneurs ‘push-ideas-through’ boundaries by re-defining the environment itself and ‘challenging the rules of the environment. In a way, the whole notion of strategy and the process of strategic management do not really fit well into the concept of ‘strategic entrepreneurship’. Because unlike ‘managers’ who try to ‘fit into’ the dimensions of the environment, entrepreneurs in fact change the environment itself and the governing rules surrounding it. They do devise strategies to moving beyond that of managers and impacts differently.

This paradox of ‘strategic gap’ of monitoring an organization between positive and negative gaps is a constant and never-ending exercise of reflection, creativity, innovation and fine judgement. Entrepreneurs are fundamentally naturally geared towards this process as illustrated by Figure 2.20. The above discussed notions of ‘strategy’ within the management context are limited to ‘existing frameworks’ and ‘known paradigms’.
However, entrepreneurs by contrast challenge the status quo and redefine existing problems through *creativity and innovation* beyond existing frameworks and paradigms. Since innovation extends beyond simply invention; entrepreneurs by nature push through ‘ideas’ through to ‘concepts’ and ‘projects’ and finally execute these ‘ideas’ in the form of entrepreneurial ventures. An important distinction here is that managers are usually prompted to action by ‘problems’ – in terms of following ‘orders’ to resolve ‘existing problems’, usually in a ‘reactive’ sense.

Entrepreneurs by contrast extends their breadth by simply coming up with new ideas on a daily basis with or without the need to resolve ‘problems’, thereby creating a ‘learning organization’, ‘continuos learning’ paradigm surrounding their environments and becoming more agile, adaptable and flexible within the contemporary knowledge based society. In doing so, more often than not, they also re-write the rules of ‘strategy formulation’. As the saying goes, “Unlike in other sciences, Golden Rules of business are written by ‘the ones with gold’”; suggesting that today’s emergence and success of entrepreneurs primarily driven by the *United States*, well-established and expanded globally – is bringing forth new dimensions to ‘strategy’ and ‘strategy formulation’.

**Figure 2.20: The Process of Assessing Feasibility**

2.7 Strategy and Entrepreneurship

The concept of ‘Strategic Entrepreneurship’, which combines Strategy and Entrepreneurship, is still in its infancy stage of development. Author’s view of strategic entrepreneurship is that it is the “combined set of interdependent relationships arising from the integration of strategic management and entrepreneurial domains; whereby it is argued that (entrepreneurship + strategy) and (strategy + entrepreneurship) = strategic entrepreneurship”. Hitt & Sexton argues that whether strategic management subsumes entrepreneurship or entrepreneurship subsumes strategic management, ‘it is difficult to deny the continuing influence of strategic management on the field of entrepreneurship (2002, p. 28)

Hitt & Sexton based on research of: Brown & Eisenhardt 1998; Meyer & Heppard 2000; McGrath & MacMillan 2000; Venkataraman 1997; and Hitt, Ireland & Hoskisson 2001; presents the following ‘Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management Interface’ to explain the developments within this area as illustrated in Figure 2.21 (2002, p. 34).

Figure 2.21: Strategic Management versus Entrepreneurship (Past)

Building upon Hitt & Sexton’s (2002) interface and as illustrated by Figure 2.22, author argues that within the contemporary external environmental domain of globalization: i) both large corporations as well as small-to-medium enterprises are affected by both ‘strategic management’ and ‘entrepreneurship’; ii) the traditional boundaries of ‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘strategic management’ are becoming illusive; and iii) entrepreneurship which used to be ‘sub-set’ of ‘management’ is becoming the ‘master-set’.

The function of Creativity and Innovation is no longer a luxury of corporate survival; rather it is a mandatory requirement of ‘mere existence’. The essence of entrepreneurship has always been ‘creativity and innovation’. Coupled with the empirical success stories of entrepreneurship in the last two decades; as a field of study/ discipline – entrepreneurship has moved to be the ‘master-set’ of both management and strategic management. Entrepreneurs without necessarily being experts of ‘planning, organizing, leading and controlling’ are continuing to drive the world into new directions and boast numerous success stories and paradigm shifts, arguably existing without ‘conscious knowledge and practice of ‘strategic management’ – where strategic management knowledge is dormant to a large degree.

However, in the ‘strategic management’ domain, today’s managers are finding it ‘impossible’ to survive without applying the entrepreneurial essence of ‘creative and innovative’ spirits. Hence, there has been a shift of dominance and order where ‘strategic management’ is more or less ‘following’ entrepreneurial directions; but not necessarily the other way around. Especially, in the future context, it is more likely that ‘strategy’ and ‘strategic management’ exists as a ‘chapter’ within the ‘entrepreneurship’ domain.
Figure 2.22: Strategic Management versus Entrepreneurship (Present)

An opposing view is posed by Baker & Pollock where they argue that ‘strategy is succeeding in its takeover of the academic field of entrepreneurship’ – where they present a set of statistics to argue their case (2007, p. 297): out of 2,035 faculty of Entrepreneurial division, 1000 (49.1%) are members of Business Policy & Strategy; out of 157 job postings by Academy of Management, two-thirds listed strategy as a teaching preference; and most entrepreneurship scholars had received their original training in strategy (Gartner et al 2006, p. 324).

However, using the same reasons above (in a ‘double edged sword’ method), author argues that the very reasons given above in fact are confirming the fact that entrepreneurship is developing beyond the capacity and limitations of ‘strategic management’ literature and practice. It is therefore very likely that entrepreneurship will gain a position and respect as a discipline of its own, possibly contributing more to the contemporary society than its previous ‘parent-domain’ – strategic management. In fact, shortly after the term ‘Strategic Entrepreneurship’ came into existence following Hitt et al (2002), Strategic Management Society announced a new journal titled Strategic Entrepreneurship and scheduled an Entrepreneurship Research Conference in May 2007.
Within the ‘strategic domain’, entrepreneurial literature is still considered ‘poorly defined’ where its interpretation is fragmented; *Matt & Tan* offers four types of strategies suitable for contemporary society: i) pioneer; ii) perspective; iii) practice; and iv) performance (2006, p. 704). Another similar strategic model developed within the marketing framework include *Miles & Snow* model of: i) prospector; ii) defender; iii) analyser; and iv) reactor (Wikipedia). Building upon *Matt & Tan* and *Miles & Snow* research, author argues that in the current global strategic domain, organizations must attempt to become ‘pioneers’ and ‘prospectors’ in order to ‘truly’ lead the world of tomorrow – challenging the traditional viewpoints of ‘cost leadership’ of *Michael Porter* and ‘reactor’ type strategies. There will certainly be a role for ‘cost leaders’ and ‘reactors’ who follow the entrepreneurial leaders. However, their role will always be one of ‘follower’, hence unable to fully utilise the ‘creative, innovative and entrepreneurial spirits’.

*Corbett* states that:

“A learning perspective on entrepreneurship suggests that alterations to the current manner in which educators teach entrepreneurship are warranted. In addition to the current focus on developing ideas and crafting business plans, perhaps courses should focus more on the process and how ideas change shape over time . . . over time environmental forces will almost always change the entrepreneurs’ original concept”.

Social entrepreneurship, arguably, is one such ‘idea’ and a ‘global contemporary environment force’ that entrepreneurs need to take seriously. As such, entrepreneurs as part of their opportunity identification and managing growth place an important emphasis to social entrepreneurial aspects of commercial ventures. Implications for social entrepreneurship within the area of opportunity identification and growth include the following: i) external environment supporting social entrepreneurial ventures more than entrepreneurial ventures; and ii) internal cognition of social entrepreneurs more likely to extend their ‘opportunities’ to include the impact of a ‘larger’ group of stakeholders as well as to consider issues more ‘deeply’; thus giving them a strategic advantage in success.
2.8 Evolving *Future* Entrepreneurial Context

According to the *World Review of Entrepreneurship*, successful management in the new millennium requires developing new methods and approaches to suite the challenges and opportunities of this new era of globalization (2005, p. 6). Due to the multi-dimensional nature, success stories and the growing interest of entrepreneurship; arguably it is the major option to enhance the organizational performance and in some cases mere survival in the current era. In 1951, *Joseph A. Schumpeter* linked entrepreneurship with leadership and change, where he states ‘entrepreneurship consists of doing things that are not generally done in the ordinary course of business routine; it is essentially a phenomenon that comes under the wider aspect of leadership’ (1951, p. 255).

There is evidence that *State Owned Enterprises (SOEs)* have in the past also utilised *Strategic Entrepreneurship*. *Luke & Verreynne* report that “incidences of strategic entrepreneurship are demonstrated in the SOEs, which extend the range of entrepreneurial types usually described in the public sector” (2006). Building upon *Luke & Verreynne’s* findings, author argues that ‘strategic entrepreneurship’ can be a useful ‘strategy’ for organizations – *for-profit, non-profit* and *governmental* types – operating within the contemporary context.
Chapter Three – Research Methodology

Research is the systematic and objective identification, collection, analysis and dissemination of information for the purpose of assisting management in decision making related to the identification and solution of problems and opportunities (Malhotra 2003 cited in Khartabil 2007).

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the methodology adapted in conducting the research at Aspire Solutions Group. This research was conducted in a qualitative manner, using a field study/ case study approach. Qualitative research is unstructured, exploratory in nature, based on small samples and utilises popular qualitative techniques such as focus groups (group interviews), word associations and depth interviews (Malhotra 1999, p. 40).

The purpose of this chapter is to describe, explain and justify the research methodology and frameworks adopted within this dissertation. An overall rationale for the qualitative methodology used is explained using multiple approaches including Nonaka’s SECI Model and Malhotra’s qualitative research frameworks. This chapter also covers an account of the benefits and limitations of qualitative research methodology. Structure and the chronology of the research design are also presented. The chapter is then concluded by addressing the key issues, justification and limitation of the qualitative approach.

The researcher explored the body of entrepreneurial literature and discovered that the literature within this domain is still being developed and considered to be in its infant stages. This ‘fragmented’ and ‘infant’ stage of the entrepreneurial literature is best researched through qualitative means. Qualitative inquiry – based upon exploratory means – is most likely to shed new insights and discover various untapped and unexplored entrepreneurial findings. As Cavanaugh et al states “Exploratory studies are taken to comprehend the nature of the issue that have been the subject of relatively few studies” (cited in Kozlowski 2007).
Based upon the above mentioned qualitative-exploratory frameworks, basic steps in conducting this dissertation can be summarised as follows:

- Preliminary analysis of the entrepreneurial body of knowledge;
- A thorough literature review on creativity, innovation, entrepreneurship and strategy;
- Development of research problems based on Literature Review and a synthesis of existent literature;
- Establishment of qualitative design as the research model – case study, action research, anthropological style, justified through Research Methodology;
- Data collection through observation, interviewing and by participating within the Aspire Solutions Group – Founder/Director role taken on by researcher to test various entrepreneurial domains;
- A critical discussion and concluding remarks by integrating theory and practice presented through Discussion and Conclusion.

3.2 Researcher’s Perspective

Researcher’s personal experience over the last decade or so as an entrepreneur and founding of the Aspire Group was a fundamental part of the dissertation. Much of entrepreneurship domain contains tacit-tacit knowledge in the form of socialisation. In order to get a closer view of the insights and intimate details of entrepreneurship; one must arguably be an entrepreneur him- herself. It was sometimes difficult to manage this dual function of the researcher as both an outsider as well as being the Founder/Director of the venture being researched. This participation of researcher within the subject being studied can have both positive and negative influences. Researcher was mindful of the negative aspects, in order to consciously avoid possible interviewer bias and various other flaws. It was an advantage that due to the ‘closeness’ of the researcher, much of the data collection was ‘deep’, ‘intimate’ and ‘personal’ in nature and in some cases researcher had to change names and details to protect the privacy and confidentiality.
As pointed out by McNamara & Carter (2007): case studies, observations and interviews are ‘time consuming to study’. This study itself extended over eight years (2001 → 2009) where the author was battling with constant radical developments in entrepreneurial literature and continuous changes to the empirical context of the domain of ‘entrepreneurship’ over the last decade. It was a constant struggle of balancing ‘theory’ and ‘practice’ entrepreneurial integration; where the author was being challenged to maintain simultaneously the ‘academic’ as well as the ‘practical’ aspects of the concept.

During some time periods, there were more input into the research domain; followed by testing the actual concepts through Aspire Solutions Group and re-visits to literature to validate the findings in a theoretical context and so on. Interestingly what was considered ‘normal’ within academic literature, in some cases were proven to be ‘abnormal’ (even wrong) in the practical domain. However, this phenomenon is not completely strange within entrepreneurial domains; where majority of the literature is still being developed, challenged and is considered an ever-evolving paradigm.

### 3.3 Justification of the research

This research report attempts to advance the body of knowledge within the entrepreneurship domain. Throughout the report, contributions are made within the existing body of knowledge in relations to Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship – often referred to as Mainstream Entrepreneurship – as well as Social-Community Entrepreneurship. Existing literature to a large degree focused on Mainstream Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurship in isolation, without adequately integrating the two concepts within the frameworks of ‘Strategic’ and ‘Global’ domains and with little incorporation of ‘for-profits’, ‘not-for-profits’ and ‘policy-makers’. The term policy-makers is meant broadly to include governments, regulatory bodies and other policy-making type groups – usually responsible for protecting the future, sustainability and welfare of societies, nations and the planet itself. This shortcoming (gap) within the literature is arguably a ‘fundamental flaw’ within the domains of entrepreneurship – especially amidst the future ‘strategic global context’.
In comparison to other disciplines, it is also a domain where ‘the ones with gold, create the golden rules’. In other words, through the entrepreneurial successes within the practical domain, theories and models are formed/ broken; rather than an emphasis of ‘theory leading practice’. In a lot of the cases, ‘practice’ has lead the researchers to explore ‘theory’ further and to develop theoretical frameworks. This is especially evident in the case of successful developments of *Serial Entrepreneurs* – entrepreneurial who continuously display successful entrepreneurial venture creation process globally.

This is not to say that ‘theory’ is not important. On the contrary, author argues that a continuous inter-dependent mix of ‘theory’ and ‘practice’ of entrepreneurial activities in the contemporary context is in fact what make this discipline so ‘unique’; and as a result of such developments, both the ‘theoretical’ and ‘empirical’ contexts can benefit in exponential levels. However, unlike other ‘hard’, ‘objective’ based disciplines; entrepreneurship does not seem to contain ‘concretely established master theories’.

The fact that the author was personally involved in a decade of entrepreneurial experiences within the anthropological, case study, action research context; and personally becoming the *Founding Director* of a ‘dedicated’ organization to ‘test’ the model in the global context – are arguably some of the strengths of this dissertation. All types of research methods have some limitations within them, such as in qualitative studies there’s tendency for ‘observer bias’; ‘interview bias’; ‘interpretation bias’; ‘anthropological bias of too much/too little involvement’; ‘wording problems’; ‘client response bias’; ‘time consuming bias’; and ‘difficulty in finding cause-effect relationship’. Due care was taken to be: ‘conscious’, ‘objective’, ‘unbiased’, ‘independent’, ‘analytical’, persevere’, ‘logical’, ‘confidential’ and ‘authentic’.
3.4 Case Study Methodology

According to Eisenhardt, qualitative research has the advantage of ‘allowing the building of emerging theory by viewing it from different perspectives, while at the same time intimately linking with evidence’ (1989 cited in Kozlowski 2007). Based on this viewpoint, it can be argued that the process itself is highly empirical because it is generated directly from primary evidence.

The main research method used within this dissertation is ‘qualitative research method’. The focus of the research was ‘exploratory’ and ‘subjective’ in nature. The qualitative research methodology employed a number of techniques of data collection ranging from interviewing, case study, action research and anthropological based inquiry – where the researcher was part of the ‘subject’ being researched, whilst maintaining a ‘safe distance’ to avoid ‘researcher bias’. According to Strauss & Corbin ‘qualitative methods can be used to uncover and understand what lies behind any phenomenon about which little is yet known’ (1990, p. 76 cited in Khartabil 2007, p. 56).

Due to the lack of existing ‘integrated’ research within the domain of entrepreneurship, author felt that qualitative approach would be most appropriate. The objective was to explore the ‘essence’ of the concept and its relationships rather than ‘conclusive research’. Both public data as well as private internally available data was used. The qualitative exploration spaned across Australasia, Sri Lanka, Lebanon and United Arab Emirates – within the context of Aspire Solutions Group and its related partners, subsidiaries, suppliers and associated companies.

*Induction* is defined as ‘a process where we observe certain phenomena and on this basis arrive at conclusions; logically establishing general propositions based on observed facts (Sekaran 2003, p. 27). *Case studies* involve ‘in-depth, contextual analyses of similar situations in other organizations, where the nature and definition of the problem happen to be the same as experienced in the current situation’ (Sekaran 2003, p. 35). Case studies generally provide qualitative/subjective data for analysis and interpretation, hence, is closely associated with *inductive methodology*. 
Action Research is ‘generally undertaken by consultants who wish to initiate change processes in organizations, within a context where the researcher begins with a problem that is already identified’ (Sekaran 2003, p. 36). Focus groups, unstructured interviews and unstructured observational studies were also added as part of to the total methodologies. Unstructured interviews are those where ‘interviewer does not enter the interview setting with a planned sequence of questions to be asked of the respondent; intending to bring forth the preliminary issues to the surface so that the researcher can determine what variables need further in-depth investigation’ (Sekaran 2003, p. 225).

Unstructured observational studies are those where ‘the observer has no definite ideas of the particular aspects that need focus; observing events as they take place is part of the plan, where the researcher records practically everything that is being observed’ (Sekaran 2003, p. 253). These types of studies are considered to be ‘the hallmark’ of qualitative research; where investigators begin with a set of ‘tentative’ hypothesis and observations are recorded over a time period. Through pattern tracing, inductive discoveries are made to support subsequent theory building and hypothesis testing.

Neuman (1997) identifies six characteristics of a qualitative style of research: i) importance of the context; ii) case study method; iii) researcher’s integrity; iv) grounded theory; v) process; and vi) interpretations. Social context is considered important in understanding social world and a case study approach is used to gather detailed information on selected cases.

Building upon above mentioned frameworks, this dissertation was experimented and executed at Aspire Solutions Group. It was a form of field research, where the author directly got involved with the organisation being studied. Through interaction over seven years (2001-2009), author studied and tested various entrepreneurial activities within Aspire Solutions Group and associated organisations.
While the researcher attempted to acquire an insider’s point of view, due care was taken to maintain the analytical perspective or distance of an outsider. Depending on the situation, researcher used a variety of techniques and social skills in a flexible manner. Data was collected in the form of written notes, diagrams, maps, pictures and recordings. A holistic view – seeing Aspire Solutions Group as a whole unit rather than in pieces, was maintained throughout the research. Researcher took into account both explicit (recognised and conscious) and tacit (implicit and unspoken) aspects of organisational culture at Aspire Solutions. The research was about observing ongoing social pressures without upsetting, disrupting or imposing outsider views.

Initially, literature relating to both for-profit and not-for-profit organisations’ entrepreneurial activities were thoroughly analysed where Chapter Two provides a synthesis of the findings. Aspire Solutions Group was selected as the field site. Subsequently, access to the premises was gained via Aspire and related organisations’ authorities. Gatekeepers (Neuman 1997, p. 351) – someone with formal or informal authority to control access to site were identified. E.g. Director Boards; Business Development Managers; Operations Managers; workers and volunteers employed full-time, part-time and casual; CEOs; and various other stakeholders.

Social relations with participants at Aspire were established and researcher adopted a social role to get along with participants. During this process onwards, quality data was collected by watching and listening. Data was analysed to focus on specific aspects. Field interviews were conducted to aid in theoretical sampling.

Flexibility was maintained in the research to easily shift direction and to follow leads. Entry and gaining access to Aspire Group can be visualised as an ‘access ladder’ (Neuman 1997, p. 352). Here, the researcher begins at the bottom, where he/ she is an outsider looking for public information. Then he/ she moves up the ladder as a non-threatening passive observer. Next is to observe sensitive events and to ask for clarifications. Finally, attempts are made to view and understand most sensitive events or information.
The researcher was the instrument for measuring the field data, and rapport was built with members/ volunteers/ participants of Aspire Solutions Group and its related organisations. Neuman (1997, p. 357) identifies various systems of ‘role involvement’ by field researchers. In this particular research project, the researcher was a ‘Participant as Observer’, a ‘Researcher Participant’ and an ‘Active Membership Holder’.

‘Participant as Observer’ means that the researcher and members are aware of the researcher’s role, but the researcher is an intimate friend who is a pseudo-member. In this case, the researcher’s identity was well known to participants from their previous encounters with the researcher, who engaged in operational positions with Aspire Solutions Group.

‘Research Participant’ means the researcher participates, but is only partially involved or committed to a member’s perspective. In other words, the researcher is not completely emotionally involved with Aspire Solutions Group, but detached to grasp a critical and analytical view of the observations. Finally, ‘Active Membership’ means the researcher assumes a membership role and goes through the same induction as other members; participation in core activities producing high levels of trust and acceptance, but researcher retains the ‘researcher identity’ and periodically withdraws from the field.

Observing, paying attention, listening and watching is an important part of qualitative research. Good field notes about activities were taken such as work phrases, maps, diagrams, photographs, interviews, tape recordings, memos and observation notes. Usually filed researchers first get a general picture, then focuses on a few specific issues. In this research, the general picture was surrounding the need for entrepreneurial integration at a macro level and the specific issues included: Creativity & Innovation; Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship; Social-Community Entrepreneurship; and Strategy.
The interviews conducted differ from typical survey research interviews. For example, the interview questions were in-depth, non-directive and unstructured. It was in fact a joint production of the researcher and the participants. Subjective meanings from these interviews were possible, because participants were ‘active participants’ and co-operated well. *Malhotra* defines depth interviews as ‘an unstructured, direct, person interview in which a single respondent is probed by a highly skilled interviewer to uncover underlying motivations, beliefs, attitudes and feelings on a topic’ (1999, p.157).

The questions used were tailored to specific participants and situations. Researcher showed interest in responses while interviewing participants and encouraged elaboration of issues. It was more like a friendly conversational exchange, but with more interviewer questions. On a number of occasions, interviews were conducted in group-settings and even included ice-breakers, stores and diversions. Lots of open-ended questions were used. The researcher (interviewer) and the participants jointly controlled direction of the interview and its pace.

The context, where the interview was conducted was noted and seen as an important factor in interpreting the meanings. Interviews were conducted at various locations such as *Aspire Solutions Group* site offices; promotional displays at shopping centres and special events; email and telephone conversations with inter-state and overseas participants. Participants were presented with various categories of interview questions. The initial setting of interview was descriptive followed by structural and contrast type questions.
3.5 Research Sample

The research sample consisted of numerous organizations involved in the domain of entrepreneurship such as Vision United Warriors (sole proprietorship), Vision United Warriors Pty Ltd (limited liability company), VUW Innovative Entrepreneurs Pty Ltd, VUW Altruistic Volunteers Pty Ltd, Aspire Solutions, Aspire Group, Inspirational Industry Solutions, Global Aspirations Pty Ltd, Aspire Group of Companies, Meewella Group of Companies, Seeview Group of Companies, World Vision; Bunnings Australia, Good Shepherds Australia, Coles Myer Limited and various others.

These samples were identified with the author’s own networks and previous business-social involvements. The sample was taken over a period of around twenty-years of involvements, experiences and projects: where the first ten years (from 1988-1998) was considered having an indirect impact; and the next ten years having a direct impact (from 1999 to 2009) on the areas of entrepreneurship.

In addition to the authors’ personal-professional experiences, networks, projects and entrepreneurial pursuits within the last twenty years; trade papers, internet searches, academic literature, textbooks, television and news media, discussions with various stakeholders within for-profit, non-profit and policy-making domains were consulted. In a majority of the cases, author was directly involved with the above mentioned stakeholders – consciously ‘experiencing’, ‘influencing’, ‘practising’ and striving towards becoming an entrepreneur.

As a result, the role of the author was somewhat a mix of anthropological type research within a framework of qualitative, exploratory, subjective research using various case studies and action research. Due to the lack of evidence of entrepreneurship being used within a context of ‘integration’ and as a driving strategy; there was great need for ‘intimate’ information which cannot in some cases be experienced through ‘print media’ and/or ‘documentation’. Coupled with the nature of ‘entrepreneurial domain’ itself – where to date the identity, cognitive, learning styles of who an entrepreneur is being debated both academically and empirically – author felt the need to conduct the long-range practical experience, in order to get a ‘closer’, ‘personal’, ‘intimate’ view of the ‘research problems at hand’.
Field research sampling differs from survey research sampling. Field researcher samples by taking a smaller, selective set of observations from all possible observations (Neuman 1997, p. 370). This process is called \textit{theoretical sampling} and it is guided by researcher’s developing theory.

\section*{3.6 Research Process}

The empirical research process, inductive research method – where the reasoning moves from particular facts to an empirical generalization – hence called a \textit{bottom-up approach} is a five-step model as illustrated below in \textit{Figure 3.1}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Inductive Method: Bottom-up approach}  \\
Reasoning moves from particular facts to empirical generalization  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{figure}

As illustrated above, the issue that was identified as needing further research is ‘entrepreneurship integration’. Observations were made within the existing literature in the form of published journals, texts and proceedings primarily surrounding ‘mainstream entrepreneurial’ domains as well as observations conducted within Aspire Solutions Group.

Next, observations were repeated – extending mainstream entrepreneurial literature to include various other domains such as not-for-profit, policy-making, political, economical, social-sciences and empirically within the networks and extensions of Aspire Solutions Group. Patterns were observed and reported within both academic and empirical settings.

Empirical generalizations were then formed synthesising the literature and based on results-findings of involvements though Aspire Group in terms of advancements and contributions to the entrepreneurial body of knowledge. New theories, models and frameworks of integrating entrepreneurship were introduced building upon the current domains of mainstream entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship.

Theory within the above context is referred to as ‘a set of logically and systematically inter-related principles, propositions or hypothesis describing and explaining social phenomena’; where proposition is relationship between concepts; hypothesis is relationship between variables; concept is a generalized name with notions of variability; indicator, a measure of the variable; and measure, quantity and time dimension (Fonseka 2008, p. 3).

Nature of scientific theories develop to answer to the questions of ‘why?’ and within this dissertation author observed a sequence of events, regulatories and irregulatories within the entrepreneurial domain and attempted to introduce and explain the integrative nature of entrepreneurship. It is said that ‘successful theories enable practitioners to predict behaviour’; within this dissertation, entrepreneurship is presented as a framework in which for-profits, not-for-profits and policy-makers can predict future behaviour, especially within the strategic and global domains.
Chapter Five – Discussion & Conclusion

In line with Fonseka’s (2008, p. 4) ‘criteria of a good theory’, author argues that entrepreneurship models presented within this dissertation has: i) high explanatory power; ii) parsimony (simplicity); iii) internal consistency; iv) falsifiability (testability); and v) generalisability (wide coverage). High explanatory power is justified through the conceptual frameworks presented within Chapter Two and Chapter Four.

Entrepreneurship models discussed further explain behaviours within multiple- and macro-entrepreneurial domains. Yet, the concept is presented within a simple framework building upon Mainstream Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurship maintaining the parsimony aspect.

Internal consistency of academic dimension is protected with direct links to and synthesis of previous, existing and recent entrepreneurial developments as well as testing repeatedly the concepts within an empirical framework through Aspire Solutions Group. Falsifiability or testability of the model is supported with the world’s largest singular entrepreneurial body – Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) and Social Entrepreneurship Monitor (SEM) using their reports of TEA (Total Entrepreneurial Activity Index) and various other measures developed in-house. The model was in fact tested within the Aspire Solutions and related institutional frameworks, covering for-profit, not-for-profit and policy-making domains. Hence the model can be generalised to a large audience involving stakeholders in all three sectors: for-profit, not-for-profit and policy-making.

This dissertation has also followed the scientific approach in setting up a theory, where a theory is ‘initially set up to explain a certain phenomena and then see if that theory can be refuted by evidence’ (Fonseka 2008, p. 4). Whilst this may raise a ‘chicken & egg question’ of observation preceding theory; author argues that due to the nature of the research project where ‘theory – synthesis of entrepreneurial literature’ and ‘practice – observation of empirical projects through Aspire Solutions Group’ moderated any negative impacts.
As illustrated by Table 3.1, throughout the dissertation the following points were taken into consideration: focus of the research was about the ‘quality, nature and essence’ of integrating nature of entrepreneurship, with philosophical roots deeply underpinned in ‘phenomenology and symbolic interactions’. ‘Ethnographic’ and ‘Naturalist’ phrases were associated throughout the dissertation. The goal of the dissertation was to better-understand, describe with more clarity (through the proliferation of terminology) and to generalise the findings to multiple domains within entrepreneurship and beyond.

Design characteristics by nature had to be flexible and in some cases changed to adapt to evolving and emerging entrepreneurial developments in the last decade. Relatively smaller, non-random samples were chosen; where data collection was conducted primarily by researcher himself (research instrument) using observations, experiences and interviews within the case study and action research frameworks. Due to the nature of the inductive (by researcher) mode of analysis, findings were comprehensive and holistic in nature; and were expanded to explain relationships within a larger context of for-profit, not-for-profit and policy-making domains.

Table 3.1: Inductive – Qualitative Research Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of research</th>
<th>Quality; Nature; Essence;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical roots</td>
<td>Phenomenology; Symbolic interaction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated phrases</td>
<td>Ethnographic; Naturalistic;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of investigation</td>
<td>Understanding; Description; Hypothesis Generalisation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design characteristics</td>
<td>Flexible; Evolving; Emerging;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Small; Non-random; Theoretical;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Researcher as primary instrument; Interviews; Observations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of analysis</td>
<td>Inductive (by researcher);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Comprehensive; Holistic; Expansive;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Research Philosophy and Contributions

Dissertation’s contributions to research in terms of epistemology (the theory of knowledge) were conducted within the frameworks of:

i) reason – emphasis on rationale and pure reason as in the case of Plato and Rene Descartes (1596-1650). Entrepreneurial integration was introduced as the ‘logical’ next step based on developments to date and within the emerging dynamic-complex global context of high uncertainty;

ii) experiential reality – acceptance of knowledge that one cannot rationalize as in the case of Aristotle; certain parts of the entrepreneurial process and entrepreneurs’ instinct, gut-feel, identity, personality, risk taking and opportunity identification and various other ‘cognitive’ and ‘behavioural’ attributes are unable to be rationalized fully. Scholars to date are attempting to break this ‘gap of knowledge’ in order to fully utilize entrepreneurial experiences for the benefit of humankind. However, until such time that ‘entrepreneur’ and ‘entrepreneurship’ are accepted and practiced as a concrete, objective, hard science, some assumptions need to be made to proceed in the contemporary context.

iii) experience – experiential reality as emphasized by Francis Bacon; Entrepreneurship arguably is a discipline born and developed based on the experiences of entrepreneurs and their ventures. Unlike various other ‘hard’ disciplines where well-developed Laws (concepts of the highest order having general validity and not subject to ceteris paribus assumption) and Principles (concepts of the second order which are stated with certain pre-conditions); the domain of entrepreneurship is still in its ‘infant’ stage. Hence, experiences do still play a major part in uncovering the ‘mysteries’ of the ‘reality of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship’.

iv) empiricism – all knowledge originates from the senses as emphasised by John Locke (1632-1704). While the five senses of humanity – seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching – dominate much of our daily encounters as well as the vast body of knowledge within scientific inquiry; when dealing with entrepreneurs, it is important to accept another type of sense – often described as the sixth sense. Entrepreneurship literature is very active in its pursuit of identifying how entrepreneurs analyse, think and
make decisions – in some cases with absolute no logic, reasoning, justification or five-sensory-perceptual judgement. Interestingly, successful entrepreneurs are continuously ‘breaking the rules’ of the sensory (five) perceptions and they seem to be able to make successful decisions leading to extraordinary growth. The sixth sense has often been associated to the world’s most successful, serial entrepreneurs such as Sir Richard Branson (Virgin Group), Bill Gates (Microsoft), Donald Trump (Apprentice) and various others. Thus entrepreneurial mindset, attitude and behaviours seem to challenge and in some cases defy the traditional scientific modes of inquiry.

v) scientific revolutions – paradigm shifts where all rules are set back to zero as advocated by Thomas Kuhn (1962). As in the cases discussed earlier about sixth sense entrepreneurs, majority of them have also redefined their particular industry contexts where whole new paradigms have emerged as a result of entrepreneurial ventures and experiences. For example, in a time when it was thought of as impossible for single private owners to enter into the arena of airline industry in the UK; Sir Richard Branson very successfully launched his Virgin Airlines and in fact challenged the existence of British Airways within regional air travel and followed on to expand the Virgin Group to move into ‘impossible’ other markets such as Australia and the United States. Considered one of the youngest people on the planet [at the time] to become a billionaire, Sir Richard Branson to date, continues to ‘make history’ by bringing the rules back to zero in various other industries such as space travel and green-energy fuels.

Similarly, when it was considered to be ‘silly’ to invest in the property market of Chicago and New York – several decades ago in a time of great economic crisis; and when all other investors were ‘fleeing far away’ from the market; Donald Trump decided ‘only’ to invest in this region; thereby accumulating billions of wealth and becoming one of the wealthiest people on the planet. More recently, once again beating the odds, he entered into the entertainment industry (The Apprentice – You are Fired) and successfully launched entrepreneurial ventures by defying the existing rules of entertainment industry. He had no prior entertainment experience, know-how, expertise in this ‘new’ industry and all of the logical analysis indicated that he would fail. Yet, he succeeded well beyond expectations and turned the Trump empire towards new directions.
vi) deconstruction – removing all prior assumptions and constructs to see reality as promoted by Lacan. Whilst the entrepreneurship domain is relatively new, several assumptions and constructs have already permeated through the literature. For example, creativity, innovation, mainstream entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship are considered to be well-established. However, using a deconstructionist approach, author ‘went back to the beginning’ of identifying the ‘origins’ of how entrepreneurship was developed, what it was intended for – such as through the writings of 17th & 18th century French scholars about ‘entrepreder’ and more recently in the twentieth century (1932) in the writings of Joseph Schumpeter.

Roots of entrepreneurship was then brought back to surface; and building upon arguments presented by Yamin (2008), argues that entrepreneurship domain always intended to ‘create dynamic communities’ whilst ‘creating commercial value’ simultaneously. Thereby fundamentally changed the ‘constructs’ of which ‘entrepreneurship’ was based upon – mainstream entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship operating in isolation. Next, the underpinning ideals were re-constructed within a framework of entrepreneurial integration and presented as the way forward into the strategic-global context.

vii) tacit-explicit knowledge of Nonaka. Tacit knowledge is defined as ‘personal, context specific, hard to formalise and communicate, know more than we can tell, subjective, experience-based knowledge that cannot be expressed in words, sentences, numbers and formulae, including beliefs, images, intuition, mental models and technical skill, similar to that of the expertise of the craftsman’; Explicit knowledge on the other hand is defined as ‘codified knowledge, referring to the knowledge that is more easily transmittable in a formal systematic language’ (Nonaka 1999, p. 65).
Building upon Nonaka’s definition, much of entrepreneurial domain is still largely contained within the *tacit* domain – due to its personal, context specific and difficulty in expressing ‘entrepreneurial transfer of knowledge’. However, it is important to note here that the two types of knowledge are not completely inseparable, rather mutually complementary. Their mutual interaction is the fundamental basis for *creativity* and *knowledge creation* within entrepreneurial domains, where *social interactions* play a major part.

Whilst excessive focus on *explicit* knowledge can potentially lead to ‘paralysis by analysis’ scenario; over-evaluation of *tacit* knowledge can arguably lead a person to rely too much on the past successes. Extreme cases of both of these dimensions are not considered suitable. As illustrated below in Figure 3.2: i) *Socialisation* – tacit to tacit; ii) *Externalisation* – tacit to explicit; iii) *Combination* – explicit to explicit; and iv) *Internalisation* – explicit to tacit; all of the four modes being important in the ‘integrated process of knowledge creation’ (Nonaka 1999).

**Figure 3.2: Ikujiro Nonaka’s Four Modes of Knowledge Conversion**

(SECI Model as process of *self-transcendence*)

Adapted from: Nonaka, I. 1999 “The Dynamics of Knowledge Creation”, *The Knowledge Advantage*, Oxford, pp. 63-87
Author argues that the basis for this dissertation is grounded on the founding of real-life entrepreneurial organization called *Aspire Solutions Group*. Entrepreneurship in its ‘infant’ theoretical developments has not been able to document and express the body of knowledge into the *explicit* form fully. As a result, the current entrepreneurial body of knowledge contains ‘partial’, ‘piece-meal’ and ‘inadequately developed’ knowledge; thereby compromising on the ‘quality’, ‘usefulness’ and ‘validity’ of such information to its users. The users here include both academics and practitioners in the broadest sense who are interested in the future development of entrepreneurship. Arguably new knowledge built on such ‘partial’ knowledge can have fundamental errors, biases and interpretation issues.

Entrepreneurship as a domain – by and large operate within the *socialization* realm, where much of the knowledge exist in the form of – as *Nonaka* presents, ‘conversation from tacit to tacit’. There’s a large number of ‘shared mental models’ and ‘technical skills through shared experiences’ which guide the developments within its body of knowledge. Since the key to acquiring this form of knowledge is the ‘experience’ itself; *Nonaka* presents ‘observation’, ‘imitation’ and ‘practice’ as the best form of learning within an environment; rather than through the ‘academic language’. The best form therefore is arguably either ‘on the job training’ in the form of *apprenticeships* and *new venture creations*.

In line with *Nonaka*’s findings, author argues that this dissertation is methodologically ‘sound’, ‘appropriate’ and ‘most suitable’, given the *tacit-tacit* nature of entrepreneurial domain. The author’s personal experiences in founding and operating *Aspire Solutions Group* is considered to be utmost important in the arguments presented within the dissertation. Much of the learning relating to specific contexts, time frames and situations would have been difficult to ‘plan-for’ and ‘account for’ within other types of scientific inquiry methods. It was also necessary for the researcher within this context to be not just a part of, rather be the driver of an entrepreneurial venture – in order to fully utilise and understand its deeply rooted knowledge.
Through the engagement of the *tacit-tacit* knowledge-base both within the author himself [as an entrepreneur] as well as other like-minded entrepreneurs; researcher was able to engage and transfer knowledge with – metaphorically speaking – ‘a new language in a new country’. Hence was able to penetrate through the ‘slang, pronunciation, jargon, symbolic, unwritten, behavioural and cultural representations’ of the entrepreneurial language rather than simply the written form. This type of language is also supported by the *Narrative* and *Social* theories of Bourdieu and Ricoere.

In the second phase of *Externalization*, author attempted to translate the *tacit* knowledge – collected over a decade of research and learning from Aspire Group – into the *explicit* form. This articulation was attempted through metaphors, analogies, concepts and models presented throughout the dissertation. It is important to note here that there is still a large amount of *tacit* knowledge present within the domain of entrepreneurship; and arguably will continue to for several more decades – until such time when entrepreneurship becomes a well-developed discipline.

For the current context however, any attempts in transforming entrepreneurial *tacit* knowledge into entrepreneurial *explicit* knowledge is fundamental to the entire entrepreneurial knowledge creation process, since much of the knowledge is grounded mostly in the form of *tacit*. Within today’s knowledge-economy, *entrepreneurial explicit knowledge* such as that presented within this dissertation could open new frontiers and revolutionary paradigms in thinking. Within the author’s knowledge, it is the very first time that entrepreneurial integration based on simultaneous priorities of *Business-Commercial* and *Social-Community* needs is presented as a global-entrepreneurial-strategy. It is also the first time where it is argued that both commercial and social entrepreneurship should be integrated within corporate strategy, without compromising on the primary objectives of each. This type of knowledge – which was more apparent in its *tacit entrepreneurial domains* – was not no apparent within the *explicit* domains of entrepreneurship up until now.
Given the contribution to the entrepreneurial knowledge – in the form of *explicit knowledge* – author then argues that this dissertation can in fact be utilised within the *Combination (explicit-explicit)* domain – the third type described by Nonaka. In other words, coupled with other *explicit* developments within *Mainstream entrepreneurship* and *Social Entrepreneurship* – academics and practitioners can use this dissertation though the systematization of concepts through models, symbols, figures and ‘language’ used. For example, the entrepreneurial integration conceptual models can be adapted to fit into various other existing *explicit knowledge base* of entrepreneurship such as *creativity, innovation, women entrepreneurship, technology entrepreneurship, minority entrepreneurship, sustainability entrepreneurship, international entrepreneurship* and various other forms.

Next, the model presented can be tested and adapted into the ‘practical’ domains of new venture creations and *intrapreneurship*. Here, *explicit* knowledge is transferred back into *tacit* knowledge through *Internalization* – often referred to as ‘learning by doing’. The new knowledge that had been created originally from *tacit-tacit, tacit-explicit* and *explicit-explicit* is now transferred back into the *tacit* mode (internalized into the individual *tacit* knowledge again), creating a unique ever-flowing cycle of continuous learning, adaptation, flexibility and improvement. These types of organisations are often refereed to as ‘learning organizations’ – the very types advocated as the ‘surviving types’ within contemporary global context. This new, re-constructed, re-innovated *tacit* knowledge is expressed in the form of ‘shared mental models’, ‘technical know how’ and ‘valuable knowledge assets’ giving entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial ventures a unique ‘strategic advantage’ over its rivals.

This ‘process of self-transcendence’ – viewing organisations as ‘places for the creation of knowledge’ – is an important fundamental change in the thinking (mind-sets) whereby the new context is more prone to supporting individuals (current entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs of future); rather than to exert higher levels of control – as a way of facilitating the *tacit knowledge base*. This is also a mandatory requirement for the development of the entrepreneurial domain; because entrepreneurs by nature need to be ‘facilitated, nurtured, encouraged’ than to be ‘controlled’.
Hence, this new notion becomes a catalyst in itself for exponential levels of entrepreneurial developments in the future, placing entrepreneurship in an ever-important role within the strategic global context. As presented above in SECI model above: individuals/entrepreneurs transcend themselves through socialization; externalization helps entrepreneurial teams to transcend their current knowledge; combination helps them to reach organization level; and internalisation means to transcend the super-personal level of individuals into entrepreneurs and reach the personal tacit levels again.

This paradigm shift of knowledge creation – based on Nonaka’s SECI Model – is therefore a radical shift away from current ‘general management’ and ‘strategic management’ literature based on linear dimensions of Planning, Organizing, Leading and Control (POLC Framework).

As such, author argues that the methodology adapted in this dissertation in not only sound but also most conducive to the given constraints in the entrepreneurial literature. Due to the exploratory context and the nature of the fundamental underpinnings associated with entrepreneurial integration being researched; deductive approaches of falsification emphasised by Karl Popper was primarily ignored within this dissertation.

It is stated that similar to other social sciences, study of management also has the basic goals of: i) describing – what, who, when, where, how; ii) predicting – knowing the conditions under which an event is likely to occur; and iii) explaining – knowing why an event occurs or identifying the casual factors of the event (Nanayakkara et al 2008, p. 2).

Within this context, author applied an inductive-phenomenological approach and attempted to conceptualize entrepreneurial phenomena from a discovery perspective of entrepreneurs/managers; followed by developing skills in executing research projects that would undertake systematic investigation into problems of human understanding.
Since the study of research methods at doctoral level requires a significant amount of ‘free thinking as well as tangible exercises’ (Nanayakkara et al 2008, p. 2); author undertook independent study within the domain of entrepreneurship; whilst at the same time conducting numerous practical observations and projects through the establishment of Aspire Solutions Group. There was an expectation of cross-learning and interdependent learning from the combination of ‘theory’ and ‘practice’; eventually producing ‘unique experiences, concepts and new ideas’ within the domain of entrepreneurship.

The particular, selected area of research interest was integrative nature of entrepreneurship. There was a focus of attention given to significant problems with current Mainstream Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurship (based on previous research, publications, policy documents and data collected by author). Author objectively assessed the significance of the research sensitivity of the problem area.

Fonseka states that doctoral thesis must ‘demonstrate originality: i) clear topic; ii) interesting; iii) magnitude; iv) achievable; v) access to data; vi) ethics; vii) knowledge drawing; and viii) blends theory and practice’ (2008, p. 1). Author argues that the title of this dissertation is clear, concise, the ‘natural’ next development of entrepreneurial domain – combining the Mainstream and Social elements of entrepreneurship. Through a model of Business-Commercial and Social-Community entrepreneurship, arguably, this dissertation has also made an ‘interesting’ discovery of a new type of entrepreneurship and a synthesis of the overall existing entrepreneurial body of knowledge maintaining the momentum throughout.

The ‘magnitude’ of dissertation explored significant entrepreneurial development areas such as women entrepreneurship, international entrepreneurship, small businesses, minority entrepreneurship, sustainability entrepreneurship, sustainability intrapreneurship, intrapreneurship/ corporate entrepreneurship/ corporate venturing, ethnic entrepreneurship, home based entrepreneurship, family controlled-owned entrepreneurship (FCB/ FOB), technology entrepreneurship, trans-national entrepreneurship, eco-entrepreneurship, civic-entrepreneurship, environmental entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial teams with links to creativity, innovation, corporate social responsibility (CSR), invention-innovation, opportunity identification-cognition-
learning, micro-financing, venture-capital, angel-investors and other emerging developments.

‘Achievability’ within the given timeframe and resources was one of the toughest challenges within this dissertation. Given the complexity, contradicting, under-developed, ever-changing nature of entrepreneurial literature especially within the strategic-global domain as well as complications of actually founding-operating a real-organization Aspire Solutions increased the original intended timeframe of this dissertation of six years part time (2001-2007) to eight years (2001-2009). Access and availability of data comprised of academic (entrepreneurial literature published in journals and texts), empirical (seminars, workshops, industry based publications) and original sources (through Aspire Solutions involvements).

Ethical issues were considered in the highest degree – so as to be mindful of sensitive issues; and as a result names and details of certain sources were changed. This dissertation also attempted to draw upon knowledge from other disciplines extending the breadth, relevance, generalisability and applicability of entrepreneurship into public-policy, strategic, management, social-science, political, economical, technological and various other related disciplines and domains. Theory and practice was blended to make sure that theoretical concepts are methodologically rigorous, yet practically relevant and attempts were taken to apply them within Aspire Solutions Group.

It is stated that basic premise of underlying research is to achieve nine things: “i) explore an unexplored area; ii) challenge what is ‘already known’ with new evidence or new interpretations”; iii) add new dimensions and aspects to existing knowledge”; iv) problem formulated in a novel way; v) new interpretations to existing findings; vi) new evidence on previous issue; vii) new methods/techniques adopted; viii) replicate a study elsewhere; and ix) synthesis of existing knowledge (Fonseka 2008, p. 1).
Author argues that within this dissertation:

i) **Advancements to existing entrepreneurial body of knowledge**

   This dissertation made several advancements to the entrepreneurship body of knowledge, by integrating entrepreneurial developments within Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship and Social-Community Entrepreneurship.

ii) **Challenged existing piece-meal entrepreneurial approach**

   It also challenged the feasibility and validity of existing ‘piece meal’/‘ad-hoc’ nature of entrepreneurial domain within the context of developments of Mainstream Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurship in isolation – within the contemporary (and especially the future) domains of the planet.

   The study further challenged the ‘failures’ of the current disintegrated applications of ‘entrepreneurship’ in operation within a holistic framework of moving the world forward. Finally, arguments were presented supported by literature and empirical examples directing for-profits, non-profits and policy-makers to work towards integration.

   For example, despite entrepreneurial successes, wage gap is increasing; poverty lines are increasing; world is starting to question the ‘appropriateness of entrepreneurship’ in solving world problems; USA, primarily the advocator of ‘entrepreneurialism’ losing the battle economically – economic crisis, rising wage gaps; socially – homeless increasing; globally – losing respect in cases such as Iraq-Iran problems; context – China and India rising to be large economic players.

   Author argues that these are not problems of ‘entrepreneurship’; Entrepreneurship can still help in changing the world as it was intended by Schumpeter. However, we need to re-visit its underlying assumptions to avoid the same mistakes possibly made by democracy; Democracy originally was intended to improve humanity and moderate the adverse effects of wage-gaps, rich-poor gap and improve living conditions globally, yet arguably has ‘failed’ to achieve its intended objectives.


iii) **Contributions to existing entrepreneurial body of knowledge**

New ways of looking at the future of the entrepreneurial context was presented as a way of helping *for-profits, non-profits and policy-makers* – making **Contributions** to the existing entrepreneurial body of knowledge. Further **New Interpretations** to existing findings were given such as in the case of *Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship* as superseding-broadly encompassing *Mainstream Entrepreneurship*; and *Social-Community Entrepreneurship* as superseding-broadly encompassing *Social Entrepreneurship*. **New Evidence** was also presented based on *Aspire Solutions Group* and related organizations and stakeholders over two decades (1988-2009).

**New Method/ Technique/ Models** were adopted based on an integrating model of entrepreneurship. Unintentionally, **Replication** of a similar previous study was discovered (found out later on, in 2008) – about *Aspire Group UK* with similar practices – however this dissertation was not biased by previous study and was not influenced up to now. **Synthesis** of existing literature was compiled.

### 3.8 Research Context and Limitations

This qualitative case study explored a number of organisations (primarily based in Australia). As part of the research, the researcher founded and operated a Greenfield project called *Aspire Solutions Group*. Numerous senior management staff; middle management staff; & supervisory staff of associated companies, suppliers and networks were interviewed to research the ‘integrated’ nature of entrepreneurship.

The research study found that the emerging global context demands more integrated and holistic approaches. *Business* entrepreneurs existing within primarily *profit-driven* industries as well as *Social* entrepreneurs operating in *not-for-profit* domains are equally at risk of failure. Sustainability, long term returns and mere survival are at the heart of the issues of discussion for both extremes. Based on the case study findings, a new model was developed to leverage corporate strategy with links to operationalise *Innovation, Strategy, & HR Alignment* through *Emergent-Leadership, Change Management, Organisation-Dynamics, e-Business, & Strategy-Relationships*. It was found that an integrated-holistic approach is preferred.
Hence, contrary to a significant amount of previous research and empirical studies, it is argued that the lack of integrated types is to some degree a result of mis-conceptualization, misunderstanding and problems with implementation; rather than the general view of *Entrepreneurship* as being an inherently for-profit driven & piece-meal approach to corporate strategy.

*Aspire Solutions Groups*’ main operations were limited to *Australasia, United Arab Emirates, Lebanon* and *Sri Lanka*. Although, much of the research within this thesis is based on global setting; the testing of these particular entrepreneurial concepts are limited to *Australasia, United Arab Emirates, Lebanon* and *Sri Lanka*. The research study also focused on identifying key issues that are considered ‘hands on and practical’ firsthand. The study was centred around *Aspire Solutions Group* and its associated suppliers, investors, partners and subsidiaries. The company itself was also founded by the researcher and his partner. As a result, whilst all practical precautions were taken by the researcher to remain neutral and objective, there is some level of potential inherent bias surrounding the main case study.

The charity industry in general as well as the business context is enormous. The relevance of the outcomes may vary according to the size and make up of *for-profit* and *non-profit* organisations. The successful applications of entrepreneurial activity in these organisations are limited by the mindset of the management. In addition, research within the context of *entrepreneurship* is continually evolving at a rapid pace. This study was originally initiated in 2001 and took varying research and practical directions. Due to the nature of and the vast developments in the contemporary context, new ideas, models within this field; any so called ‘new knowledge’, by the time it’s published is already considered ‘old knowledge’.

Being a qualitative research design, this dissertation was naturally open to the general limitations of exploratory research such as: wording problems; bias client responses; unreliability of feedback; significant costs; interviewer’s possible impact on client responses; taking too much time; difficulty of interpretation and categorization; and scheduling difficulties. Despite these inherent limitations of qualitative methods, researcher took utmost care to stay objective and to be mindful of researcher bias.
The gathered knowledge base – in the form of primary data (Aspire Solutions set up and operating data) and secondary data (industry based data and academic literature already published for other purposes than this dissertation) – formed the core of the research information. Among the vast amount of stakeholder groups intercepted within for-profit, non-profit and policy-making domains – in terms of interviews, observations, involvements and dealings were: i) entrepreneurial owner-operators; ii) entrepreneurial start-ups; iii) entrepreneurs; iv) directors, chairmen and board members; v) employees, contractors and volunteers; vi) government agencies and representatives; and vii) community members.

Due to the limited availability (in some cases non-existence) of literature within the domain of entrepreneurship – especially in relation to ‘integration’, an ‘Exploratory, Qualitative and Subjective design’ was utilised. Throughout the research the typical shortcomings of each type of methodology was considered carefully, as illustrated by Table 3.2 (Adapted from: McNamara & Carter cited in Khartabil 2007, p. 21).

Table 3.2: Research Method Shortcomings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Major Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires, Surveys, Checklists</td>
<td>Wording problems; May bias client responses; Need for sampling experts; Unreliable feedback;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Takes too much time; Hard to compare and analyse; Significant costs; Interviewer impacts client responses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation Reviews</td>
<td>Incomplete information; Takes too much time; Outcome of research may not be clear; Not flexible due to restriction of existing data;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Difficult to interpret and categorise; Expensive; Can influence respondent’s behaviour;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Need experienced facilitators; Difficult to schedule; Information can be hard to interpret and analyse;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Time consuming to study, organise and analyse; Such analysis may present a detailed analysis of phenomena rather than provide a complete and deep understanding of cause-effect relationships;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 Summary

This dissertation is presented in the form of ‘applied research’ which is about conducting research to find problems to specific ‘real life’ problems. For example, finding reasons for ‘failures’, ‘causes’, ‘motivations to do something’. Applied research is different from ‘pure research’ which aims to expand the frontiers of knowledge and does not directly involve solutions to immediate problems as in the case of studying about gravitational force (Fonseka 2008, p. 2).

Within this context of ‘applied research’, the author attempted to address: i) **Exploratory** – initial research conducted clarifying and defining the nature of integration of entrepreneurship and introduced a totally new concept considered an advancement to the body of knowledge. Here the problem was not directly guided by prior theories, hypothesis or propositions and hence was of pure qualitative nature; ii) **Descriptive** – careful and accurate descriptions were reported of the characteristics of both Mainstream Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurship; answering the question of ‘what’. iii) **Explanatory** nature of entrepreneurial domain – discovered and reported relationships among different aspects overarching entrepreneurial integration and its links with for-profits, not-for-profits, policy-makers, Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship, Social-Community Entrepreneurship, Mainstream Entrepreneurship, Social Entrepreneurship, Creativity, Innovation, Entrepreneurial Mind-sets, Strategy and contemporary and future global context – explaining the reason ‘why’.
Chapter Four – Evaluation of Case Studies

4.1 Introduction

As discussed in Chapter Three, the majority of the qualitative data for this study was extracted from several case studies. The case studies were selected on the basis of firstly having access to qualitative data relevance to dissertation, availability of key managers in cooperating with the researcher and ability to get access to key insights of the organizations. Since majority of entrepreneurial knowledge base still reside in tacit forms, researcher felt the need to conduct the study using mainly interviews, observations and in some cases be involved in the organization. This type of research is especially effective in anthropological type research settings where the researcher herself becomes part of the subject being studied. Various strengths and limitations of such methodology were discussed earlier.

Due to the relatively recent history of entrepreneurial developments; limited access to any ‘grand master theories’; large gaps in literature; contrasting models; practice driven and successful, yet with little conclusive evidence of such approaches; and various other entrepreneurial related limitations; author felt a qualitative approach was most suitable in this study. This approach was also more ‘appropriate’ and ‘comfortable’ for the subjects being studied such as founders of entrepreneurial ventures; serial entrepreneurs; non-academics and relatively less-educated entrepreneurs.

Entrepreneurial mindset is a mystery yet uncovered (The Economist). Anatomy of entrepreneurs consist of elements of passion, fire and knowledge (University of Waterloo). Passion as a subject matter relates to the ‘heart’. Knowledge-base (primarily tacit) relates to the ‘mind’ uncovering the ‘potential and the unique thinking style’ of entrepreneurs. Fire-zeal deals with matters of charisma, inspiration, drive, energy, enthusiasm, dynamism, perseverance, persistence and magnetism at extraordinary levels. To date, researchers and practitioners struggle to uncover these mysteries and in a majority of the cases, even the entrepreneurs themselves are unable to ‘explain fully’ the details and the rationale of why they behave very differently from that of others.
Amidst this challenging task, author felt the need to ‘become’ or at least to ‘further develop’ his own ‘entrepreneurial make up’. Due to the inherent contrasting ‘paradigms’, especially in the area of entrepreneurship, it is rare for academic researchers to embark on such type of research. Yet, such methods also have the capability to transcend beyond the ‘traditional’ means of inquiry and tap into the ‘real make up’ of entrepreneurs – first hand. Contrary to traditional ‘trait’ view, significant amount of entrepreneurial literature points out that ‘entrepreneurs can be made’. Yet, much of the literature has failed to pin point accurately how ‘entrepreneurs can be made’. It was theoretically plausible and was in fact a motive for the author to embark on such a journey and become an entrepreneur to uncover those mysteries. One such study in particular written by Professor Howard Armitage of University of Waterloo states the following:

“There are some ‘privileged’ entrepreneurs who start ahead of the pack; it could be argued that they aren’t driven a the hunger to catch up or to get ahead; ... Starting form a place of privilege, I dare say, is not the norm ... defining an ‘entrepreneur’ in the end is an impossible task. While each entrepreneur shares some common traits, the reality is that each entrepreneur is as unique, independent, and individualistic in their own right. Their personal vision and personal drive are all key to what makes each entrepreneur successful – it’s very personal, it’s very complex. In many ways an entrepreneur’s uniqueness defies definition or scientific measurement. In innate, it may suggest that entrepreneurs are born, not made. But while it may contain some truth, a new breed of academics, focused on entrepreneurship, would argue that at the least entrepreneurship can be taught, directed, and nurtured. ... In the experiences of University of Waterloo, Centre for Business, Entrepreneurship & Technology (CBET), entrepreneurs can be taught, mentored and inspired’.

Professor Armitage further states that Post secondary educators for the last 60 years have focused narrowly on big business; and as a result has neglected the domain of entrepreneur. The bigger the organization, the easier to collect information, analyse scientifically, measure and compare results. Yet, in the cases of most entrepreneurs, “small and agile, defies measurement and comparison, just by their nature – too many variables”.
Entrepreneurs, considered ‘agents of historical change’ (Austrian Economist, Joseph Schumpeter 1947) are a unique make up of a mix of variables from personality type, behavioural characteristics and is flexible in ‘changing shape’ to match the opportunity faced. In 1959, American Economic historian, Arthur Cole – based on a ten year study at the Centre for Research on Entrepreneurship History – stated that “there are four types of entrepreneurs: i) innovator; ii) calculative inventor; iii) over-optimistic promoter; and iv) organizational builder. Yet, although these seem to be personality traits, they are not related to the personality of the individual at all; rather, to the type of opportunity they face at the time” (Armitage 2008, p. 30). Such knowledge provides an account of entrepreneurs being flexible, flowing, willing, able and as agents of change. Due to these complexities, author felt that there was a further need to understand these ‘opportunities’ firsthand and perhaps to follow on with ‘opportunity identification’ tasks personally.

Anthropologically, this is similar to when a researcher resides within a certain tribe and become part of the daily activities of that particular tribe. Eventually the researcher is accepted as part of the tribe and learns to behave as much as the tribes-people themselves. Their experiences become ‘very rich, intimate and in-depth’ and in turn, researcher learns the ‘language, behaviours, attitudes, customs’ and uncovers the so called ‘mysteries’ and ‘anomalies’. It is stated that “entrepreneurial knowledge transfer is hands-on; at the very least entrepreneurs are required to share one of their many intangible skills – to grow and prosper. On the job, entrepreneurs become trainers and teachers, mentoring apprentices who learn soft skills and hard ones” (Armitage 2008, p. 30). Author similarly felt that there was a need to be ‘on the job’ and ‘to become’ an entrepreneur to get firsthand account of entrepreneurial experiences. As such, the majority of the research focused on author’s own ‘practical efforts’ in starting up several entrepreneurial ventures from very humble beginnings to eventual expansion of Aspire Solutions Group – strategically aligned network of companies spanning across three continents.
4.2 ‘Aspire Solutions’ Entrepreneurial Evolution & Networks

Prior to commencing doctoral studies, author had set up a small charitable organization called Vision United Warriors. Upon the commencement of the doctoral studies, author founded an actual organisation called Aspire Solutions. It was incorporated on the seventh day of September 2001 and was originally formed with the intention of pursuing a Social Entrepreneurial mission. By the end of the research the name was re-branded as Aspire Solutions Group and evolved into one pursuing integrated entrepreneurial strategies. It was originally incorporated to develop the idea of ‘Social Entrepreneurship’ within the Australian context. Strategic Global mindset was later evolved through Aspire revolutionising its core-values away from the traditional types of charities, not-for-profits as well as the more recent social entrepreneurial types.

Within the American and British context, social entrepreneurial organisations have added high value to community groups. They have been identified as much more efficient and effective in delivering services to people with disabilities; the poor; and the needy. In fact, more and more charities and not-for-profits have been moving towards social entrepreneurial type corporate structures in America and Britain. Aspire Group’s very first organisation – Vision United Warriors – intended to pursue on a similar path in Australia using social entrepreneurial activities, where they thrived to achieve excellence in delivering help to the poor; the sick; the homeless; the abused; and the needy. Majority of VUW-AV activities included charitable and non-profit type activity with close ties to well established NGDOs (Figure 4.1).

VUW-Innovative-Entrepreneurs Pty Ltd was set up several years later to operate within the for-profit, commercial sector (Figure 4.2). This was an extension to VUW-Altruistic-Volunteers which was set up to operate within the not for profit sector. Due to the legislative and administrative context of Australia at the time, it was more practical to incorporate two separate companies rather than just one integrated company.
Figure 4.1: Vision United Warriors (Altruistic Volunteers)

Source: Vision United Warriors (Altruistic Volunteers) Pty Ltd, Australia

Figure 4.2: Vision United Warriors (Innovative Entrepreneurs)

Source: Vision United Warriors (Innovative Entrepreneurs) Pty Ltd, Australia
Towards the end of the study, author formed *Aspire Solutions Group* (Figure 4.3) and attempted to pursue an integrated entrepreneurial strategy. Author ‘tested’ various entrepreneurial models within *Aspire Solutions Group* in Australasia, Sri Lanka, UAE and Lebanon. Whilst the entrepreneurial integration of *Aspire Solutions Group* emerged only towards the end of this study, roots of its entrepreneurial endeavours date back to the childhood of the author.

**Figure 4.3: Aspire Solutions Group**

Source: Aspire Solutions Group, Australia ([www.aspiresolutions.biz](http://www.aspiresolutions.biz))
4.2.1 Phase One – Problem (Dormant), the Eastern Experience

- Sri Lankan + ‘eastern-developing’ Experience (1973-1988)

Born in Sri Lanka – an eastern-developing country – author was faced with his own ‘problems’ of bringing about societal change. From a young age, author took upon himself the responsibility of facing numerous ‘societal problems’ such as: helping the homeless; sharing food with hungry kids at school; clothing the poor and various other means. As illustrated in Appendix Two, at ten years of age, the author was offered several awards for his contribution in Sri Lanka including: Village Development Project; Help-age International Project; and Scouting Projects.

The entrepreneurial type and behaviour strategy displayed by the author during this stage – Phase One – is most closely associated with ‘Dormant’ type (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor categories). Here the author was almost ‘inactive’, ‘sleeping’ and experienced ‘underdeveloped and hidden’ entrepreneurial characteristics. The ad-hoc ‘emotionally driven’ actions had nothing much ‘strategic’ about it.

There were no real intentions of ‘changing the world at a global scale’; simply it felt great to help out, do the part and do the right thing. Whilst this type of behaviour can be very inspirational, there’s nothing really strategic and global about it. In other words, such types of ‘piece meal’ approaches are unlikely to change the course of world history towards eliminating the poverty or contribute significantly to macro utopian goals.

There were no real intended ‘entrepreneurial outcomes’ and no ‘entrepreneurial planning’ such as the creation Business Plan. These ‘pure heart driven’ activities were very much internal and philosophically based; however are unlikely to significantly contribute in changing the ‘real world’ and aid in solving global strategic problems. Further, creativity and innovation – considered fundamental within the process of entrepreneurship – was also to a large degree ‘missing’ during this stage (1973-1988). As such, this first stage – Phase One – can hardly be considered as entrepreneurial.
4.2.2 Phase Two – Idea (Potential) the Western Experience

- **Australian + ‘western-developed’ Experience (1989-1998)**

Next decade or so of the authors life (1989-1998) was spent in mainly ‘western’ and so-called ‘developed’ countries of the world – for most part in Australia. Here, author started to view the world through various different lenses and was beginning to build a ‘love-hate’ relationship with the world’s contrasts. For example, it was becoming evident that the world does not really have scarcity problems of ‘food, water, shelter and other basic needs’; rather issues of how they are allocated among the global population. The world produces more than adequate ‘food supplies’ yearly – in fact five times more than that’s needed to feed the whole world. Yet more than half the world’s population live under poverty line to date.

As one of the United States presidents, John F. Kennedy stated ‘the world has enough, what it lacks is the will’. Further, World Vision statistics show that there are adequate resources to completely eradicate poverty; however need to change our ‘mindsets’. Here, creativity and new idea generation was beginning to flourish through the author’s mind. What used to be a ‘linear problem’ in the authors mind was now being transferred to a much more complex, inter-dependant set of ‘non-linear opportunities’.

Through the travels and experiences of the teenage years, the narrow view of the world was being advanced through the exposure to the world. Whilst this multi dimensional acceptance did not necessarily help the author in finding ‘real life solutions’ to the issues at hand; the fact that the author started to behave differently in terms of ‘questioning’, ‘challenging’ and by ‘thinking outside the square’ meant that the ‘entrepreneurial potential’ was being harnessed.
Although, author was more confused and unsure of how this mess can be untangled; within that chaos and complication, creativity started to emerge out of mere survival instincts. In a biological sense, this is similar to where, it’s almost natural that when we see food, our saliva glands start to initiate saliva in our mouths. Creativity started to work through out of necessity to the ‘mental needs’ of author, in trying to find ‘solutions’ to the issues at hand. Here, creativity stage was fundamental in the author’s ‘ability to piece together unusual interrelationships between various issues relating to poverty eradication; however not necessarily having a clear understanding how to take the next steps.

Although the author displayed the ability to come up with ‘new ideas’ and exercised some level of ‘creativity’; there was no real outcome such as a prototype, patent or a business plan. Hence, at this stage, author did not really move into ‘innovation’ stages. Within the high school system in Australia followed by Diploma in Swinburne University; majority of author’s activities revolved around ‘idea generation’ of how to help. During the same time author was studying full time; was employed full time in family business; and had part time employment in Shell Australia. It is important to note here that most entrepreneurs do seem to go through these extreme behaviours prior to maturing in their entrepreneurial ventures. By then, the experiences from both academic and industry based projects were starting to ‘influence’ the author about the emerging ‘global strategic context’.

For example, author learnt about the lack of the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives within Shell global networks; and the adverse, negative consequences of those in the long run. It is no secret that Shell was under heavy scrutiny globally due to their lack of environmental concerns and lack of respect for local communities such as in Nigeria. However, in an attempt to ‘survive’, Shell very quickly adapted strong ‘environmental friendly’, ‘community friendly’ and more of ‘triple bottom line’ corporate social responsibilities in their strategic plans.
During this time Shell became one of the few oil giants to introduce more superior and environmental friendly petroleum products such as Optimax. This ‘new’ type of petrol was of a higher-density and higher-performance with less ‘lead’ and ‘carbon pollution’. Hence, it was a cleaner burning fuel reducing the harm to ozone layers and environment. Interestingly, Shell also managed to build a ‘positive organisational culture’ around this Optimax campaign during the same time; thereby ‘piggy-backing’ on this environmental initiative to increase their profits, whilst maintaining higher customer and employee overall satisfaction. As a result, eventually managed to not only ‘survive’, but also to become a very strong ‘petroleum brand’ globally.

Such type of first-hand experiences and exposure was ‘helping’ the author to nurture/develop newer mindsets about ‘suitable’ future entrepreneurial models. The entrepreneurial type and behaviour strategy displayed by the author during this stage – Phase Two – is most closely associated with ‘Potential’ type as presented by Legge, Hindle and Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. Here the author, for the first time, started to experience ‘innate instincts’ of entrepreneurial characteristics – without necessarily knowing and/ or having a conscious understanding. These types of entrepreneurial behaviours are also known as ‘would-be/ likely/ prospective’ entrepreneurs.

4.2.3 Phase Three – Concept (Nascent) the Charity Experience

- VUW set up as charity only (1999-2000)
In an attempt to execute some of the ‘previous’ learning and to contribute to the society in a charitable manner; in 1999, author started up an organisation called Vision United Warriors (VUW) in Australia. VUW was set up as purely ‘charitable organisation’ in order to ‘test’ the Australian market. The typical activities of this venture were limited to charity BBQs and Homeless visits. VUW also had strong links with larger charities and Non Governmental Development Organizations (NGDO) such as the World Vision.
Chapter Five – Discussion & Conclusion

The incorporation of *VUW* was almost a ‘natural extension’ from *Phase Two – Idea* into *Phase Three – Concept*. During this stage, author’s energies was focused in ‘concept testing’ the new entrepreneurial model by ‘sub-contracting’ and ‘outsourcing’ projects from other larger ‘charitable’ and ‘community development’ organisations. It is important to note here that, although outsourcing was common practice within ‘profit organisations’; ‘outsourcing’ and ‘sub-contracting’ projects within charity industry was quite ‘extraordinary’ and ‘revolutionary’.

Majority of charities at that time experienced serious efficiency/ productivity improvement challenges; was finding it difficult to attract good quality employees due to poor financial conditions; had governmental restrictions on paying ‘market based salaries’ to charity workers, thereby losing best staff to *for-profit* sector; experienced issues relating to the managing of large ‘inefficient’ volunteer forces and various other factors. Majority of charities operated under very hierarchical and bureaucratic structures, thereby hindering their ability to be flexible, creative, innovative and ‘entrepreneurial’. Author however started to see these ‘problems’ as ‘opportunities’ and started to sub-contract projects from larger, more established *charities*. It was a ‘win-win’ for both sides – where the large charities were able to complete their projects at a much lower cost, yet achieve results in much shorter timeframes, enjoy increased levels of productivity and higher overall project performance.

Here, author – through the various experiences and ‘opportunity identification processes’ – also focused on very strong ‘niche markets’ in order to ‘maximise the returns to *VUW*. One such project was called the *Mobile Sales Force* project with *World Vision Australia*. Traditionally, large semi-governmental charities such as *World Vision Australia* tend to have access to *AusAID funds* – government based funds that can be utilised in community development projects. As a result, unlike the small-local based ‘charity-boutiques’, larger charities are relatively more organised, better structured and more effective in their crisis management plans at the execution level.
At the ‘execution level’, they are able to make very quick impacts in managing natural disaster situations. Human resources & recruitment strategies of these large charities tend to attract paid-staff and volunteers who are very passionate in ‘helping the world’ – almost within idealistic and utopian values. As a result, during times of major crisis, these paid-staff and volunteers are able to push through the ‘hard times’ and to self-motivate themselves. They complement and justify their long unpaid hours and minimum working conditions through very strong altruistic and philosophical means. However, majority of this workforce have very little business skills and entrepreneurial skills; and are almost ignorant about the business context.

Whilst it’s commendable that these ‘volunteers’ contribute significantly to the overall vision of large charities; World Vision utilises this same workforce and volunteer base in their Sales, Marketing, Business Development and other Commercial-type operations. Although in the past, charities were able to perform quite successfully within above mentioned departments with existing paid-staff and volunteer-base; various changes and challenges during the 1980s & 1990s meant that it was no longer a luxury simply to ‘survive’, rather non-profits were being pressured to perform ‘efficiently and effectively’. Continuous improvements, performance gaps, introductions of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), Balanced Score Card Type Applications and various other ‘business-commercial’ control-systems were introduced within these charities (Appendix Two: World Vision Brochures and Newspaper Extracts).

The typical pressures during this time included: reduction in AusAID Governmental funding; increase in new charity set-ups; pressure to increase accountability and produce tangible results; mandates to lower administrative and operational expense percentage of donor funds; reduction of volunteer base due to poor economic conditions and rising cost of living (thereby both parents working, aged population working extra years, teenagers starting work at younger ages – hence less time for volunteering within the community). Further the existing volunteer base were never really ‘competent’ at business-commercial type activities such Sales, Marketing, Business Development and Entrepreneurship. As a result, there was extra pressure on charities to become more accountable for their actions and needed to justify their existence within all levels of the organisation, community and nation. Through this process, it was becoming evident that
much of the previous ‘non-performing’ individuals, projects teams, administrations and in some cases complete departments were being ‘re-structured’.

During this period, author identified this ‘opportunity’ and approached World Vision to seek ‘sub-contracting’ projects in the areas of Sales, Marketing & Business Development. Several proposals – business plans – were presented highlighting the benefits for both parties. At this stage, World Vision Victorian Office was lagging in their ‘sales’ from ‘child sponsorship’ program. Child Sponsorship Program was one of the major sources of ‘revenue’ for World Vision at the time. The Sales & Marketing approach adapted at the time was very much ‘backwards’, based on ‘push approach’ and was relatively less customer-focused.

As part of the proposal, author embarked on a project initiation called ‘Mobile Sales Force’ within World Vision Australia and changed the program to become very much ‘pull focused’, ‘customer focused’ and introduced strong Customer Relationship Management systems. Personalised networks and regular communication channels were built with donors (customers). Up until then, World Vision also expected customers to ‘walk in’ to the physical premises and then make donations. As part of the Mobile Sales Force program, this process was revolutionised by geographically expanding the Sales, Marketing & Business Development department across the Victorian State. Instead of waiting in the office, the sales consultants were now holding World Vision Stands and attending Exhibitions, Events and Promotions throughout the entire region.

The whole process was managed in such a way to attract a ‘different breed’ of paid-staff & volunteers. Training, motivational & team building workshops were conducted right from the beginning for each member. The total Sales, Marketing & Business Development structure was re-written based on pull approaches and very personal customer interaction methodologies. The results showed radical steps forwards where sales increased by hundred-fold. For example, where an office with around 20 staff were previously bringing in sales averaging around 2-5 per day, per person; Mobile Sales Force consultants were able to top 40-50 sponsorships per day, per person from the first month onwards. Appendix Two illustrates evidence of several projects conducted at several non profit organisations.
The entrepreneurial type and behaviour strategy displayed by the author during this stage – Phase Three – is most closely associated with ‘Nascent’ type as advocated by Legge, Hindle and Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. Here the author was emerging and blossoming showing ‘promising signs’ of becoming an entrepreneur. Although this high growth of the venture was ‘partially unconscious’ and based on ‘gut feel based practical learning’ of the author; being at the ‘right place at the right time’ helped the entrepreneurial development to be nurtured.

Scholars to date have not agreed upon any conclusive facts about this opportunity identification nature of the entrepreneurs. ‘Being at the right place at the right time’ is considered by some scholars as entrepreneurs being ‘purely lucky’. Several others argue that there is no luck involved at all; rather it is the innate instincts of the entrepreneurs creating such opportunities; which others conclude as ‘luck’. Some others say that it is a mix of inborn talents, instinct, gut-feel and little bit of luck.

### 4.2.4 Phase Four – Project (Baby) the Charity + Community Experience

- **VUW-AV leading VUW-IE; Charity + Community (2001-2004)**

Next, author further developed this venture by expanding the Mobile Sales Force across Australia’s Victorian region including major country towns. During the early period of Phase Four, although Mobile Sale Force was expanding fast, VUW faced some difficulties associated with ‘growth’. Continuous high growth demanded that support systems were in place to manage the administrative and operational tasks. By This time, VUW was being contracted, consulted and outsourced by several NGDOs such as World Vision. However, majority of these NGDOs being very hierarchical and bureaucratic – was continuously challenged in ‘keeping up’ with its newly-formed innovative departments (alliances) called ‘Mobile Sales Force’.

For example, administrative and operational staff were unable to process the excess ‘sponsorships’ on-time; they lacked training and competency in speedy delivery and professional customer follow-ups; the number of errors in mis-handling increased due to extra pressure. Overall, higher management were ‘too slow’ – at least in the entrepreneurial Mobile Sales Force’s point of view; thus creating tension between the upper hierarchy and execution level.
In a lot of the cases, the hierarchy was unable to make ‘quick decisions’, and impacted negatively on the flexibility/agility of the Mobile Sales Force. The entrepreneur (author) was motivated and driven by very different attributes such as: the challenge itself; the satisfaction in new venture creation; wanting to lead and pioneer the world’s best growth models; and other ‘entrepreneurial drives and motivations’ – rather than to ‘fit in’ and accept the ‘status quo’ or at best ‘incremental growth and development’.

For entrepreneurs, challenge and radical innovation is part and parcel of not only the venture itself but also part of who they are – their innate make up. To steer away from this is fundamentally ‘wrong’ in the eyes of entrepreneurs. In cases where entrepreneurs are unable to express their abilities fully; they tend to move on to new ‘territories’ in search of better/new ‘environments’ that facilitate high growth opportunities.

It almost seemed that although these larger NGDOs enjoyed their increased ‘growth levels’; they were ‘very comfortable’ in following through a steady growth rate. After all, the increased growth levels were sufficient enough to ‘justify’ their corporate existence and personal endeavours. Their inability to ‘keep up’ with the ‘high growth’ was justified by emphasizing on the negative-adverse aspects of growth and by numerous case studies of how growth had impacted negatively on few other charity organisations. Whilst the author did agree on the need to ‘manage the growth process’ so that it helps in becoming a strong market-based charity in the future; author felt that the ‘excuses’ provided by management were simply a ‘cover up story’ – because of their inability and lack of experience in this ‘growth domain’. After all, they had to protect their jobs and careers – which were based on several decades of conservative thinking.

Various scholars argue for and against high growth enterprises and new venture start-ups. Whilst these debates tend to focus on the benefits and disadvantages of ‘growth’ in firms; scholars to a large degree have left unanswered the relevance of internal and external focus in its ‘judgement’. Growth viewed internally needs to focus on the ‘firms’ ability to keep up with growth; and external aspect means the need to follow the global market trends.
Based upon this view, author agrees that it may be viable for smaller charities to ‘slow down’ the growth process, in order to smooth out administrative and operational difficulties. Majority of these charities have very short-medium term and localised strategic goals and aspirations; and they are not too heavily subjected to too many global trends. Yet at the same time, as a result, they are also less likely to make a ‘global impact’ with this type of strategy. Having understood the strengths, weaknesses and the corporate aspirations of smaller type charities, it is in their best interest to ‘slow down’ the growth process.

However, for larger charities based upon and heavily subjected to global, strategic aspirations – ones who wish to ‘shake and move’ the future developmental paradigms – it is not advisable to take an internal focus toward growth. Large global charities need to first analyse the future trends and global context; and then strategically align themselves from anticipated future to ‘fit in’ by planning ‘backwards’.

In other words, to prepare the organisation for the conditions and challenges ahead based upon market-based principals. Based on arguments presented earlier about the future emerging global strategic context: Environmental Uncertainty Matrix; Extended PEST Analysis; Courtney’s Four Levels of Residual Uncertainty Model; Learning Model of Truly Ambiguous, Dynamic-Complex Future; and Global Mindset Framework); it is no longer good enough to say that the organisation is not capable in managing ‘fast growth’.

This process of continuous tension and disagreements between VUW and its NGDO partners finally led the two sides to ‘separate’ themselves. VUW as a result had to re-invent themselves by questioning the ‘paradigms’ in which it operated. Whilst both companies still shared common interests and had mutual respect for each other, VUW felt the need to find new avenues of growth and expansion.
In the hindsight, *VUW* was very pleased with the ‘separation’ and embarked on a journey to discover new challenges and adventures. The *entrepreneurial type* and *behaviour strategy* displayed by the author during this stage – *Phase Four* – is most closely associated with ‘Baby’ type (*Global Entrepreneurship Monitor* category). Here the author was ‘growing’ very fast within a ‘conscious learning cycle’. Author was ‘continuously learning’ in an attempt to fit into the ‘knowledge based’ environment.

Up until now, only *social driver* was seen as important in the author’s mind with less regard to *commercial* aspects. Whilst there was an element of *Charity + Community* approach in operating the organisation; *VUW* did not really fully utilise ‘commercial/profit-driven’ approaches yet.

Majority of the dealings so far was conducted with the help of ‘pure volunteers’ and other *partially paid* (stipend) and *non-paid* contractors. As illustrated by *Figure 4.5*, up until now there were strong ‘utopian’ type mentalities common amongst the organisation.

*VUW* viewed themselves as purely ‘social warriors’ who were fighting against *poverty*, *suffering* and all forms of *social injustice*. They struggled to work towards a poverty-free world and were driven by the dream of and passion of ‘changing the world’. The three main *VUW* divisions included: i) *Home Shelter Warriors (HSW)*; ii) *Child Sponsorship Warriors (CSW)*; and iii) *Street Safe Warriors (SSW)*.

These three divisions attempted to provide services to the community in terms of: i) Helping the *Homeless* and their families; ii) Helping the *poor children* and their families; and iii) Helping the *Abused/ Disturbed* and their families. Volunteers and other *VUW – Vision United Warrior* members took the responsibility of representing the ‘poor’ and the ‘weak’ very personally and emotionally. Whilst the author did ‘learn’ very much during these experiences and certainly has no regrets about the contributions that were being made to the society through *VUW* initiatives; authors ‘inner core beliefs’ and ‘gut feel’ was directing the organisation towards a new era.
Figure 4.4: VUW Utopian Profile

**Vision United Warriors**
- Social Warriors → fighting against *poverty, suffering* and all forms of *social injustice*.

**Who we are!**
- *Vision United Warriors* is an Australian based not-for-profit organisation working towards a poverty-free world.
- We are driven by a passion for changing the world.

**What we do!**
- **HSW – Home Shelter Warriors** → Helping the *Homeless* & their families
- **CSW – Child Sponsorship Warriors** → Helping the *poor children* & their families
- **SSW- Street Safe Warriors** → Helping the *Abused/ Disturbed* & their families

**Warrior oath**
- We are the voice of the ‘*poor*’; We represent the ‘*weak*’
- We are *Visionaries*; We are *United*; We are *Warriors*;

Source: *Vision United Warriors, Australia*

---

4.2.5 Phase Five – Social Entrepreneur (*Established*)
- middle ground between *profit & charity* (2005-2006)

During Phase Five, *VUW* exercised some major changes in its fundamental thinking. The whole organisation’s reason for existence (vision, mission, values), its strategy, structure and culture were changed. The new direction of *VUW* was exercised through two new trading names: i) *Aspire Solutions* © (*www.aspiresolutions.biz*); and ii) *Ripple Waves* © (*www.ripplewaves.com*). Overall, there was an attempt to integrate both *Business-Commercial* (through *Aspire Solutions*) and *Social-Community* strategies (through *Ripple Waves*).
For the first time in its existence, VUW (now operating through two separate independent organisations) accepted Business-Commercial approaches as being equally important as Social-Community type approaches. Both organisations were set up independently of each other within the legislative & regulatory frameworks under Australian Securities & Investment Commission (ASIC – www.asic.gov.au). The separation was also helpful in setting up for taxation, accounting and other financial reporting purposes. It was more feasible for the two organisations to be incorporated separately due to the conflicting natures of each business segment (one being for-profit and the other not-for-profit). Further, each segment was subject to differing legislative, taxation and regulatory frameworks.

However, the actual management and operation of the two entities were to some degree aligned ‘strategically’. Both organisations were managed by the same Director Boards and same Managing Director. The ideology was to find the middle ground between profit and charity, however with a stronger focus of social entrepreneurship. Aspire Solutions Group was being expanded within both for-profit and not-for-profit sectors by making strong alliances with existing and new ventures.

There was also a third company, *Global Aspirations Pty Ltd* ([www.globalaspirations.biz](http://www.globalaspirations.biz)) that was formed in 2006 in order to fully integrate the *VUW* missions of *Business-Commercial & Social-Community* endeavours. The third company was a joint effort between *Aspire Solutions*, *Ripple Waves*, *Inspirational Industry Solutions* and several hundred other *Sub-Contracting Bodies*. It was a courageous, yet very risky move of trying to fully utilise *Social Entrepreneurial Initiatives* within a regional level – *Australasian & South East Asian Region*.

During its formation and early stages, the future was seemingly very bright and operations were running smoothly and as intended. However, as the months pass by, *Global Aspirations* started experiencing some major hurdles in its expansion as well as survival. Whilst the *Social Entrepreneurial* intentsions of the organisation’s founders were noble; the actual implementation was somewhat more challenging. The organisation *Aspire Solutions* – which started up as a single proprietary firm – had eventually grown to become a large network of *Social Entrepreneurial* type alliance contributing more than one million dollars in revenue annually. However, this huge growth was not supported by existing infrastructure, training and the human resource base.

From the author’s point of view, some of these hurdles included: conflicting interests amongst the stakeholders; sheer number of the sub-contracting bodies being too large to manage (several hundred); upper management’s inexperience in managing high-growth enterprises; *Australia*’s downturn of economy including high interest rates; separation of the two *Co-Founders/ Co-Directors* of the organisation – one remained in *Australia* and the other migrated to the *United Arab Emirates*.

The *entrepreneurial type* and *behaviour strategy* displayed by the author during this stage – *Phase Five* – is most closely associated with ‘Established’ type (*Global Entrepreneurship Monitor* categories). During this time period (2005-2006), both the organisation and the entrepreneur became ‘well-known’ and ‘reputable’ within the training & consulting industry in *Australia* and were reaching ‘fully-grown’ stage in the organisational life cycle.
Aspire Solutions Group had reached its peak in securing several large vocational training contracts with government and semi-government institutes such as: Department of Workplace Relations (DEWR), New Enterprise Incentive Scheme (NEIS), Victoria University, Kangan Batman Tafe, Inner Easter Group of Tafes (IEGT), IE, William Angliss Institute and Swinburne University. Aspire’s clients expanded to include: Subway, Boost Jooce, McDonalds, Bakers Delight, Bunnings Wesfarmers, Anaconda Adventure Stores, Hungry Jacks – Burger King network and various others.

4.2.6 Phase Six – Strategic Global Entrepreneur (Serial) the Holistic Experience

- **strategic global sustainability; for-profit, not-for-profit & policy-making domains (2007 → current)**

The next stage of developments (2007 → current) of Aspire Solutions Group involved some ‘repeated’ entrepreneurial projects and activities outside of the Australian sector. Aspire Solutions consulting projects started to expand outside the national borders to China, Sri Lanka, the Maldives, United Arab Emirates, Lebanon, Ethiopia and various others.

The entrepreneurial type and behaviour strategy displayed by the author during this stage – Phase Six – is most closely associated with ‘Serial’ type (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor categories). During this time period (2007 → current), entrepreneur and the venture Aspire Solutions Group started to move towards ‘experienced risk taking’ and influence the organisational surroundings with ‘repeated’ entrepreneurial successes.

By now, most of the past so-called ‘failures’ were helping the entrepreneur in finding the ‘right balance’ with ‘risk-return’ strategies. ‘Gut feel’ and other ‘intuition’ based decision making processes were becoming ‘finely tuned’ within the entrepreneur’s ‘mindset’. Repeated past attempts were also making the entrepreneur learn from ‘obvious’ mistakes and thereby take more innovative approaches in managing growth. It almost seemed as if for the first time in the venture itself and the entrepreneur’s lifecycle; that entrepreneur was becoming ‘mature’ in the pursuit of entrepreneurial endeavours.
Entrepreneurship was also moving towards more international/ global approaches in the venture development (Figure 4.6); and as a result explored into the ‘global environmental dynamics’ of Aspire Solutions sustainability in the coming decades. Through this process, a new type of strategy emerged through – which the author labelled as Strategic Global Entrepreneurship.

Figure 4.5: Entrepreneurship Context
Up until now, concepts such as Entrepreneurship, Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship and Social-Community Entrepreneurship were being researched widely across the globe. Strategic Entrepreneurship as a field of study was just been ‘born’; and Strategic Global Entrepreneurship which incorporates strategy and global dimensions had limited applications (Figure 4.7).

**Figure 4.6: Strategic Global Entrepreneurship (SGE) Conceptual Framework**

![Strategic Global Entrepreneurship (SGE): Conceptual Framework](image)

Source: Author
As illustrated above in *Figure 4.7*, based on research findings and empirical experiences from *Aspire Solutions*, it was evident that the domain of entrepreneurship was moving towards integration. Within such a context author presents the *Strategic Global Entrepreneurship* framework as the ‘way forward’ for *for-profits, not-for-profits* and *policy-makers*. Within the emerging global context, regardless of the orientation (profit, non-profit or governance) organisations are recommended to integrate both business-commercial and social-community strategies.

*As Mair & Martin* presented, boundaries of purely social entrepreneurship strategies are poorly defined and its relationships to other fields of study remain fuzzy’; suggesting opportunities for researchers from various fields to challenge and rethink central concepts and assumptions (2005, p. 2). Building upon the suggestion of *Mair & Martin*, author introduces the new framework *Strategic Global Entrepreneurship* – as the way forward advancing the developments within manager, leader, entrepreneur and social entrepreneur domains (*Figure 4.8*).

This new concept also presents a greater understanding of ‘what it means to be social’, partially filling current gaps of explanations within existing ‘social entrepreneurial’ frameworks. Within such a context, ideals of integrated *Social Entrepreneurship* strategies and *Commercial Entrepreneurship* strategies can be utilized in small businesses. For example, a small business which is highly active in the social-community context of its immediate environment is more likely to be favoured by local customers – in comparison to large global corporations.

The publicity, goodwill and local employment provided by a small business in its ‘local’ context can act as a ‘barrier to entry’ for large global corporations into the local market. Similarly, *Strategic Global Entrepreneurship (SGE)* could offer benefits of *economies of scale* and *economies of scope* which are generally not available to SMEs. These impacts are discussed in more detail in *Chapter Five: Discussion & Conclusion*. 
Figure 4.7: Emergence of Strategic Global Entrepreneurs

Source: Author
4.3 Summary

In an attempt to capture the process, rationale, natural progression of the author’s role as an entrepreneur and to integrate the life-journey into the theoretical constructs, author now presents the summary of findings in a chronological format. As a way of illustrating this ‘natural entrepreneurial progression’ of the author’s own life-journey of ‘becoming an entrepreneur’; Legge & Hindle and Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) models were re-adapted and modified (Figure 4.8). The case findings indicate that more integrated and holistic approaches are preferred within the contemporary and emerging context.

Figure 4.8: Author’s own Entrepreneurial Journey

Adapted from: Legge & Hindle 2004 “Entrepreneurship: Context, Vision and Planning”, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, p. 93; & Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM 2008);
Chapter Five – Discussion & Conclusion

5.1 Preamble

As case findings indicated in Chapter Four, entrepreneurial integration combines ‘strategy’ with ‘entrepreneurship’ within the global context. “(Entrepreneurship ↔ Global ↔ Strategy ↔ Entrepreneurship) = Strategic Global Entrepreneurship”.

- **Business-Commercial ventures taking on more Social-Community directions**

“The most important contributions of the members of the socially responsible business movement have little to do with recycling, nuts from the rain forest, or employing the homeless. Their gift to us is that they are leading by trying to do something, to risk, to take a chance, to make a change, any change. They are not waiting for ‘the solution’ but acting creatively without guarantees of success. That is what all of us must do. Being visionary has always been given a bad rap by commerce. But without a positive vision for humankind, we can have no meaning, no work, and no purpose” (Paul Hawken & William McDonough, Seven Steps to Doing Good Business, Inc).

- **Social-Community bodies taking on more Business-Commercial directions**

“Social workers . . . raised by experience and training to distrust money, business and capitalism, developing mindsets that view money as evil. Grow up” (Jed Emerson, The New Social Entrepreneurs). “Too many non-profit organizations are financially stagnant, raising and distributing funds the same way they have for decades . . . A non-profit that is run for profit sounds like a contradiction in terms. But it doesn’t have to be” (Bill Shore, Revolution of the Heart cited in Boschee 1998, p. 1).

As highlighted by Bill Shore, Paul Hawken and William McDonough, Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship is primarily based on ‘commercial’ missions; Social-Community Entrepreneurship on the other hand is primarily focused on ‘social’ missions. Ironically, within the academic literature and empirical context, these two missions have traditionally existed in an isolated and non-integrated manner.
For example, neither businesses nor not-for-profits have ‘genuinely’ attempted to achieve an integrated mission of both commercial and social means successfully. Businesses and not-for-profits continue to operate within these ‘traditional’ boundaries to date as if they belong to two separate worlds. In actual fact, the problems with current global context can to a large degree attributed to the past isolated strategies exercised by businesses, not-for-profits, governments and their related stakeholder groups.

5.2 Disintegrated Nature of Entrepreneurial Domains

Arguably, there is actually no such thing called ‘Commercial Entrepreneurship’ and/ or ‘Social Entrepreneurship’; because all forms of entrepreneurship involves to a large degree the ‘social’, ‘community’ and ‘people’ components. As Reynolds et al states “there is no such thing as non-social entrepreneurship; entrepreneurship creates the majority of jobs in developed countries – certainly an important social function” (2002, p. 4). Reader & Watkins comments that, entrepreneurship research is a ‘social activity, although may be invisible to outsiders or novitiates’ (2006, p. 417).

Author argues that Business-Commercial Entrepreneurship and Social-Community Entrepreneurship integrated within holistic and inter-dependant frameworks are more likely to bring forth enormous benefits to all stakeholders involved. In reality, the world operates within a flux of inter-dependant variables that exist amongst businesses, not-for-profits and government related public policy initiatives. These variables including all types of resources such as human, physical, intellectual, economic and others are inseparable from the ‘whole’.

For-profits/ Businesses operating under primarily commercial missions, must consider the impact, adverse effects and long term repercussions of their existence by adapting a co-existing social mission within their corporate strategies. These corporate strategies must then be passed down the business level, functional level, worker level and to customers with full top-management support; eventually embedding integrated entrepreneurial strategies within all levels of strategy, structure and culture.
Not-for-profits, primarily based on social missions, must also consider the importance of accountability, responsiveness, market aggressiveness and commercial agility in order to better service their clients and to reduce administrative costs. Both efficiency and effectiveness improvements (similar to business context) should be the core of not-for-profits within a framework of highly systematic and professional operations (yet not too bureaucratic impeding flexibility).

Boschee argues that pressures on non-profits are daunting due to: i) continuing cuts in public sector support; ii) fluctuations in individual and corporate giving; iii) more non-profits competing for available funds; iv) lots of people/ victims in need; v) pressures form funding bodies to merge/ downsize; and vi) repeated blows to the reputation of the sector (1998, p. 1). Mort et al confirms these ‘rapidly changing’ pressures due to increased globalization, increased need in target communities, tighter funding environment; and growing competition for donors and grants (2002, p. 77). What exactly is considered ‘an effective non-profit’ has often been a hot debate (Brooks 2002, p. 503). Light suggests that ‘effective non-profits’ are those that: i) collaborate widely; ii) diversify revenue; iii) measure outcomes; iv) consist of flat structures; and v) have clear-open communication lines (2002, p. 188). Dann et al argues that through social entrepreneurship – especially social marketing – non-profits are gaining deeper consumer understanding and learning more about motivations for charitable behaviour and gift giving (2007, p. 291). Hence there is a sense of ‘legitimacy’ (Dart 2004, p. 411) gained by social entrepreneurial type non-profits as compared to traditional charities.

Governments and public policy initiatives (locally, nationally, regionally and globally) must also take into account the benefits of integrated frameworks of both commercial and social missions. Contemporary governments must challenge the destructive components of the status quo and conventional thinking; in order to move societies towards entrepreneurial pursuits. After all, ‘entrepreneurship’ is suggested to be the fourth pillar of economic development in future – in addition to land, labour and capital.
Within this context, strategic global entrepreneurship combines both mainstream (business-commercial) and social-community entrepreneurship. Austin et al’s definition of social entrepreneurship – ‘innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the non-profit, business and government sector’ is possibly the closest ‘social entrepreneurial definition’ to ‘strategic global entrepreneurship’ (2006, p. 2).

However, author argues that entrepreneurial integration thrives beyond simply creating ‘social value’ across non-profits, businesses and government; extending its usage to simultaneously creating both social-community value and business-commercial value within holistic integrated frameworks. Such approaches are arguably most suitable for future global organizations, because the traditional boundaries and rules of the ‘formation/ establishment’ of non-profits, businesses and government are diminishing at a rapid pace.

Seelos & Mair comments that the “complexity, scale and scope of world’s environmental and social problems and challenges seem overwhelming – tempting us to resign ourselves and to doubt the capabilities and inspired entrepreneurs are continuously showing new paths and solutions;” (2004, p. 3). Contemporary systems should therefore adapt more integrated entrepreneurial ventures in order to allow inspired entrepreneurs to take on more of integrated commercial and social missions.

Examples of social entrepreneurial ventures where it has taken a global stance include Skoll Foundation set up by Jeff Skoll. Jeff Skoll initially donated 4.4 million pounds to set up a research centre dedicated to research and contributed directly to internationally recognized sustainable development goals. This project also inspired numerous other global institutions and established corporations to take on a greater social responsibility. Hence it can be considered to be a closer example of entrepreneurial integration.

Similarly, Muhammad Yunus, an economics professor founded Grameen Bank in 1976 to provide small-funds to the poor who were not eligible for bank loans. Grameen Bank later increased its offices to more than 1000 branches, expanded in more than 65 developing countries; and subsequently Professor Muhammad Yunus won the Nobel Prize Award as a tribute for his contributions.
Sir Richard Branson, who is considered one of the youngest billionaires in the world and Founder of the Virgin Group, similarly donated $3 billion of his personal profits in order to develop an energy source that does not add to the problems of global warming (Hartigan, P. 2006, p. 43). Further, David Green – founder of Project Impact (http://www.project-impact.net) – is considered a ‘serial social entrepreneur’ by Hartigan: where David continuously created new paradigms in healthcare industry to help the needy (2006, p. 43).

Yet, for most part of the world, despite various attempts in place for eradicating poverty and suffering, “life remains grim, and hope for improving their situation is frail” (Human Development Report 2003). Especially within the contemporary global context – where it’s a rapidly changing world – businesses/ institutes, in order to ‘survive’ need to continuously identify new opportunities (Hamel & Prahalad 1989; Mintzberg 1994; Shepherd & Krueger 2002, p. 167).

Entrepreneurship capital – those factors influencing and shaping an economy’s milieu of agents in such a way as to be conducive to the creation of new firms – is identified as the fourth type of capital, in addition to: i) physical capital; ii) human capital; and iii) knowledge capital within the domain of global economics (Audretsch & Keilbach 2004, p. 419). Entrepreneurship in its strategic-global context is arguably positively linked to economic growth, suggesting a ‘new direction for public policy’ (Audretsch & Keilbach 2004).

Here, ‘entrepreneurship capital’ is considered to be different from (but a subcomponent of) ‘social capital’ – whereby it is argued that some components of social capital inhibits entrepreneurship, whilst other components promotes it. Audretsch & Keilbach introduces ‘new business creations’ as the measurement of / degree of entrepreneurship capital (2004, p. 427). Within this framework, Competitive Analysis (CA) is considered to be ‘an important element for success in today’s marketplace (Zahra et al 2002, p. 1). Entrepreneurial education is one such important element that promotes new business creation.
5.3 Problems of Entrepreneurial Integration

Entrepreneurship from its very beginning intended to expand its ‘wings’ widely encompassing a global, integrated framework. As Burnett & Yamin argue entrepreneurship is ‘viewed as a holistic and dynamic process rather than a fragmented and static system’; suggesting also the need for agility, change and renewal away from ‘static’ (2005, p. 1). Building upon Burnett & Yamin views, author argues that entrepreneurial integration is in fact the natural extension of the contemporary domain of entrepreneurship to incorporate and integrate ‘strategy’ and ‘globalization issues’ into its currently fragmented context.

“The poor are poor, and one’s sorry for them, but there it is. As civilization moves forward, the shoe is bound to pinch in places, and it’s absurd to pretend that anyone is responsible personally” (Henry Wilcox, E. M. Forster’s Howard’s End). “However, that era has come to a screeching halt in the 20th century with continued protests; emergence of anti-big business movements; increased unrest in globalization’s success stories in countries such as India and China; rise in militant religious groups and other human rights and environmental concerns challenging the long-term sustainability of the planet” (Blowfield 2007).

Generally, majority of the global businesses concentrate on the developed world. The poor, with their individual low marginal propensity to consume (mpc/c) are often not considered as ‘good opportunities’. Yet, collectively, the so called ‘bottom of the pyramid’, with lowest annual income per capita category includes 4,000 million consumers with more than US$13 trillion in purchasing power parity (Harjula 2007, p. 85). 1983 feature film Local Heroes which was about how a small Scottish village inspiringly resisted the village ‘takeover’ by a particular oil giant is an example of such ‘localized power’ (Wiseman 2006, p. 95).
While some critics argue against this view stating that the film was in fact an example of how difficult (sometimes impossible) it is to challenge the sources of global power and globalization; contemporary context needs to take into account an integrated approach of both global and local implications and it’s inter-dependant impact. Global policy makers – in combination with regional, national and local policy makers – must attempt to formulate strategies that stimulate both Mainstream (Business-Commercial) entrepreneurship and Social-Community entrepreneurship. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) is one such example of a global effort intended to achieve similar outcomes.

5.4 Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) & Social Entrepreneurship Monitor (SEM)

GEM was initiated in 1999 with 10 countries and is currently expanded to 42 countries. It is a not-for-profit academic research consortium that has as its goal making ‘high quality international research data on entrepreneurial activity’ readily available to as wide audience as possible. GEM is considered the ‘largest single study of entrepreneurial activity’ in the world (http://www.gemconsortium.org/).

Social economies in modern societies are becoming increasingly important for contemporary policy makers. Demoustier argues that employment tendencies are ‘shifting in convergent directions’ (2000 as cited in Ahlander 2001, p. 414), suggesting a shift away from ‘agriculture’ and ‘industrial’ context to ‘services’. ‘Increased market pressures’ and ‘budgetary reductions’ coupled with ‘higher demand for volunteers’ are predicted within the future global context (Ahlander 2001, p. 414). Policy makers, in formulating strategies must link both economic and social factors that contribute to global development and competitiveness. This is even more important in policy making in less developed countries.
According to the *Social Entrepreneurship Monitor* (SEM), 6.6% of the UK population was engaged in *Social Entrepreneurial Activity* in 2003. Interestingly *mainstream entrepreneurship* accounted for slightly lower percentage, suggesting the growth of *social entrepreneurship*, possibly ‘overtaking’ the mainstream. It is also stated that *social entrepreneurship* creates higher percentage of jobs than *mainstream entrepreneurship*. According to *The New Non-profit Almanac and Desk Reference 2002*, from 1987 to 1997, ‘new’ non-profits increased by 31% to 1.2 million; as compared to 26% for-profits.

Within *mainstream entrepreneurship*, over-analysis and too-much-knowledge could in fact discourage *social-community entrepreneurs*. Arguably, for *social entrepreneurship* to thrive, policy makers and mangers must simply set the boundaries and let the ‘*social entrepreneurs*’ evolve within their own chosen frameworks. According to the *Social Entrepreneurship Monitor Report*, as social entrepreneurs become ‘more experienced’, there is tendency to be ‘more disillusioned’ and to see ‘fewer opportunities’, ‘fear failure’ and view social entrepreneurship as a ‘bad career choice’ (2006, p. 3). Women, younger people, the educated, labour market inactive and minority groups are identified as having closer links to *social entrepreneurship* (Social Entrepreneurship Monitor 2006, p. 3). Author argues that entrepreneurial integration advocated within this dissertation offers new insights and solutions to the inherent problems identified within *Social Entrepreneurship*, such as the ‘high dissolution, less opportunities, fear of failure and bad career choice’.

*Milton Friedman* (1970) states that social responsibility of firms is to ‘maximise profits’ and to ‘conduct the business in accord with [shareholder] desires’, suggesting that corporate giving is a perfect substitute for personal giving; *Baron* argues against this view stating it is not the case in contemporary context (Baron 2007, p. 683). It is suggested that organizations are able to profit-maximise (short-term) and to maximise *market value* (medium-long-term) through ‘*strategic CSR*’.
Whist trait theory has been criticised for its validity in the recent years, certain traits and biographies of social entrepreneur role-models can in fact stimulate positive directions in the contemporary society. For example, Michael Young, a social entrepreneurial sociologist – remembered as a pioneer in this field (Briggs 2001, p. 450); Professor Mohamed Yunus, founder of Grameen Bank; Geoff Skoll, founder of Skoll Foundation; Bill Gates & Melinda Gates, founders of Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation; Sir Richard Branson from Virgin Group and various others have contributed significantly to both academia and empirical context of ‘social entrepreneurship’.

In comparison to ‘strategic CSR’ and ‘social entrepreneurship’ above, Strategic Global Entrepreneurship in a metaphorical sense can be attributed to an odyssey – ‘a long and eventful journey’ (Dion 2005, p. 295). It is a journey that requires a fully integrated, global, holistic and a long-term approach. The great need and the right timing for such directions within today’s contemporary society could not have been more appropriate. As such, author presents entrepreneurial integration as a more superior and a more appropriate strategy for organisations operating within contemporary and emerging global context.

Several organizations, institutions and policy makers have already attempted to take ‘crawling steps’ towards this direction with mixed results of its successes and failures. One such move was by the European Union (EU) in March 2000, where they launched a ‘far reaching agenda to achieve high economic, social and environmental standards; by defining new strategies to tackle the challenges of globalization’ (Dion 2005, p. 295). EU within this context had very ambitious ideals of achieving both ‘economic prosperity’ and ‘social welfare’ simultaneously.
In line with Downing’s view above, author argues that the journey towards entrepreneurial integration needs to incorporate both academic (‘intellectual entrepreneurship’, Chia 1996) and empirical (practical knowledge – Swedberg 2000) aspects (2005, p. 196). Further, it is understood that family firms are ‘more socially responsible’ than their non-family counterparts (2006, p. 785). Main reasons for family firms’ actions towards higher social involvement includes a mix of both self-preservation reasons such as protecting image/reputation as well as a genuine internal need to fully integrate into their local surroundings.

Further, in line with Eikenberry & Kluver author argues that ‘piece-meal marketization’ of non-profits, attempting to display business-like characteristics could actually create negative consequences to civil society (2004, p. 132). Here, Civil society is defined as ‘a sphere of our communal life in which we answer together the most important questions: what is our purpose, what is the right way to act, and what is the common good’ (Elshtain 1999); ‘the space of un-coerced human association and set of relational networks – formed for the sake of family, faith, interest and ideology – that fill this space’ (Walzer cited in Barber 1998, p. 4).

Whilst in the short-run non-profits may benefit from adapting business approaches and values of private markets; in the long-run, this marketization could affect public policies negatively. The solution is not one where non-profits assimilate into becoming businesses; rather, both non-profits and businesses start to appreciate the role, strengths and weaknesses of each setting in attempting to create a fresh integrated and holistic approach. Here, synergistic outcomes, innovative solutions and paradigm shifts in operations are explored, without losing the identity and fundamental nature of each sector within for-profit and not-for-profit boundaries.
Future organizations – non-profits, for-profits and policy makers, arguably losing its traditional boundaries are even more at risk of this ‘convergence’. Here, extra care must be taken into account in order to create integrated, yet fundamentally different ‘strategic blocks’. Within such a context, corporate governance – ‘questions about what business is for and in whose interest should they be run and how’ (Elkington 2006, p. 1) – is likely to play a major role. Arguably, corporate governance needs to take into account wider macro-societal-concerns in an ever increasing battle of priorities between governmental agenda, corporate responsibility, social responsibility and sustainable development.

As illustrated by Table 5.1, according to Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM), entrepreneurial behaviour strategy can be categorised into four main types: i) Potential; ii) Nascent; iii) Baby; & iv) Established (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Report, GEM). Author, building upon GEM Typology extends the entrepreneurial types to seven overall categories: i) Dormant; ii) Potential; iii) Nascent; iv) Baby; v) Established; vi) Serial; and vii) Traditional. Within this extended framework, Dormant entrepreneurs are those with inactive, hidden and underdeveloped entrepreneurial characteristics. They are unlikely to even be aware of the existence of entrepreneurial talents within themselves. From a metaphorical sense, this type of entrepreneurs can be attributed to the fetus of a pregnant woman.

Next level of the typology is Potential. Here, ‘would-be’ entrepreneurs are being emerged with entrepreneurial ‘prospects’ and ‘likelihood’. Unlike in the case of Dormant type, Potential entrepreneurs begin to exercise their ‘innate instincts’. Metaphorically, this is the stage where the above-mentioned fetus is being incubated for nine months of ‘good pregnancy’ and getting ready for ‘delivery’. Thirdly, Nascent entrepreneurs tend to display ‘emerging, promising and blossoming’ entrepreneurial characteristics with ‘unconscious, gut-feel based learning paradigms’. From the metaphorical sense, it is the time period of a newborn up until about one to two years, displaying ‘high growth’ activities.
## Table 5.1: Entrepreneurial Types verses Behaviour-Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Dormant</th>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Nascent</th>
<th>Baby</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>inactive; sleeping; undeveloped; hidden;</td>
<td>would-be; possible; likely; prospective;</td>
<td>emerging; promising; blossoming;</td>
<td>growing; toddler;</td>
<td>fully-grown; well-known; reputable;</td>
<td>repeated; sequential; consecutive; on-going;</td>
<td>Past strengths and successes hindering future entrepreneurialism; <em>Oxymoron</em> – ‘traditional entrepreneur’ – no such thing?; conventional; conservative; conformist;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time period Venture existence</strong></td>
<td>Minus; Mum’s stomach, but <em>fetus</em> exist;</td>
<td>Zero; ‘good pregnancy’; ready for delivery;</td>
<td>One-Two;</td>
<td>Three+;</td>
<td>Teenage +;</td>
<td>Adulthood;</td>
<td>‘Too traditional/ old to ‘fit in’?;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviour</strong></td>
<td>Does not know of existence; Unconscious; No instinct;</td>
<td>Does not know of existence; Innate instinct;</td>
<td>Growth; Research; Unconscious; Gut-feel based learning;</td>
<td>Conscious Learning; Continuous Learning Organ; Knowledge-based;</td>
<td>Early-maturity; Becoming of . . .; Calculated but amateur risk taking;</td>
<td>Late-maturity; Become Calculated and experienced risk taking; <em>Oxymoron</em> – no such thing as expert risk taker; it takes away the risk (danger) element; also may reduce ‘entrepreneurialism’ of adult - traditional;</td>
<td>Ent Laggards; Too late to catch up, pick up, too slow; Strengths &amp; successes of past entrepreneurial ventures hindering future adaptation &amp; survival;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM 2008)*
Fourth type – Baby entrepreneurs – are conscious learners who continuously learn through various means to enhance their knowledge base. Metaphorically, it is like in the case of a ‘toddler’ growing up from three years upwards. In the business setting, it is the ‘growing’ years of a business venture. Fifth type – Establishment – is the journey of becoming ‘reputable’ within the industry context and becoming well-known as a ‘matured entrepreneur’. Metaphorically, this is the teenage years or the ‘early maturity’ of a child, where these teenagers tend to exercise ‘calculated, but amateur risk taking tasks’. Just as teenagers experience various ‘age and hormone related life obstacles’, established entrepreneurial ventures also tend to experience ‘amateur, yet daring’ risks within their ventures.

Sixth, Serial entrepreneur types are those who repeat multiple venture creations in multiple industries. The ‘sequential, consecutive and on-going’ natures of multiple-continued-venture-creations make serial entrepreneurs to be ‘idolised’ and ‘respected’. These types of individuals also tend to carry with them ample amounts of charisma, inspiration and business success. This category of entrepreneurs is very calculative and mature enough in their risk taking abilities. Their experience coupled with continued success stories make them the ‘ultimate entrepreneurs’.

However, their continued success has a tendency to take away certain ‘risk elements’ and ultimately endanger their ‘entrepreneurial ideals’. Through the great experiences and success stories of ‘old times’, these serial entrepreneurs have the potential/tendency to develop negative characteristics such as: ‘I have always done this way and has created new ventures successfully’; ‘Old ways of venture creation and venture success has continued to show positive results to-date, hence will continue to do so in future’. These types of beliefs are the very same beliefs that make entrepreneurs different from that of others including businessmen and managers. Metaphorically, in contrast to children, this is the adulthood where adults tend to ‘know how things work’ and as a result compromise on the creativity and innovation process.
Further, whilst serial entrepreneurs are often categorised as ‘expert risk takers’; the term ‘expert risk taker’ itself is an oxymoron. Since risk-taking involves an element of uncertainty; and being an expert indicates being very good at (and sure of/ certain of) something; fundamentally, they are too extremes, never intending to be aligned. If by any chance the alignment does occur, then it no longer belongs to the ‘entrepreneurial arena’. For example, if great masses of wealth can be created with little risks (through the learning and experiences of repeated ventures), then almost everyone will try to take advantage of it and thereby lose its uniqueness. As such, it no longer becomes ‘entrepreneurial’.

Finally, Traditional category is the extension of the Serial entrepreneurs who sometimes become stagnant in their entrepreneurial pursuits. Here, the very same strengths of the entrepreneurs that make them successful create barriers to move forwards into the emerging future context. The world continually evolves in exponential levels of both dynamic and complex aspects; hence, these ‘traditional’ entrepreneurs may become ‘too traditional to fit in to the new environments.

Natural ageing process, stage of the individual life cycle, self motivation levels and need levels (Maslow) and various other factors tend to contribute to this ‘traditional entrepreneurial’ nature. In its true sense, perhaps, it is not possible for ‘traditionalism’ and ‘entrepreneurship’ to exist simultaneously-integrated. Entrepreneurship in fact challenges the core ideals surrounding traditions, conservativeness and conforming behaviours. Such type of ‘entrepreneurial laggards’ eventually become ‘too late to catch up’, where their own past strengths and successes hinder their future adaptation and survival. Eventually they become ‘legends’ of the past, still respected for their great visions, ideals and success stories; however, takes on a much more passive role in the new venture creation and related entrepreneurial adventures. Such as in the case of natural ‘human life cycle’ of ageing process; the future adaptation/ survival and the ‘view of the forthcoming entrepreneurial worlds’ are often challenged by newer generations of entrepreneurs; thus creating continued shifts of paradigms in an ever-evolving entrepreneurial process. Social entrepreneurship is one such movement that has been evolving as an improved version of traditional charities.
5.5 Social Entrepreneurship’s contributions & challenges...

Several authors (Brinckerhoff 2000; Dees 1998; Drayton 2000; Martins 2007;) link social entrepreneurship to complex frameworks of political, social and economic changes that take place at local, regional, national and global levels (2007, p. 85). Harding argues that social entrepreneurs should receive at least [preferably more] ‘the same level of importance as mainstream entrepreneurship’, suggesting that policymakers should replace the traditional one-sided view of ‘making money’ with ‘making a difference’ (2004, p. 43). Within this context, social definition extends to maximizing social value rather than private value or profit – defending the ‘global commons’ and ‘public interest’. In a similar note, McDonald & Marston argue that there is an urgency for social policy research to move beyond a ‘universalistic and state-centred approach’ towards a ‘new welfare’ system (2002, p. 376).

Critics such as DiMaggio and Anheier (1990) and Wallerstein (2004) argue that non-profit sector is ‘unlikely to exert strong casual effects on features of state and politics’ due to global elites having better vehicles and more power in furthering their own self-interest (cited in Vogel 2006, p. 652). The underlying impression of ‘failure of non-profits’ arguably, can be renewed with entrepreneurial integration. ‘Unemployment’ is often directly associated to crime rate, minority reconciliation and survival of democracy (Van-Niekerk 2006, p. 324). Since ‘job creation’ is a fundamental aspect of entrepreneurship; it can be argued that entrepreneurship can significantly reduce crime rate, reconcile minority differences – leading to peace, and at the same time protect the democratic values associated with free-market liberalism of contemporary societies.

Thus, entrepreneurship has embedded within itself the ‘global solutions’ to guide our plant towards sustainability, wealth, peace and overall development. Author thereby argues that entrepreneurial integration in fact ‘innovates’ the traditional ‘non-profit’ sector; by commercializing it’s application through its ‘for-profit’ means. Here, strategies advocating entrepreneurial integration are expected to transcend traditional non-profits by radically transforming the fundamentals, systems and the core of its rudimentary existence.
After all, since entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs are said to have ‘permeated all aspects of contemporary global society’ (Kuratko 2004) and will continue to do so in the coming decades; then the very notion of for-profits, not-for-profits and policy-makers must also apply creativity, innovation and radical transformation into their own roots in an attempt to assimilate and integrate entrepreneurship. Otherwise, holistically it would be seen as simply a collection of terminology and also compromise the existence, survival and sustainability of the three sectors – for profit, non-profit and governance.

A positive movement towards entrepreneurial integration is already being paved in the contemporary global context, such as in the case of Skoll World Forum on Social Entrepreneurship at Oxford University’s Said Business School. Within this forum, as a means of promoting social change – innovative ways to combine business strategies and philanthropy was explored. The forum comprised of 600 non-profit leaders, business executives, and various other interested parties from 40 countries (Wallace 2006, p. 27), thus suggesting the growing global interest of entrepreneurial integration.

Yet, social entrepreneurship as a field of study is in a period of transition, and is still considered ‘fragmented with no coherent theoretical framework’ – arguably failing its originally intended mission (Weerawardena & Mort 2006, p. 21). Some attempts in trying to mimic their ‘for-profit’ counterparts’ behaviour are also showing mixed results. Especially when ‘increased marketization’ is advocated on a piece-meal basis, it is considered to be harmful to the core ideals and values of the social enterprise – ultimately losing social entrepreneurship’s identity, clarity and purpose. Building upon Weerawardena & Mort’s recommendations that Social Entrepreneurial organizations must build cultures of innovativeness, proactively manage environmental context and manage risk; author argues that entrepreneurial integration is in fact the natural next evolutionary progression of social entrepreneurship. Within this dissertation, author further offers solutions to current problems associated with social entrepreneurship within this so called ‘transition period’.
**Family Controlled-Owned Businesses (FCB/ FOB)** are considered to be an important part of this entrepreneurship development. Based on **Dyer & Whetten** (2005) research, **Wiklund** argues that family businesses are more likely to exert **Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)** behaviour than their corporate counterparts (2006, p. 803). The rationale here is that family values spill over on corporate values and consequently bad publicity spills over from firm to family. Building upon **Dyer & Whetten** (2005) and **Wiklund** (2006), author argues that entrepreneurship therefore impacts positively on CSR behaviour; and paves ways to finding solutions to global sustainability problems. **Sustainable Livelihood Theory** (Blowfield 2007) and various other global efforts have also failed to eliminate ‘poverty’ to date. In the contemporary society, where the degree of uncertainty and complexity in everyday life is advancing; entrepreneurship is increasingly becoming a ‘hot topic’ of discussion globally within multiple domains of **for-profit, non-profit and policy making** context. One such debate is known as ‘**The Third Way Debate**’.

**5.6 The Third Way and Globalisation**

As **Gibb** states, ‘key trigger for the growing interest in entrepreneurship is **globalization**’, where a wide range of stakeholders comprising of ‘priests, doctors, teachers, policemen, pensioners, community workers – potentially everyone in a community – are confronted with the need for entrepreneurial behaviour’ (2002, p. 234). During the same time-frame new political movements such as **The Third Way** – a move away from both **Left-Wing** as well as **Right-Wing** politics – has been attributed to entrepreneurial developments.

**Anthony Giddens**, considered to be the father of **The Third Way** presents an interesting articulation of forces operating within **free-market liberalism, state-centred socialism** and **knowledge economy**; where he presents **Third Way** politics as a **utopian reality** grounded in globalization’ (2001, p. 3). Within this context, numerous factors such as ‘growing world-wide dominance of knowledge economy’, ‘potential changes in people’s everyday lives’, breaking free from tradition’ and ‘new flexibility and individualism’ is presented as the birth of ‘generative politics’ where individuals are ‘enabled for’ (empowered) rather than ‘provided/ catered for’ (dependency).
Whilst there is underlying assumption of ‘empowerment’ within The Third Way politics; there is still a role recognized for and advocated for the ‘government’. State’s role here is presented as ‘to intervene in [when necessary], but not to dominate’. Other authors such as Gittell & Wilder argue that ‘political environment’ as affecting ‘community development’; where ‘intermediate outcomes’ such as partnership buildings are encouraged (1999, p. 341). The empirical evidence for The Third Way – according to Lyons and Passey is somewhat misleading suggesting the absence of a third sector to start with; and its patchy, piecemeal and absence of recognition of such a structure contributing to economy, society and politics (2006, p. 90).

Further, terms such as Eco-Entrepreneurship, Environmental Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Entrepreneurship are becoming increasingly popular among current practice. Collectively these can be defined as “innovative behaviour of single actors or organizations operating in the private business sector which see environmental aspects as a core objective and competitive advantage” (Gerlach 2004, p. 1). Within this context, other scholars who specialise and link entrepreneurship to take on a more strategic and global roles include: Azzone 1998; Farrow 2000; Isaak 1997, 1999; Kech 1997; Larson 2000; Lober 1998; Nocci 1998; Pastakia 1998; Petersen 2000; Pettersen 2000; Schaltegger 2000, 2002; Volery 2002; and Welsh 1998.

Often businesses, capitalism and democracy are blamed for ‘poverty problems’. Whilst it is true that global companies in the past had in some cases (oil and mining industry especially) ‘abused’ local communities, negatively affected local income streams, ignored human rights and took away various rights and responsibilities from local stakeholder groups; businesses alone are not able to solve this ever-expanding struggle. In order to fully understand the strategic and global context, the world itself and the surrounding dynamic and complex environmental forces need to be taken into account.
5.7 Contemporary Dynamic and Complex Environments

Arguably, the world has moved away from its traditional-stable environments to very dynamic-complex-uncertain environments as illustrated by Figure 5.1. According to Robbins & Coulter, much of the contemporary global context is very dynamic and unpredictable – Cell Four type. There are also many components in the environment and the components are not similar to one another. In its struggle to keep up with the continual process of change, there is a high need for sophisticated knowledge. This need for sophisticated knowledge is arguably originated from the wider micro-macro environmental forces.

Figure 5.1: Environmental Uncertainty Matrix

Environmental Uncertainty Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Complexity</th>
<th>Degree of Change</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Dynamic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Cell 1</td>
<td>Stable and predictable environment</td>
<td>Dynamic and unpredictable environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Few components in environment</td>
<td>Few components in environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Components are somewhat similar and remain basically the same</td>
<td>Components are somewhat similar but are in continual process of change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal need for sophisticated knowledge of components</td>
<td>Minimal need for sophisticated knowledge of components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Cell 3</td>
<td>Stable and predictable environment</td>
<td>Dynamic and unpredictable environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many components in environment</td>
<td>Many components in environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Components are not similar to one another and remain basically the same</td>
<td>Components are not similar to one another and are in continual process of change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High need for sophisticated knowledge of components</td>
<td>High need for sophisticated knowledge of components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8 Wider Micro-Macro Environmental Implications

This wider micro-macro environmental context is likely to exert higher levels of pressure on organizations in terms of its adaptability to general, broad, long-term as well as specific, immediate, short-term aspects, as illustrated by Figure 5.2. Macro variables are identified as political, legal, economical, social, cultural, religious, technological, knowledge-based- economy, enviro-sustainability, energy-ecology, trends, globalization, demographics and competitive context. Micro environmental variables are identified as Customers, Competitors, Suppliers and Pressure Groups. Organizational strategy, structure and culture needs to be based upon the underlying themes of creativity, innovation, business-commercial and social-community (Strategic Global Entrepreneurship). According to Kuratko & Hodgetts, environmental assessments, are neither highly sophisticated nor heavily quantitative (2004, p. 201). A typical environment assessment tool that can be used for such a context is called ‘PEST’ analysis. Organizations need to analyse and forecast the impact of these forces as part of the strategic planning process.

Figure 5.2: Extended PEST Analysis

Adapted from: General Management literature
As the threat of climate change and sustainable development issues continue to rise; each of us living on the planet will be expected to take on a more active role in the identification, analysis and implementation of the ‘solution’. Collectively, not-for-profits, businesses and government-related policy makers account for the majority and obviously encompass the largest influence through collective means; individuals operating within these three domains are most responsible in dealing with global sustainability issues.

*Beland & Waddan* argue that there are in fact new social risks related to family structure and employment conditions (2007, p. 783). In line with global contextual changes, convergence of nations-cultures-religions, increases in technology & communication media and other globalization related patterns; a new world is currently being incubated. This new era is likely to demand the need for more collaborative, yet productive (both in means of efficiency and effectiveness) - co-competitive institutions within not-for-profit, business and government domains.

Despite a vast range of ‘newer’ efforts – such as fair-trade and micro-financing – poverty and poverty-related issues are rising globally. Ironically, wage gaps and disparity in wealth are highest in the so called rich nations. *Blowfield* argues that it is actually the responsibility of global businesses to find answers in addressing issues of poverty in the poorest sectors of the planet (2007, p. 35). *Max Havelaar, Equal Exchange, Honest Tea* and *Grameen Bank* are presented as the ‘good guys’ who build products and brand-image building upon missions of serving the needs of the poor.

Followed by these early inspirations, more recent firms such as *Chartered, Avon, Vodafone* and *Deutsche Bank* have successfully developed niche product lines addressing both commercial and social aspects of business modelling. Yet, despite these interventions and their successes, social entrepreneurship is still being considered as being secondary important or a ‘step-child’ within the domain of entrepreneurship. Within feminist frameworks – in the name of ‘equal employment opportunity’ and ‘affirmative action’; women still feel that they have to ‘become more like men’ to ‘voice’ their opinions in a continuous struggle to achieve ‘equality’. Similarly, social entrepreneurship is seen as ‘filling the market gaps between private enterprises and public sector provisions’ (Haugh 2007, p. 161); suggesting a subjugated relationship
against for-profits and policy-makers. Author argues that in order for ‘true social mission’ to thrive independently, it needs to be given a proper title (a newer title), respect, attention, and all necessary resources. As such, the new title Strategic Global Entrepreneurship is presented within this dissertation as a totally new framework.

It is important to note here that the new title is not simply an extension of social entrepreneurship. Since social entrepreneurship is already considered to be a ‘valuable agent’ – as secondary importance – in ‘social, economic, and environmental regeneration/renewal’ (Haugh 2007, p. 161); academics as well as practitioners will continue its ‘use’ into the future. However, new integrated model is expected to develop as a separate integrating domain of its own, with more inter-dependency and as an ‘equally important segment – arguably more superior than’, Mainstream Entrepreneurship.

In addition, the new model takes into account the importance of a wider and deeper level of stakeholder involvement than its previous ‘types’. For example, Big Issue – a prominent example of a social entrepreneurial initiative in the UK – provides the homeless with opportunity to earn an income where the magazine itself (Big Issue) is sold by the homeless, where the needy are involved in a ‘self-help’ mission (Hibbert et al 2001, p. 1). It is commendable that there is a direct involvement of the homeless in this exchange positively through its empowering process at the ‘frontlines’ of the venture.

However, such ventures needs to extend this model to involve the homeless, possibly in the decision making processes and overall strategic direction (rather than simply to ‘sell’); and create partnerships with for-profits and policy makers on a global scale to address contemporary issues from its root causes (rather than to provide short-term, piece-meal solutions to poverty). After all, it is a majority view that ‘poverty’ is actually less of a ‘financial’ and a ‘resource availability’ problem. According to a World Vision Australia study, the world produces five times the amount of ‘food’ than the total-population-needs annually, yet more than half the world population live within poverty stricken environments where poverty and poverty-related-issues continue to exist and expand, as highlighted below in Table 5.2 and Figure 5.3.
Table 5.2: Poverty versus Annual Burger Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty items VS Annual Burger Sales</th>
<th>$ in Billions</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean water</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min income</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate poverty</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger Sales</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: World Vision Australia

As illustrated above, Annual burger sales of McDonalds and Burger King account for US $94 billion. Mere US $14 million (15%) is required for providing food for all ‘the hungry’ in the world; US $11 million (12%) for providing education; US $16 million (17%) for clean water; US $36 million for minimum wage conditions (38%) – all of which we take for granted in much of the ‘developed world’.

With 82% of annual budget sales (US $77 million) of McDonalds and Burger King alone; one could arguably provide food, water, education and a liveable wage for the whole world. It is also reported that annual Coke sales account for more than US$36; and a mere US$16 billion is considered adequate to provide clean water globally. Gambling in Australia alone – arguably a social-destructive activity – contributes to US$ 94.5 billion annually; and this budget in itself is adequate for providing food, water, education and a liveable wage globally.
How much money would it actually cost to completely remove ‘poverty’ from the world (including debt relief and sustainable long-term future costs)? *World Vision* estimated the cost of such an inspiring venture as little as US$ 284 billion. Compared to the annual global expenditure on weapons – US$ 1,420 billion; one could ask “So what is the world waiting for?”

Unfortunately, more than 16% of world’s children attend ‘work’ activities at the expense of sacrificing their health, education and development; 130 million (21% of all children) of primary school age in developing countries do not attend school at all – all of which contribute to the overall problems (*World Vision* 1999). *World Vision* further states that less than US$10 is required to protect a child against six killer diseases; under US$25 to feed a hungry child for a month; and around US$55 to provide a harvest pack of seeds and tools to grow two tonnes of food.

Given the alarming statistics and the complicated nature of the global sustainability; developmental and sustainable solutions needs to move away from its current piece meal, non-integrative, traditional and ad-hoc means to ones involving a globally sustainable solutions comprising of *for-profits, not-for-profits* and *policy-makers*. It must also involve integrated solutions encompassing holistic frameworks to find the ‘root causes’ of the issue; rather than ‘temporary quick fixes’. As such, entrepreneurial integration is presented as a solution for the inter-dependant flux of strategic-global paradoxical anomalies existent within the contemporary global context – involving the majority of stakeholders searching for a ‘permanent and sustainable solution’.
In comparison, *Social entrepreneurship* is still being developed within both academic and practical contexts: ‘still emerging as an area for academic inquiry’, ‘theoretical underpinnings have not been adequately explored’ (Austin et al 2006, p. 1). *Hula & Elmoore* presents ‘governing nonprofits’ as an ‘alternative form of urban governance and an institutional framework for fully incorporating views, individuals and groups into the political process’ (2000, p. 42). Clues to success within this framework are identified as: i) being able to sustain over time; ii) identification and measurability of results; and iii) contribution to the process of transforming the community.

Author argues that the new model is able to provide the necessary means and the tools in which to achieve: sustainability over time; identification and measurability of results – short, medium and long-term; and contribute to the process of transforming the community. Therefore integrated models are able to transcend beyond *Social Entrepreneurship* and are most suited for ‘*truly ambiguous*’ environmental models – the types that are considered to be the emerging global types. Within this so called ‘*truly ambiguous*’ environments (knowledge based economies), knowledge itself as well as the knowledge creation process are considered to be of high importance. As a result, *policy-makers, for-profits and not-for-profits* must give careful consideration to the overall entrepreneurial education process.

### 5.9 Entrepreneurial Education

Entrepreneurial education is identified as an important element within the future context; whereby future entrepreneurs are expected to learn from prior ‘failures’ of themselves and others before them. Since *Insanity* is defined as ‘doing the same thing and expecting different results’: emerging generation of entrepreneurial educators should ‘learn’ to avoid the so called *paradigm paralysis*. Paradigm paralysis is defined as: ‘the greatest difficulty in the world is not for people to accept new ideas, but to make them forget about old ideas’ (John Maynard Keynes *cited in* Kuratko & Hodgetts 2004, p. 590). This view is also similar to that advocated by Kurt Lewin’s *Unfreezing-Changing-Refreezing* model. The need to adapt new and innovative approaches within the teachings of entrepreneurship is suggested by Kuratko & Hodgetts as the integration of industry, practice and global context with academia.
As Robert F. Kennedy stated –

“You are living in one of the rarest moments in education history – a time when all around us, the old order of things is crumbling and a new world society is painfully struggling to take shape. You possess one of the most privileged positions, for you have been given the opportunity to educate and to lead. You can use your enormous privilege and opportunity to purely seek your tenure and security. But entrepreneurial history will judge you, and as the years pass, you will ultimately judge yourself, on the extent to which you have used your abilities to pioneer and lead our universities into a new horizon. In your hands are the future of your entrepreneurial world and the fulfilment of the best qualities of your own spirit”.

This statement is equally valid today as it was in Kennedy’s time. We are once again challenged to educate the global populations – through modern entrepreneurial pedagogy – to create new paradigms of entrepreneurial mindsets of integration. Such mind-sets require a move away from the traditional ‘teacher centred’ approaches to include other more innovative approaches such as ‘teaching centred’, ‘learner centred’ and ‘learning centred’ methods. As illustrated by Table 5.3, Krueger presents a simplified version of this evolution of modern pedagogy below. It is recommended that a mix of all of the four types to be adapted for entrepreneurial education.

According to Krueger (2007), teacher centred approaches are based on ‘memorisation’ and ‘route learning’. This method of delivery is largely based on ‘lectures’ summarising the ‘facts’ of a particular topic. The teacher transmits the facts to ‘passive’ students; who in turn try to ‘remember’ the learning. Whilst this particular form of teaching pedagogy is still being used today; it’s relevance within the entrepreneurial domain is questionable. Entrepreneurship by definition is much more ‘hands on’ and experiential type discipline extending beyond ‘simple memorisation’.
### Table 5.3: The Evolution of Modern Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key focus of pedagogy</th>
<th>Key assumption</th>
<th>Example of key tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher-centred</strong></td>
<td>Teacher <em>transmits</em> to passive students</td>
<td>Memorization (lecture on Ent facts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching-centred</strong></td>
<td>Learning as a <em>process</em></td>
<td>Skills &amp; Drills (write Bus Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learner-centred</strong></td>
<td>Learners having <em>ownership</em></td>
<td>Cases (assess Bus Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning-centred</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning is situated – students &amp; teacher alike</strong></td>
<td><strong>Problem-based learning (self-managed field projects)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In fact, it is unlikely that entrepreneurs are created through such means in the ‘real world’. Whist teacher-centred approaches can ‘prepare’ the potential entrepreneurs with a basic understanding of entrepreneurship; the ‘nurturing’ and ‘actual practice’ of entrepreneurship requires a combination of teaching centred, learner centred and learning centred approaches.

For example, through teaching centred approaches – learning is viewed as a ‘process’. Hence, entrepreneurs can be exposed to ‘skills and drills’ through writing of business proposals, project briefs and business plans. Next, this ‘nurturing’ process can be extended to include learner centred approaches to allow the entrepreneurial students to experience ‘ownership’ for their own learning.

Here one could involve this ‘entrepreneurial apprentice’ in the ‘overall assessment and evaluation process’; by exposing them to ‘self-assessment’ techniques for business plans, case studies and new venture proposals. From a pedagogical standpoint, this step is a radical shift away from the teacher and teaching centred mentality. Here, learners start to rely upon, take responsibility for their own learning – without depending on someone else to ‘spoon feed’ them.
Such type of self-learning and self-assessment is paramount in an entrepreneur’s ‘new venture creation process’ as well as for the ‘venture continuity’ and ‘venture success’. From the ‘teachers’ point of view, there is no actual teaching to be done. Rather, the exercising of a different role as a ‘mentor’, ‘coach’, ‘facilitator’ and a ‘guide’ – taking a step backwards and exercising a more passive standpoint.

Unlike in the case of ‘teacher centred’ approaches where the students were ‘passive’, there’s a shift for the ‘teachers’ to become passive. Eventually, this process can be further enhanced by the inclusion of ‘learning’ centred approaches. Here, learning is situated – teachers and students alike – within more ‘problem based learning’ contexts.

For example, ‘self managed field projects’ can be used as a tool for creating learning environments and thereby prepare the entrepreneurial apparentices for the contemporary knowledge based economy. The experiences gained through such methods and are more likely to provide the novice entrepreneurial learners skill-sets in minimising the high failure rates within entrepreneurial venture creation process in today’s truly ambiguous global context.

### 5.10 Future ‘Truly Ambiguous’ Environments

As illustrated by Figure 5.4, the world is moving towards ‘true ambiguity’ where not only we are uncertain about the future global context, but we are also unable to predict even a range of possible likely solutions to future problems (2001, p. 5). In other words, much more turbulent, dynamic and complex changes are anticipated with higher frequency of changes with each change highly complicated – suggesting the need for continuous paradigm shifts. Within these ‘truly ambiguous’ environments, entrepreneurial integration is more likely to offer better solutions.

As illustrated below in Table 5.4, teacher centred approaches are most suitable for L1 type ‘clean future’ environments with a single view of the future. However much of today’s global environment – especially within the entrepreneurial context – is far from ‘single futures’. As a result, entrepreneurs need to gain knowledge, experiences and master in operating under other alternative futures, range of futures and truly ambiguous futures.
Figure 5.4: Courtney’s Four Levels of Residual Uncertainty Model

Table 5.4: Learning Model of Truly Ambiguous, Dynamic-Complex Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robbins</th>
<th>Krueger</th>
<th>Courtney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable &amp; Simple</td>
<td>Teacher centred: passive memorising students</td>
<td>L1 clear future: <em>single view of future</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic &amp; Simple</td>
<td>Teaching centred: <em>learning as a process</em></td>
<td>L2 alternative futures: <em>limited possibilities with one certain outcome</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable &amp; Complex</td>
<td>Learner centred: <em>learner having ownership</em></td>
<td>L3 range of futures: <em>range of possible future outcomes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic &amp; Complex</td>
<td>Learning: <em>self-managed &amp; problem-based learning</em></td>
<td>L4 true ambiguity: <em>not even a range of possible future outcomes</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kennedy & Smith argue that unlike the last two decades – where organizations used to ‘incrementally’ grow from a local context into the global context – contemporary organizations enter internationalization almost immediately (2006, p. 104). This notion of ‘born global’ organizations is challenging established theories of incremental international entry. Numerous authors support this view: ‘current and increasingly global nature of demand in many markets . . . global start-ups’ (Oviatt & McDougall 1995); ‘internationalization of smaller firms’ (Coviello & McAuley 1999); ‘entrepreneurship goes global, born global’ (Karra & Phillips 2004); and ‘born-global firms’ (Knight & Cavusgil 2005). Within this context, Nummela, Saarenketo & Puumalainen introduces a framework for analysing the ‘global mindset’, as illustrated below in Figure 5.5 and Figure 5.6 (2004 cited in Kennedy & Smith 2006, p. 105).

**Figure 5.5: Global Mindset Framework**

Global mindset was identified as ‘related to performance’ of organizations operating within the international context (Nummela et al 2004). Global mindset within this context was stated as having international experience, education, ‘global-ness’ and turbulence in the market. Research setting for the above study was based on: management experiences, market characteristics, subjective and objective performance. Management Experience was based upon international work experience and international education. Market Characteristics involved ‘global-ness’ and ‘turbulence’ of the market. Subjectivity of Performance related to quantitative and qualitative measures. Objectivity of Performance involved development of turnover, number of export markets, share of foreign customers and foreign partners. Overall, Global Mindset was based on proactive-ness, commitment and international vision.

Figure 5.6: Global Mindset Basis

5.11 ‘Ethnic’ Entrepreneurship

Global mindsets open up a whole dimension of expansion, flexibility and free-movement for individual countries and ethnic groups; thereby naturally creating ‘ethnic entrepreneurial issues’ on a global scale.

Within such a context, Ethnic Entrepreneurship is defined as “simultaneously owners and managers (or operators) of their own businesses, whose group membership is tied to a common cultural heritage or origin and is known to out-group members as having such traits; they are intrinsically intertwined in particular social structures in which individual behaviour, social relations, and economic transactions are constrained” (Aldrich & Waldinger 1990; Yinger 1985; cited in Zhou 2004, p. 1040).

Ethnic entrepreneurship – through a model of trans-national entrepreneurship – is presented as synergistic and community-building. Within today’s context, the scale, diversity and density of international movements are highly developed; and the world economy is continually restructuring itself along with globalization of capital and labour.

These waves of shifts have enabled individuals of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds from their own ethnic groups to engage collectively in trans-national business; and at the same time experience social effects that go beyond successes of individual entrepreneurs.

Whilst ‘ethnic entrepreneurship’ has created a lot of positive responses for overall entrepreneurship; one must take into account the importance of establishing ‘holistic’ entrepreneurial frameworks globally. Entrepreneurship – in its strategic and global context – must be able to incorporate multiple ‘ethnic’ needs as well as to cater for ‘unified and holistic’ entrepreneurial approaches simultaneously.
5.12 ‘Holistic’ Entrepreneurship

General Systems Theory (GST) introduced by Boulding (1956) recommends to ‘achieve a compromise between the specific that has no meaning and the general that has no content’. Here, Boulding attempts to point out three important points:

i) **Similarities between the theoretical constructions of different disciplines**
Author argues that there are similarities between theoretical constructions of different disciplines within the entrepreneurial integration context. For example, whilst the concept of ‘Strategic Global Entrepreneurialism’ (SGE) is almost non-existent within organizations; the philosophical underpinnings of this concept is widely researched under the titles ethics, morality, social responsibility-responsiveness, civic innovation, community consciousness, triple bottom line, charity, corporate social responsibility (CSR), organizational spirituality, social entrepreneurship and various other terms.

ii) **Reveal gaps in empirical knowledge and**
Within both the academic as well as empirical context, entrepreneurial integration is hardly discussed. It is still in its early stages of development and is considered an ‘evolving discipline’. As a result, there are various ‘gaps’ in both literature and practice of entrepreneurial integration. Within this dissertation, the author has attempted to explore the possibilities such integration by presenting Strategic Global Entrepreneurship as a driving strategy for contemporary organizations.

iii) **Provide a language by means of which experts in different disciplines could communicate with each other.**
Entrepreneurial integration by no means is restricted any one discipline. Its roots lie deep within various social science related disciplines including economics, administration, management, human resources, finance, psychology, organization behaviour, change management, innovation, development studies, commerce and various other fields. Its evolving nature has started to permeate into profit and non-profit sectors in both local and international contexts; showing significant contributions to organizations of both small and large within multiple industries.
The common theme flowing seems to be the ‘social’ element of entrepreneurial
d endeavour with a very long-term and holistic view. In recent years, ‘entrepreneurship’
 itself has been challenging the very basic foundations of ‘fundamental laws of global
economics’, where some consider ‘entrepreneurship’ as the fourth pillar of the basic
elements of economies – in addition to land, labour and capital.

Within this larger macro context, Yamin & Tanas presents the following conceptual
framework as illustrated below, where they argue that entrepreneurs are driven by (sole
purpose) opportunity utilization rather than imagination: implying that entrepreneurship
is influenced by both the ‘external environment’ and ‘social capital’ (2006, p. 80). It
can be argued that external environment is attributed to the success or failure of
entrepreneurial ventures.

Figure 5.7: External Environment and Social Capital

Capital Perspective”, International Journal of Business Innovation and Research, Vol. 1, No. 1-2, pp. 73-91
5.13 Recommended Strategies for Practical Applications of Strategic Global Entrepreneurship

“Most firms face external environments that are growing more turbulent, complex, and global – conditions that make interpretation increasingly difficult. To cope with what are often ambiguous and incomplete environmental data and to increase their understanding of the general environment, successful firms engage in a process called external environmental analysis” (Michael A. Hitt, R. Duane Ireland, & Robert E. Hoskisson, Strategic Management: Competitiveness and Globalization).

“Today, thanks to a thriving world economy, global telecommunications, and expanding travel, exchange among Europe, North America, and Pacific Rim is happening at an unparalleled pace. In the urban centres of the developing world signs of the international youth culture are almost everywhere . . . For the companies that sell these new international products, that understand the world as one single market, it is an economic bonanza” (John Naisbitt and Patricia Aburdene, Megatrends 2000 cited in Kuratko & Hodgetts, 2004).

The boundaries amongst for-profits, not-for-profits and policy-making domains are becoming less clear: for-profits are expected to participate in more and more Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Social Entrepreneurship (SE) type activities; not-for-profits are expected to become more accountable, efficient and adapt more ‘business-like’ approaches; & policy-makers are expected to become efficient, effective, accountable, responsible, move nations forward and maintain national and regional identities – yet, advance forwards within a global context of diminishing national boundaries.

Typical Business-Commercial Entrepreneurs such as Bill Gates (Microsoft – Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation), Sir Richard Branson (Virgin Empire – Eco-Planet) and Geoff Skoll (Skoll Foundation) are moving towards more Social Entrepreneurial type ventures – foundations, institutes, charities. Typical Social-Community Entrepreneurs such as Professor Mohamed Yunus (Grameen Bank – Nobel Prize Recipient) are moving towards more Mainstream Entrepreneurship type ventures – banks, commercial enterprises.
Typical policy-makers are moving towards ‘privatisation’, ‘outsourcing’ and are continually being pressured to perform both efficiently and effectively. Further, they are moving towards systems of ‘higher disclosure & public participation’, ‘on-line type projects’, ‘e-Governments’ and internationalisation of ‘policy making’ domains. For example, in the United Arab Emirates, there is a strong shift towards e-Governments; privatisation of major governmental services such as electricity, water, energy and related sectors; higher public involvement through more open and transparent governance systems. Similar trends are seen across the globe, suggesting the future convergence of for-profits, not-for-profits and policy-makers to adapt more strategically integrated entrepreneurial models.

Global environmental and sustainability concerns are becoming increasingly important; hence, corporations, charities and governments are expected to take on more responsibility and to advocate for ‘planet’s survival’. Hence it is likely that the ‘traditional differences’ between the above mentioned three sectors to decline; whereby entrepreneurs of the future may be ‘forced’ to create and operate ventures that align mission of corporate, social and global values.

Various scholars argue that entrepreneurship and new venture creation is already a ‘high risky endeavour’ – without necessarily having to add other social and global missions. For example, Timmons argue that “starting a new venture is an activity that entails a high level of risk with failure rates for new businesses hovering around 40% in the first year and up to 90% over 10 years (1990 as cited in Dimov & Clercq 2006, p. 207).

Further Baum & Locke state that entrepreneurship is a “complex and costly process characterized by an unfavourable success rate (2002 as cited in Markman et al 2002, p. 149). Author argues that by adopting integrated models, entrepreneurs are able to gain a unique competitive advantage and are seen as part of the ‘solution’ for increasing global issues. Thus they are likely to increase the chances of survival not only for the venture itself but also for the larger macro community.
Harrison & Leitch highlights the importance of learning and knowledge in the contemporary ‘knowledge based economy’ (2005, p. 351). Building upon Harrison & Leitch’s arguments, author recommends that entrepreneurial integration as a better approach in contributing to ‘continuous learning’ and ‘innovative knowledge creation’. As such, it is more appropriate for contemporary and emerging knowledge based economies.

Relationship building and striving for mutual partner exchanges are considered ‘critical to survival and growth of young firms’ (Hay 2001; Hite 2001; Hesterly 2001; Larson 1991; Larson 1993; Sapienza 2001; Star 1993; Van de Ven 1998; Venkataraman 1998; Yli-Renko 2001; as cited in Reuber & Fischer 2005, p. 57); and Entrepreneurship is identified as having a positive link with economic performance (Audretsch & Keilbach 2004, p. 419). As such, entrepreneurship is already seen as making ‘positive impacts’. Hence, making a ‘global positive impact’ seems to be the natural progress of entrepreneurial contribution.

Within the contemporary global environment of dynamism and complexity, entrepreneurial firms that are building networks/ alliances with their stakeholders are more likely to survive the future generations. Murphy & Crockett (within the case study, Dealer Trade Group) lists 10 strategic principles for survival as listed below (2007, p. 643): i) don’t kick the gorilla: Physical auctions dominate the industry; partner rather than compete; ii) behaviour changes slowly: Let dealers participate as they are accustomed; iii) handshakes build more loyalty than features: People matter more than processes; iv) relationships outrun transactions: Lose a deal – save a relationship; v) business is intimate: In-person visits are customary and essential; vi) avoid imports: Develop native solutions that adapt to existing behaviour; vii) saving time + money + hassle = maximum success: Create win-win-win solutions; viii) slow and steady wins: Quality companies cannot grow overnight; ix) don’t push for maximum margin: Transaction volume makes the model fly; x) knowledge is power: We benefit when dealers have good data to make good decisions.
In terms of the labour market availability for such environments, early retirees arguably are good candidates for the domain of ‘nascent entrepreneurs’. Given the appropriate labour market conditions, macro economic conditions coupled with individual health, wealth and work history attributes; arguably, more ‘early retirees’ can be encouraged to participate in entrepreneurial activity (Singh & DeNoble 2003, p. 207). This is especially beneficial for countries with ageing populations such as Australia; where entrepreneurship can contribute through new venture creation as the substitute for early retirement – thereby providing more employment to younger generations.

In countries with growing younger generations such as the United Arab Emirates, entrepreneurship can assist in home-based and small-to-medium-enterprise creation as a substitute for full time employment. According to Simon & Houghton, within the context of ‘younger-smaller firms, entrepreneurs are more likely to experience challenges of “underestimating competition; overestimating demand; and overlooking requisite assets” (2002, p. 105).

Fully integrated and government supported Entrepreneurship Centres can reduce this risk – and thereby increase the success rate of ‘younger-smaller-firms’. Further, Begley, Tan & Schoch presents seven politico-economic dimensions as important in new venture creation: i) financing availability; ii) supportive government regulation; iii) market opportunities; iv) access to support services; v) supply of skilled labour; vi) needed connections; and vii) competitive conditions (2005, p. 35).

In its academic context, entrepreneurship is increasing demonstrating its establishment as a ‘key area of research’ where it was originally developed from a ‘sub-discipline of management studies’ to one with ‘enhanced, discipline-specific, theoretical and professional language of its own’ (Cornelius et al 2006, p. 375). Further Dean, Shook & Payne highlights that there’s an increasing number of entrepreneurial doctoral programs/ doctoral training (2007, p. 601). As argued by Cornelius, Dean, Shook & Payne, entrepreneurship is developing as a ‘credible’ field of its own; where ‘credibility’ is referred to ‘the extent to which entity-specific information is believable’ (Fischer & Reuber 2007, p. 53).
The future of much of the entrepreneurial domain is summed up by Gilovich as ‘... how and why people: believe [that] something is systematic, ordered and real, when it is really random, chaotic and illusory; people are extraordinarily good at ad hoc explanation. . to live, it seems, is to explain, justify, and to find coherence among diverse outcomes, characteristics and causes’ (1991, p. 21 as cited in Hindle 2004, p. 601).

Much of the current research on entrepreneurship is limited to ‘functional – objective & regulated domain’ of research; and recent scholars calls for an inter-paradigmatic debate amongst all four types of paradigms of social theory: i) radical humanist; ii) radical structuralist; iii) interpretive; and iv) functionalist (Burrell & Morgan 2003, p. 22 as cited in Jennings et al 2005, p. 145).

Despite the fact, that entrepreneurship is considered to be the ‘most potent economic force the world has ever experienced’ and the recent growth in curricula and programs devoted to entrepreneurship; entrepreneurial education is presented as one of the challenges within the contemporary domain of entrepreneurship (Kuratko 2005, p. 577).

As a solution to the disintegrated approaches within this field, Kuratko suggests ten themes that should be embedded within the pedagogy of entrepreneurial education: i) entrepreneurial (more opportunity driven) and managerial (resource- and conversation-driven) domains are not mutually exclusive; ii) venture financing; iii) corporate entrepreneurship; iv) entrepreneurial strategies; v) types of entrepreneurs and their methods; vi) risks & trade-offs of an entrepreneurial career; vii) women and minority entrepreneurs; viii) entrepreneurial spirit being universal; ix) economic and social contributions of entrepreneurs; x) ethics of entrepreneurship (2005, p. 581).

Further, Nayak & Yamin suggest that entrepreneurs – in order to survive the contemporary global context – must accumulate a ‘rich and valuable domain specific knowledge’ as well as ‘capability to think holistically’ (2008, p. 2). This balance of the ‘broad general knowledge’ and ‘narrow specific knowledge’ continue to remain with the tacit entrepreneurial knowledge base.
Within the broad context, ‘creativity and innovative thinking’ and ‘entrepreneurial mindsets’ are being advocated to nurture ‘entrepreneurial identities, attitudes and behaviours’. Specific domain includes: various academic efforts such as entrepreneurship certificates, degree majors, complete degrees, masters and doctoral programs; and industry based efforts such as entrepreneurship centres, business plan competitions, new venture creations, business incubation and various others.

Further, Hite argues that “ties entering networks through personal relationships to involve quickly toward full relational embeddedness” (2005, p. 113). This suggests the importance of strategic entrepreneurial networks and the role of entrepreneurs as agents for their emerging firms. Arguably, entrepreneurs are capable of proactively managing their firm’s emergence and growth. Based on a study of 15 Swedish, U.K. and U.S. firms, Covin & Miles argue that Corporate Venturing (CV) and Business Strategy can co-exist within organizational phenomena (2007, p. 183).

Homeboy Industries, founded by Father Greg Boyle – where former gang members in Los Angeles were provided with employment opportunities – is an example of a social entrepreneurial enterprise in the USA. However, as the enterprise grew and became established, Michael Baca, the new Operations Director was faced with the dilemma of whether or not to expand; and was confronted by ‘unusual entrepreneurial environments’, ‘organizational challenges’ and ‘philosophical dilemmas’ (Choi & Kiesner 2007, p. 787).

Building upon Choi & Kiesner’s findings, author argues that within today’s global context, organizations need to move towards more holistic approaches resulting in a constant trade-off between ‘quantity and quality’ of available resources and ‘efficiency versus effectiveness’ (Hanlon & Saunders 2007, p. 619). Further ‘information from third parties’ and ‘community involvement’ is identified positively affecting the ‘build up of trust’ within entrepreneurial ventures (Howorth & Moro 2006, p. 495). Future entrepreneurs are expected to bring about benefits not only for himself/ herself but for the municipality, region or country as a whole (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entrepreneurship).
Another benefit of entrepreneurial integration is that it is closely linked to *Deliberate Democracy* – a concept originally derived from political science for reconciling ‘interests’ within ‘interest groups’ that were initially in collusion. *Mansbridge* (1983) present it’s function as creating shared understanding and consensus-building activities; whereas *Dryzek* (2000) identifies the concept as resolution through informed debate and preference changing dialogue. It is important to note that *Strategic Global Entrepreneurship*, similar to *Deliberate Democracy* – focuses on promoting collaborative action among political and social institutions.

*Yamin & Tanas* argue that education and pedagogy of entrepreneurship is an important element in ‘creating dynamic communities’ and ‘creating wealth for enterprising individuals’ simultaneously (2006, p. 73). Here, the underlying principals of both ‘business-commercial’ and ‘social-community’ aspects are evident – suggesting the need for a more broadly and clearly defined type of entrepreneurship to blend in the two types.

Author argues *Strategic Global Entrepreneurship* in fact offers such a framework, maintaining [and contributing to] the widespread acceptance and growth of entrepreneurship as ‘an important focus for practitioners and academic across the world’ (Kao 1991; Shane & Venkataraman 1999; and Venkataraman 1997 cited in Yamin & Tanas 2006). Further models of entrepreneurial integration are expected to advance the ideals of ‘creating dynamic communities’ which is primarily a *Social Entrepreneurial* aspiration into ‘creating dynamic knowledge economies’ – identified as the emerging global context.

Within this so-called, ‘knowledge economies’, what makes an entrepreneur ‘entrepreneurial’ has often been a debate both within academia and industry. Entrepreneurs clearly posses unique characteristics different from workers, managers and strategists. Whilst there could be some overplay between these terminologies, the fundamental nature and mind-set of entrepreneur is easily identifiable. *Sarasvathy* argues that the difference is that entrepreneurs ‘believe in a yet-to-be future that can substantially be shaped by human action’ – where this human action can in fact control the future [world]’ (2001, p. 37).
Building upon Sarasvathy’s ‘effectual logic’, author argues that entrepreneurs posses high levels of internal locus of control; to such degree that they don’t like to ‘read’ about history, rather aspire to ‘make history’ on a daily basis. Entrepreneurs are expected to ‘make history’, ‘create growth’ & to ‘help sustain the world’. However, what if the world does not sustain itself soon enough? What if, for every tip towards a better world there is an opposite and greater tip towards a horrific world. What if those days overpower the good days?"

This paradox of some entrepreneurs in trying to make a better world whilst others may directly/indirectly work towards a horrific world is a constant struggle. Whilst this may have little logical explanation, it may be necessary for the evolution of mankind and the growth of our civilisation. In fact, the very existence of both business-commercial and social-community entrepreneurs in today's world is as a result of this constant struggle.

It can be argued that, in the absence of darkness, it is harder to explain light. Some of our greatest achievements as human civilization were during times of war, destruction and madness. During the world war I and II, whilst there were so many deaths, suffering and destruction; humankind also managed to invent some of its greatest inventions followed by radical innovations in multiple industries and massive increases in global technologies.

Author is certainly not suggesting that war is good, nor the fact that we should encourage/foster violence in any form. Simply that, the world operates in more than one ‘form/ paradigm’ and requires analysis beyond scientific and logical arena. In a way, one could argue that the world has a life of its own. If as Mainstream Business-Commercial Entrepreneurs & Social-Community Entrepreneurs, we fail to succeed in 'saving the world'; the next natural step is for the emergence of entrepreneurial integration within contemporary and emerging global context.
In the current global setting where humankind is experiencing more natural as well as ‘man-made’ disasters than ever before in the world; entrepreneurial integration is more likely to provide sustainable and planet-wide acceptable solutions. As the saying, ‘bigger problems bring out bigger leaders’; in times of great distress in the world, great leaders will also emerge out. Authors own view is that these great leaders are likely to take ‘forms’ and ‘variations’ of Strategic Global Entrepreneurialism. Those leaders are more likely to adapt entrepreneurial integration in the form of ‘business models’ in the emerging global context. Based on Seelos & Mair’s Social Entrepreneurship Model (2005), author presents the following synthesis of entrepreneurial integration and its viability as a business model in the contemporary context.

   i)  *for-profit verses Social-Entrepreneurial strategy*

According to the author, the term *social entrepreneurship* is used to refer to the creation of business models which satisfy basic human needs. The underlying assumption of this argument is that the particular services are currently not serviced by existing markets and institutions and hence social entrepreneurship is used as a type of a business model to develop the organization’s profits, market share, business strategy and long term survival and sustainability. Entrepreneurial integration, building upon these ideals is likely to move businesses to even more effective.

   ii)  *customer perspective*

In the eyes of the customers, businesses that satisfy the needs of its (organization’s) stakeholders better are considered ‘higher-performing’ organizations. These organizations are viewed as ‘good citizens’ of the corporate world. In a majority of the cases, these organizations are likely to achieve a better market response, higher customer satisfaction and increased return on investment. Hence, from a customer perspective entrepreneurial integration is more likely to be favourable due to its positive global conditions.
**iii) simply to do ‘good work’ is insufficient**

While it is true that there are ‘financial’ advantages and motives for existing *for-profit* organizations to ‘do good work’ in its immediate environment and hence experience increased levels of business success; it is unlikely to stay as a competitive advantage in the future organizations. For example, in a multitude of industries, the customers’ of the contemporary society already expect the organizations to ‘do good work’; and hence has lost the ‘unique strategic advantage’ of such pursuits.

**iv) doing ‘good work’ as a necessity**

In the future organisations, to do ‘good works’ is a mandatory requirement. Doing the right thing is no longer a luxury for the majority of organizations – rather it is a necessity of conducting business. These demands are imposed on organizations by customers, governments and regulatory bodies both in terms of formal (legislative, code of conduct, ethics committees) and informal (lobbying, rallying, boycotting) frameworks.

**v) price of not doing ‘good work’**

Organizations who do not respond to these demands are considered to be destructive to the environment (world) and are often criticized by media, public and governments. More often than not, competitors of such organizations use these very weaknesses to attack the organization and in term ‘steal’ its customers, goodwill and market share. If such behaviour continues, the organization comes under heavy scrutiny from other stakeholders as well and eventually may lead to self-destruction, bankruptcy, mergers and takeover bids.

**vi) cost of ‘cover ups’**

There are numerous cases where organizations try to cover up this type of behaviour and in fact pay the price. For example, *Shell Petroleum Company* in the early 1990s tried to cover up a major petrol spill disaster in Nigeria in an attempt to reduce financial compensation for the victims and to reduce ‘bad publicity’. The adverse result was that the events become public in the global media anyway and *Shell Petroleum* was boycotted by numerous countries and regulatory groups.
vii) global context
In the current global context, with numerous global movements such as the S11, Al Gore movement, Greenpeace and various environmental groups fighting against global warming, environment protection, long term sustainability and similar issues – it is very difficult for organizations to do anything but strive to be seen as a ‘responsible corporation’.

viii) legality verses doing the ‘right thing’
In some cases, even when the organizations follow the legal system and are well within their right to conduct certain trades – they may still come under scrutiny of other global movements and have negative impacts.

For example, while it is legal for Japanese ‘whaling ships’ to hunt humpback whales for its meat and as raw material for various other products; these whaling companies are often interrupted by Greenpeace, WSPC and other animal protection groups both on the global media and at sea. The recent accident between a Japanese whaling company and an environmental protection boat at sea was a classic example of this type of tension.

ix) charitable ‘works’ are expected
Hence, in today’s global context, organizations are expected to do the ‘right thing’ anyway. It is no longer a luxury. Majority of organizations do conduct some form of ‘charity’ at least in their immediate environment. For example, sponsoring a local sports club; donations to local charity groups; charity BBQs; support in special appeals such as the Tsunami.

While it is true that these activities do contribute to maintaining an organization’s reputation, positive image and better client relations; it is no longer a luxury or a form of competitive advantage for organizations. It certainly does not make organizations unique within its industrial territories. Hence it does not necessarily differentiate them from its competitors.
x) truly unique strategy – Strategic Global Entrepreneurship
To become truly unique and wanting to stand out from its competitors, organizations need to look at their overall business model in a completely innovative and radical way. This needs to be at a holistic level rather than a piece meal approach. The days of the past – with its piece meal approach to conducting ‘good works’ in its arena are becoming redundant. Organizations wishing to stay ‘on top’ and wanting to master the contemporary global corporate battlefield must pursue a more holistic and adhere to more entrepreneurially integrated models – rather than to simply do good works and charity.

xi) SGE as core
Entrepreneurial integration need to become the core of its existence, whereby the rest of the organization is shaped and reshaped to mould into the overall organizations vision, mission and core values. This is also in line with the current global context, where organizations continuously struggle to fit into its immediate surrounding through increased agility and flexibility.

xii) faster Response time – need for agility
This agility makes the organization respond to changes in its environment very quickly, yet within an entrepreneurially integrated ‘theme’. In other words, even though the organization changes so quickly, the rapid changes are in fact glued around the essence of entrepreneurially integrated values and principles.

xiii) agility as competitive advantage
That ‘agility’ in itself also becomes a source of competitive advantage that differentiates the organization from its competitors. Today’s customers are no longer dictated by limitations of products such as in the case where Henry Ford said, you can have any colour car you like as long as its black colour; today’s organizations need to fit in with customer demands.
xiv) evolution of customer dynamics

This is evident in the evolution of Sales and Marketing in the global context, where we moved away from a push type strategy to a pull type strategy. Initially organizations focused on Sales; then to Marketing; followed by Relationship Marketing; more recently Societal Marketing; and currently and certainly in future – arguably strategically integrated marketing.

5.14 Future Research Directions

While this study provides a focus towards an integrated framework based on a comparative analysis of a case study and presents a conceptual model, future research may enhance the knowledge base by addressing the following areas:

- To enhance the validity of the SGE framework provided in this study by testing it in various types of industries in different countries and cultural settings.
- Future studies should aim to develop an empirical model by gathering primary data from a variety of sources based on a research instrument that incorporates the constructs of this integrated model.
- One of the main limitations of this study was the lack of generalisation. Findings were mainly limited to specific type of organisation operating in the Australian environment. Future studies should aim to explore and develop an integrated model which can be applied in a wide variety of global business, non-business and governmental sectors.

5.15 Concluding Remarks

This dissertation explored entrepreneurial integration as a corporate strategy to better manage organisations. Whilst various entrepreneurial efforts have traditionally existed within organisations in partial or ‘piece-meal’ approaches; the roots of entrepreneurship dates back to 1950s in theoretical concepts. Although there’s limited evidence of entrepreneurial integration utilised as a ‘driving-strategy’ and a ‘success strategy’ within organisations of the past; research in both academic literature as well as real-life organisations’ empirical evidence have neglected/ have limited applications of the effective utilisation of such models applied within holistic and more global approaches.
Within this dissertation, new models of entrepreneurial integration were developed to leverage corporate strategy with links to operationalise *Innovation, Strategy, & HR Alignment* through *Emergent-Leadership, Change Management, Organisation-Dynamics, e-Business, & Strategy-Relationships*. Findings based upon the experiences of *Aspire Solutions Group* case study conclude that *Strategic Global Entrepreneurship* is the natural development and the next step within the global entrepreneurial context.

Within this study, the research specifically addressed three questions:

- **What are viable entrepreneurial strategies for future organizations?**
  Author concludes that entrepreneurially integrated approaches such as *Strategic Global Entrepreneurship* are viable strategies for future organizations.

- **Under what conditions are these entrepreneurial strategies most effective?**
  Integrated entrepreneurial strategies are most effective in organisation’s where it is used as part of the corporate strategy; with top managements’ support; in a holistic approach, rather than a piece meal approach.

- **What are the frameworks for utilising such strategies in global settings?**
  Entrepreneurially integrated strategies can be implemented using three different frameworks – i) in-house development and application; ii) externally driven development and application; iii) joint approach by both internal and external project members.

In conclusion, entrepreneurially integrated model can be used as a corporate strategy to better manage organisations. While under certain conditions, the effectiveness of this strategy may vary; the frameworks in which they are implemented are the ‘key drivers’ in its success or failure. Hence, it is argued that, the lack of this type of organisations is to some degree a result of problems with implementation; rather than entrepreneurially integrated models being inherently out-dated (in its earlier form as *Social Entrepreneurship*) and piece-meal approaches (fragmented nature of *entrepreneurial* domains) to corporate strategy.
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Appendix One – Determine Your EQ (Entrepreneurial Quotient)

- **Definition:** An “EN-TRE-PRE-NEUR” is an individual who creates, develops, and manages a business venture, with personal risk, for a potential profit.

- **Description:** The EQ, more commonly known as the Entrepreneur Quotient, is a self-directed learning tool. It is not a test, but rather a method by which an individual can compare his or her own personal characteristics with those of successful entrepreneurs.

- **Instructions:** Answer each question to the best of your ability. There is no time limit. Correct answers are given to each question to further stimulate your interest.

- **Interpretation:** Remember, this is not a test. If you cannot answer any of the questions, do not be alarmed. You can learn to be an entrepreneur. For those individuals who prefer a scoring format, the procedure below provides rough guidelines.

- **Correct number:**
  - 100 If you’re not already an entrepreneur, you should be.
  - 85 You’re compatible. Get started.
  - 70 You have potential. Study the rules.
  - 55 You’re behind, but you can still make it.
  - 40 You don’t seem to be interested, but that doesn’t mean you can’t make it.
  - 25 You still have a chance. Go for it.
  - 0 You’re probably dead.
1. As a child, did you have a paper route, sell candy or magazine subscriptions, or shine shoes for money? Yes / No

2. Did you come from a family that owned a business? Yes / No

3. Do you have a relative who is in business? Yes / No

4. Have you ever worked for a small firm where you had close contact with the owner? Yes / No

5. Are you between the ages of 16 and 44? Yes / No

6. Have you ever worked for a large company where you worked closely with a top manager? Yes / No

7. Have you ever been fired from a job? Yes / No

8. Do you have experience in organization, planning, budgeting, personnel, marketing, advertising, administrative, or evaluation? Yes / No

9. If you are married, is your spouse supportive of the personal and financial risks involved in starting a business? Yes / No

10. Do you have a library of ‘self-help’ success books? Yes / No

11. Are you respected by your peers at work and by your friends in other areas of your life? Yes / No

12. Are you inquisitive, inventive, creative, innovative, and aggressive? Yes / No

13. Do you enjoy solving problems? Yes / No

14. Would you rather be your own boss? Yes / No

15. Do you like to make things happen? Yes / No

16. Do you enjoy taking personal and financial risks? Yes / No

17. Were you a first-born child in your family? Yes / No

18. Are you male or female? Male / Female
19. Are you married or single? Married / Single

20. Do you consider yourself a free and independent spirit? Yes / No

21. Do you have a high need for achievement? Yes / No

22. Did you have a good relationship with your father? Yes / No

23. Small businesses employ more than 50 percent of the workforce, generate 50 percent of all new jobs, and account for 44 percent of the gross national product. True / False

24. Do you take rejection personally? Yes / No

25. Do you like to move around a lot? Yes / No

26. Is it true that entrepreneurs make good managers? Yes / No

27. To be a successful entrepreneur, an individual needs a lot of good luck. True / False

28. Successful entrepreneurs often use the advice of experts outside consultants. True / False

29. Do you believe that you can control your own destiny? Yes / No

30. Are you a consistent goal setter and a results-oriented individual? Yes / No

31. Have you ever been forced to move, gone through a divorce, or suffered a death of a spouse or parent? Yes / No

32. Do you have specific experience in the area of business you plan to go into? Yes / No

33. Personal savings is the most important source of start-up funds for entrepreneurs. True / False

34. Do you have managerial skills? Yes / No
35. Are you willing to work longer hours for the same salary you now make? Yes / No

36. Do you have a college degree or special skills and knowledge from a vocational or technical school? Yes / No

37. Do you know how to raise money for starting a business? Yes / No

38. Do you like people? Yes / No

39. Can you make quick decisions? Yes / No

40. Do you have a high energy level? Yes / No

41. Do your friends and acquaintances place a great deal of faith and trust in you? Yes / No

42. Do you follow through with implementation when a decision has been made? Yes / No

43. Do you believe in your own power to accomplish goals? Yes / No

44. Are you willing to change your negative habit patterns? Yes / No

45. Do you have high moral and ethical standards? Yes / No

46. Do you have a good idea or product and/or know how to get one? Yes / No

47. Do you know how to tap the power of your subconscious mind? Yes / No

48. Are you dedicated and committed to being in business for yourself? Yes / No

49. Do you know how to develop a business plan for presentation to a group of investors? Yes / No

50. Can you inspire and motivate other individuals? Yes / No

51. Do you know how to use radio, TV, direct mail, and space advertising? Yes / No
52. Do you know what the four Ps of marketing are? Yes / No (and seven Ps of marketing are? Product, Price, Place, Promotion, People, Processes, Physical Evidence)

53. Are you familiar with the OPM principle? Yes / No

54. Do you know how to multiply your talents? Yes / No

55. Do you know how the 20/80 rule affects success? Yes / No

56. Have you ever made an assessment of your personality characteristics? Yes / No

57. Have you ever determined your net worth? Yes / No

58. Do you know what the 12 laws of universal success are? Yes / No

59. Have you ever explored your career potential? Yes / No

60. Do you believe in the power and success of self-directed learning? Yes / No

61. Do you wake up happy 99 percent of the time? Yes / No

62. Do you provide a period during each day for thinking, studying, planning, or relaxation? Yes / No

63. Do you consider yourself ambitious? Yes / No

64. Do you enjoy power, control and authority? Yes / No

65. Would you be willing to quit your job today and start at the bottom? Yes / No

66. Do you know how to determine the ‘break even’ point? Yes / No

67. Do you know what motivates customer behaviour and buying habits? Yes / No

68. Student organizations such as ATA, VICA, DECA, FFA, and others help students learn about entrepreneurship. True / False (whilst I’m not aware of these exact names)

69. Do you know where to get information on franchising? Yes / No
70. Do you know the rules of buying an existing business? Yes / No

71. Are you willing to follow a proven success system even if it differs from yours? Yes / No

72. The National Federation of Business is the largest small business organization in the United States. True / False

73. Can you accept failure without admitting defeat? Yes / No

74. Do you know how to project cash flows? Yes / No

75. Do you know how to read a balance sheet and profit and loss statement? Yes / No

76. Are you familiar with the current business and tax laws?

77. Are you familiar with the laws affecting recruitment and selection of personnel? Yes / No

78. Do you know, or are you willing to learn, how to sell? Yes / No

79. Do you consider yourself enthusiastic, imaginative, and tenacious? Yes / No

80. Are you willing to participate in both the profits and losses of a business? Yes / No

81. Do you know how to protect your ideas from thieves? Yes / No

82. Do you have a savings account? Yes / No

83. Are you familiar with the principles of bartering? Yes / No

84. Are you familiar with the rules and laws pertaining to investments? Yes / No

85. Are you familiar with the 30,000 occupational titles in the United States? Yes / No (I am aware of similar titles in Australia)

86. Do you know how to get free publicity for your product or service? Yes / No

87. Are you dissatisfied with your present employment or school work? Yes / No
88. Women entrepreneurs represent about 7 percent of all self employed. True / False

89. Minority entrepreneurs represent about 5.5 percent of all self-employed. True / False

90. On the average, incorporated self-employed persons make more than self-employed proprietors. True / False

91. On the average, women entrepreneurs make less than men. True / False

92. Do you know where to find business and operating rations for specific industries? Yes / No

93. Are you familiar with the differences between a general corporation, partnership, subchapter S, and proprietorship? Yes / No

94. Do you know how to find adult training programs in entrepreneurship? Yes / No

95. Are you familiar with the services offered by the SBA? Yes / No

96. Are you familiar with the services offered by the Minority Business Development Agency and the Minority Business Development Centers? Yes / No

97. Are you familiar with federal government contracting and R&D monies available to small business? Yes / No

98. If you are a parent or teenager, are you familiar with entrepreneur programs available in high schools and colleges? Yes / No

99. Are you familiar with business control systems such as accounting, record keeping, financial analysis, bookkeeping, profit center, collections, forecasting, and so on? Yes / No

100. Do you know the secrets of working with bankers, accountants, and attorneys? Yes / No
101. The failure rate of most small-business start-ups is about 80 percent within the first three years. True / False

102. Immigrants have a high rate of entrepreneurship in the United States. True / False

103. More than 90 percent of all businesses in the United States are small, employ fewer than 20 persons, and are organized as sole proprietorships. True / False
Appendix Two – Various SGM awards and experiences

Social-Community & Policy-Making Entrepreneurial Experiences

-helper plans to sponsor village

We provide...
- In-depth knowledge of World Vision and its work
- Excellent training in Public Speaking and Display Management
- Exciting and fulfilling work experience
- A supportive team committed to educating, motivating and empowering Victoria to build a better world
- The opportunity to expand your world

Be part of our life-changing work

The Area Representative Program seeks people with exceptional communication and people skills to welcome and provide public relations support to World Vision in your local area.

Do you think you are suited to any of the following roles?
- Public Speaking
  Speaking on behalf of the poor in schools, churches and other community groups in particular, taking primary and secondary school audiences on a journey in real time through interactive activities.
- Staffing Drop-ins
  Working with other Area Representatives to staff World Vision's display in local shopping centres and community events in your area.
- Infant Feeding
  Organising, coordinating or simply providing support for World Vision's infant feeding program.
- Visiting World Vision Supporters
  Visiting Australians who have supported World Vision, visiting supportive communities, organisations and community groups with information about their sponsored children or other projects.
- Other Public Relations Activities
  As they develop.

World Vision

For more information, contact your local World Vision office.

World Vision
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Make a donation and you’ll be an angel

WORLD Vision is urging Mourni residents to cele-
bamate the spirit of Christmas and look to Christ-
mas Angels worldwide.
Shoppers at Clarksdale Shopping Centre can visit a World Vision stall from Thursday to December 24 to donate money and receive two成本的 angels for their generosity. One of the angels is signed and placed on the World Vision Christmas tree at the shopping centre, the other being sent out as gifts.
World Vision manager Melanie Wilkins said that Christmas was a time for looking out for those who are, instead of the items we take for granted.
"Every donation made at every store will help provide essentials to children in desperate need in places like Africa, South America, and Asia," she said.

Christmas spirit: World Vision workers John, Melissa, and Ruth at work in the world this Christmas. Picture: Lisa Georgiou

News

True spirit

World Vision workers John, Melissa, and Ruth at work in the world this Christmas. Picture: Lisa Georgiou

Garden mulcher $99
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World Vision acknowledges that

JOHN MEEWELLA

attended the

WORLD VISION'S RESPONSE
TO KENYA & MOZAMBIQUE

training seminar

31/08/00

Working for a world that no longer tolerates poverty

Congratulations!

It is our great pleasure to announce that:

John Meeewella

has contributed over 500 volunteer hours to World Vision,
and has thus earned a Gold Badge.

Thank you for being so responsive to the needs of the poor and for so willingly committing your time and energy to work for a World that no longer tolerates poverty.
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42nd COLOMBO SCOUT GROUP
ROYAL COLLEGE
COLOMBO 7.

This is to certify that

S. M. G. M. Weerasinghe
of the Pigeon Patrol
obtained proficiency in the following events at the Skill-O-Rama conducted during the Gold Troop Inter-Patrol Competition held for the 2 Col. M. N. J. Courlty Challenge Shield for year 1987.

Commando March
Basketball
Hog Climbing
Gymnastics

Dated: 04/03/87

Principal

Certificate of Appreciation

To be awarded to
John Weerasinghe
in recognition of voluntary
service to the community
International Year of Volunteers 2001

42nd COLOMBO SCOUT GROUP
ROYAL COLLEGE
COLOMBO 7.

This is to certify that

Junior Scout S. M. G. Weerasinghe
was a member of the Pigeon Patrol which was runner-up in the Gold Troop Inter-Patrol Competition held for the 2 Col. M. N. J. Courlty Challenge Shield for year 1987.

Dated: 04/03/87

Principal
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Gracing the skyline of Colombo from today
Ceremonial Opening by Dr. A. S. Jayawardena
Governor, Central Bank of Sri Lanka

A Futuristic Architectural Marvel. The Prestigious 11-storeyed
Blue Heat Strengthened Glass Curtain Walled Merewella Office
& Apartment Building at 329, Galle Road, Bambalapitiya on 18th
January, 1996 at 10.46 a.m. A B.O.I. approved project

The Merewella Land and Development (Pvt) Ltd. is a known for its unique glass curtain wall for the business or residential use. The Merewella building is situated in a prime location in Colombo, offering a modern and sophisticated lifestyle to its occupants.

The building is designed with a unique glass wall that provides a stunning view of the city skyline. The Merewella building is a prime example of modern architecture and is a significant addition to the skyline of Colombo.
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SECRETARIES TO THE COMPANIES

MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTING SERVICES LTD
3rd Floor, YPIA Building, Colombo 1, Sri Lanka.

AUDITORS

S. SAVIRIMUTU & CO. CHARtered Accountants
44 3/6, YPIA Building, Colombo 1, Sri Lanka.

BANKERS

PEOPLE’S BANK
Corporate I, Colombo, Sri Lanka.

PAN ASIA BANK
Colombo, Sri Lanka.

BAYTON NATIONAL BANK
Colombo, Sri Lanka.

TOKYO MITSUBISHI BANK
Tokyo, Japan.

FUJI BANK
Tokyo, Japan.

SANKWA BANK
Tokyo, Japan.

ANZ BANK
Melbourne, Australia.

NATIONAL AUSTRALIA BANK
Melbourne, Australia.
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www.aspiresolutions.biz