

Submission of Thesis to Norma Smurfit Library, National College of Ireland

Student name: Maysa Rodrigues Maciel

Student number: 18150349

School: School of Business

Course: MSc on Entrepreneurship

Degree to be awarded: MSc on Entrepreneurship

Title of Thesis: The role of social entrepreneurs in the formation of organisational culture

One hard bound copy of your thesis will be lodged in the Norma Smurfit Library and will be available for consultation. The electronic copy will be accessible in TRAP (<http://trap.ncirl.ie/>), the National College of Ireland's Institutional Repository. In accordance with normal academic library practices, all thesis lodged in the National College of Ireland Institutional Repository (TRAP) are made available on open access.

I agree to a hard bound copy of my thesis being available for consultation in the library. I also agree to an electronic copy of my thesis being made publicly available on the National College of Ireland's Institutional Repository TRAP.

Signature of Candidate: Maysa Rodrigues Maciel

For completion by the School:

The aforementioned thesis was received by:

Date:

This signed form must be appended to all hard bound and electronic copies of your thesis submitted to your school

National College of Ireland

MSc on Entrepreneurship

**The role of social entrepreneurs in the
formation of organisational culture**

by Maysa Rodrigues Maciel

Submitted to National College of Ireland
August 2019

1. Abstract

After more than twenty years from the first studies about Social Entrepreneurship there are still several disagreements and no consensus about several of its characteristics. However, only in Ireland more than 1400 social enterprises were launched between 2009 and 2011 (European Commission Report, 2017), demonstrating that this new business model, although still not delimited by research, is attractive for entrepreneurs that aim to imprint a positive impact in the society.

This paper aims to gather data and analyse practical aspects of social entrepreneurship through the lens of their organisational culture; identifying the role and impact of the social entrepreneur in the development of this values, beliefs, mission, vision and rituals, and determining the positive and negative effects of this correlation. It is also a main objective the construction of new perspectives towards social enterprises processes and strategies, proportioning new insights in the development of hybrid organisations using the perspective of the entrepreneurs interviewed.

Declaration

I, Maysa Rodrigues Maciel, identified by the student number X18150349, declare that this work has been composed by myself and that all verbatim extracts contained in the thesis have been acknowledged and identified. The references section of this dissertation includes the full details of all sourced work and their origins. This work has not been previously submitted by any other person to any college or university for the award of Degree or Master's Degree.

Signature of research student: Maysa Rodrigues Maciel

Date: 14/08/2019

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Declaration	3
Table of contents	4
1. Introduction	6
1.1. The historical evolution of business accountability.....	6
1.2. Entrepreneurs as business changes.....	9
1.3. Relevance and research question.....	10
1.4. Thesis layout	13
2. Literature review	14
2.1. Social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs	14
2.1.1. Building business through social problems	14
2.1.2. Boundaries of social entrepreneurship	17
2.1.3. The role of the entrepreneur in social enterprises	19
2.2. Organisational culture and identity	22
2.2.1. Defining organisational culture	22
2.2.2. The importance of organisational culture	24
2.2.3. What an organisation is	26
3. Methodology	27
3.1. Research design justification	27
3.2. In-depth interviews	30
3.2.1. Sampling method and sample	30
3.2.2. Procedure	31
3.3. Data Analysis	32
3.4. Ethical Considerations	33
4. Findings and Discussion	34
4.1. Data presentation	34
4.2. Research findings	34
4.2.1. Entrepreneur’s role on social enterprises	35
4.2.2. Entrepreneur’s impact on strategies	37

4.2.3.	Entrepreneur’s impact on culture	39
4.3.	Discussion	41
5.	Conclusion	43
5.1.	Social Enterprises building new overviews on organisational culture	43
5.2.	Limitations and future research	44
	References	45
	Appendix I.....	57
	Appendix II.....	58

1. Introduction

1.1. The historical evolution of business accountability

The concern about social issues is not a new subject in the society. While we have had organised communities and pioneers of commercial exchange for an inconceivable amount of time, we have also had the juxtaposition of bodies created to protect the citizens. For instance, evidence from law codes from before the Common Era that Babylonian kings imposed punishments for the strong who abused the weak. During the development of the new societies, Greek cities also presented many forms of philanthropy. Whenever the life-balance unprivileged some pockets of society, new groups were created to restructure the equilibrium.

Although there is a range of concepts and no consensus among scholars, technically there is no strict definition to the term philanthropy. The most widely accepted definition comes from Salamon (1992) that characterize philanthropy as private citizens' donation of their time or assets for public purposes, as much as strategies to create income in non-profit organizations (Sulek, 2009). The definition was created and used to discuss several areas of human knowledge, as sociology, psychology, human behaviour and social sciences. For several years, philanthropy is related mainly with religious movements and government initiatives (Kallman, Clark, Wu & Lin, 2016).

However, the conservative wave that had reached several countries in the early seventies brought the society to a different structure, the neoliberalism. Scholars define the term as a set of policies adopted firstly by the United States and later copied by several other countries since the late 1970s. The main characteristics of these phenomenon is the subordination of productive sectors to financial concerns, leading to a significant reduction of the role of the state and privatization of formerly state-run directives. It has also observed an increase on capital barriers between countries and a raising concern for property rights and market regulation (Kallman, et al., 2016).

Acting in favour of the market interests and creating policies in favour of the economic development, all collaborate to build the model of society exists today. Notwithstanding also created a clear unbalance between owners of business and workers (Goldin & Margo, 1991). According to the US Bureau Census report in 1998, inequality of household income increased

between 1970 and 1990. In addition, wages for individuals at the bottom end of the wage distribution were 18 percent lower than wages for men at the bottom over 1980 (Juhn & Murphy, 1995). The increasing neo-liberalism polarised wages, subverting democracy and working-class institutions, increasing inequality and reducing social mobility (Hall, 2011). This new environment created a new set of social and economic conditions that helped spark the global rise of non-profit organisations (Kallman et al., 2016).

Contextualising the historical period of the society is also important to understand how social groups become non-profit or non-governmental organisations - taking into consideration that although both agencies is individual and distinct, it also makes part of the evolution of social accountability. By the 19th Century, many countries had struggled with poverty, health and basic sanitation issues, discrimination and increase of violence. These factors empowered civil society to act on behalf of their common good. In addition, several scholars in different areas had started to present the main characteristics, boundaries and consequences.

Regardless of the significant improvement brought by these institutions to the individual's rights and guarantees in the majority of the countries, proceeding a pure logical reasoning, the world population had increased from 1.6 billion by 1900 to 4 billion in 1975. In contrast, philanthropic and non-profitable were in a significantly slower growth. For instance, in the United States the non-profit activity represented 1.3% of the country's Gross National Product in 1930, and totalized 2.9% fifty years later, in 1980 (Burke, 2001).

The third sector was an important phenomenon to balance the consequences of a capitalized world and creating better opportunities for excluded and endangered populations. However, the necessity of introducing the business sector to the same practices raised alongside the increase of the world population. Even though the role of private companies has been a theme up for debate for years, corporate social responsibility (CSR) was first cited in 1953 by the book, *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*, wrote by Howard Bowen (Beal, 2013). In his work, Bowen explains that the businessmen carry the obligation of pursuing policies and to make decisions that are aligned with the values of the society. Moreover, as servants of society, these figures must not ignore socially accepted values or substitute own values above those (Bowen, 1953).

In the following decades several definitions of CSR raised to delimit the responsibility of companies towards the environment that they are made up of. Frederick (1960) stated that the economy's means of production must also enhance social welfare, and defined the

phenomenon of social responsibility as the use right of society's economic and human resources as means to broad social ends instead of being used to only fulfil the interests of private persons and firms (Carroll, 1999).

Both definitions presented above have similarities, especially toward the focus on the businessperson's role in society and how the core of a company must be built in alignment to the values and beliefs of the population in general. The most important aspect to highlight though is the fact that in Frederick's definition, the capital and human resources are important parts to the business success and should be used to the good of the general stakeholders, going against the main assumption that business's main role is to support and serve its owner's interests.

The 20th century brought new paradigms and definitions to the corporate social responsibility field, mainly after the wide-spread of information brought by the internet in 1991. The consumer base was programmed to use word of mouth to communicate with others towards products and services. Now, the internet become the platform that allows the engagement to different services and options of buying, increasing competition and consumer awareness. It is also in the nineties that the main corporate scandals start to be publicized in mass media vehicles, such as Parmalat accounting practices; Volkswagen incentives to contracts and Facebook's data leakage.

Facing legal movements against well-positioned companies also changed the way scholars and researchers approached CSR. McWilliams & Siegel (2001) presented that the matter incorporates corporate actions that lead to a social good, in addition to the law's requirements. The Two Tomorrows report from 2013 go further into the definition, stating that Corporate Social Responsibility refers to *"how businesses build their values and behaviour with the expectations and needs of stakeholders, being accountable to its stakeholders for its actions, including important issues as governance, environmental management, stakeholder engagement, labour standards, employee and community relations, social equity, responsible sourcing and human rights"*. (Beal, 2013).

Building an attractive value investment is one of the main assets for businesses that are searching to create a differentiator towards competitors and possible substitutes have. Enterprises with economic incentives will fulfil their CSR as a competitive strategy, thus gaining an economic advantage in the market (Flammer, 2015). In fact, several scholars studied the advantages of the corporate social responsibility to build a better positioning in

the customers' minds. Farmer and Hogue (1985), Kotler and Lee (2004), Killian (2012) and Beal (2013) relate the concern with society with concepts as value creation, marketing, market model's development and decision-making management.

Nevertheless, not-for-profit organisations starting to generate revenue and business owners incorporating CSR into their mission and vision values incentivized the study of a new phenomenon, the social enterprises (SE). These companies are designed and defined for several authors as hybrid organisations that unite a social driven mission, innovative resources management and profit. The understanding of the boundaries that separate social enterprises and common businesses are still unclear, however several scholars already present proposals to decrease this discussion. Going further into the simple designation of the concept, this research objective is to build more empirical data in social entrepreneurship through the study of their leaders, collecting and analysing information that collaborate to the clarification of the phenomenon, as much as to identify actions and parameters that might lead to its success or failure.

1.2. Entrepreneurs as business changers

The nature of the studies on entrepreneurs started by being involved in a mythic and fanciful landscape that insert the individual as an extraordinary model to be followed. One of the first studies on the matter trace back to 1952, when Hill analysed more than 500 successful entrepreneurs of the period to determine their entrepreneurial characteristics (Short & Dunn, 2011). This is not a coincidence, as essentially, they are often defined as people that have different approaches and behaviours from managers and other individuals (Busenitz & Barney, 1997; Dyer, Gregersen, & Christensen, 2008; Sarasvathy, 2001). In fact, some authors go further, given the entrepreneurs characteristics as hard workers, early starters, willing to be free, to take chances, to live your life (McCarthy, 2000).

The role of the entrepreneurs in the literature has raised several discussions between scholars, especially to develop an understanding of the main characteristics that will distinguish them from managers and businessman. In general, economists often look at entrepreneurs as ambivalent, irrational and passionate, which oppose the idea of the rational and logical business theories (Manfred & de Vries, 2013). In fact, management relate to the integration of all activities of the organisation, including changing behaviour, developing

employee's skills, reaching towards objectives and achieving results (Mullins, 2005), while entrepreneurship is related more specifically to the ability to perceive opportunities and to transform them in new business by a creative use of resources (Kwiatkowski, 2004).

Shane & Venkataraman (2000) present three main roles of entrepreneurship. The first role mentioned is to be a mechanism of transformation that gather human and technical resources adding value to products and services. It also reduces processes' inefficiencies to build an equilibrated marketplace. Moreover, the authors highlight innovation as the main source of change created by these actors, and consequently creating a necessary unbalance in the marketplace to force progress in the economy.

Entrepreneurship has also become a significant economic component to understand the development of businesses in the society. Globalization and the enhancement of technology across all areas requires structural changes and redistribution of resources (Yolac, 2015). Entrepreneurs are key actors in the formation of the modern economy (Gries & Naude, 2010), as their activities involve innovation, what increase competition leading also to new business models (Thurik & Wennekers, 1999). The management of innovation improves the productivity and efficiency through the optimal distribution of resources (Rabiei, 2011).

Junaid, Durrani, Mehboob-ur-Rashid, & Shaheen, (2015) present the early definitions of entrepreneurship, stating that different perspectives and fields of research bring different definitions to the concept. To economists, entrepreneurs are risk takers appropriating legitimate profits. More sociological approaches as Schumpeter (1934) are less complex and present entrepreneurial function as the creation of "new combinations" of existing resources, whether it be material, social, or symbolic. In summary, entrepreneurial activity can be considered the dynamic process of wealth creation, having the entrepreneur in its centre (Thurik & Wennekers, 1999; Bridge, O'Neill & Martin, 2009).

1.3. Relevance and research question

The research on Social Entrepreneurship is vast, although there is no consensus among researchers that allows us to build a science or definitive theory. Notwithstanding, universities and governments already have research centres in the matter worldwide (O'Connor, 2006). In fact, entrepreneurship in all its forms has become an umbrella to a wide range of concepts (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

Analysing the phenomenon as an independent field of study, there are still a lacking on the definition of the matter. For instance, Short, Moss & Lumpkin (2009) presented more than fourteen different domains where the researches on Social Entrepreneurship had been conducted, identifying accounting, education, entrepreneurship, finance, management and psychology, among others, as fields to the matter. In 2010, Dacin, Dacin & Matear had identified 37 different studies conceptualizing social enterprises, analysed through different dimensions and fields of study (Collavo, 2018).

This study is relevant for the research field and practitioners, firstly, to build more empirical research to collaborate to its definition and establishment of boundaries. Although 32 percent of social entrepreneurship articles studied by Ireland & Webb (2007) were in management journals, there are still space to discuss the role of groups as sources of success (Short et al., 2009). Studying leadership in social ventures has also did not receive considerable attention from researchers (Short et al., 2009). Dacin, Dacin & Matear (2010) state that researchers also should focus on the process of social change and structuration in field-level research. Collavo (2018) highlights the need of empirical research focusing on the practical use of denominations as 'social entrepreneurship', 'social enterprise' and 'social entrepreneurs'. These examinations reinstate that there is a large environment for empirical studies on the subject.

Moreover, the growing attention to the phenomenon has also increased the use of this denomination by several organisations around the world, incentivizing the misuse and leverage under false pretences of the denomination and even weaken the industry as an important social asset. Despite well-recognized organisations advocating to the social enterprise field development, of instance the Skoll Foundation and the Schwab Foundation, enhancing the value of the field (Cho, 2006); the delimitation of clear boundaries through the study of organisational culture is not an unanimity, especially to the community in general. In Ireland, for example, a consultation was made between 23 April and 14 May 2019 aiming to gather support in the National Social Enterprise Policy for Ireland 2019-2022, and to publicize their work to the society.

Thirdly, most researches focus on the optimistic aspect of social entrepreneurship, highlighting its innovative and entrepreneurial use of resources to sustain themselves financially (Lasprogata & Cotton, 2003), as much as address crucial social problems in their communities (Korosec & Berman, 2006). It is highlighted that these businesses combine

institutional practices that pursue financial objectives and innovation (Cho, 2006), in a process to mobilise social change (Mair & Marti, 2006). However, empirical research can demonstrate with more clarity if social enterprises culture is formed and designed differently from commercial business. Moreover, it will be possible to identify if entrepreneur and enterprise are different entities, what can contribute to the comprehension and development of new ventures based on social fulfilment.

Lastly, it is identified that there is a gap between the idea of the concept and its implementation (di Santolo, 2017). While several companies, as Speaking up (UK), Natura Co. (Brazil) and Ben & Jerrys' (US) make profit and even pay dividends to its partners, others as Malala Fund (Pakistan), Charity: water (US) and Grameen Bank (India) invest their profits back into their company. What makes both set of social enterprises successful even with different business models is important to understand the limits and processes of the industry, as much as the impact of its culture in these processes.

The statements above underline the significant relevance and necessity of developing insights of the role of the entrepreneur in social enterprises, if their decisions interfere in the delimitation of boundaries to this field, and the impact of the organisational culture in these decisions, as much as if they play an important role to build theories around the practices. Moreover, it is also important to highlight the main characteristics that leads to the success or failure of these ventures, as much as with their own society.

In conclusion to these statements, this thesis aims to present how the social entrepreneur's values and beliefs impact on the formation of the organisational culture in the venture launched by them. The main research question is *"The organisational culture of social enterprises is strictly connected to its founder's culture?"* Going further with this questioning, it is also the objectives of this research to identify the opportunities and threats, through the study of organisational culture literature, which this correlation can bring to the social enterprise's future.

Other important questions that will be in focus on this research are: what is the role of the social entrepreneur in social enterprise development? How the decisions are made and what is the participation of the team members of these ventures? What are the identified opportunities and challenges that this alignment or non-alignment presents to the future?

1.4. Thesis layout

This thesis is organised along these lines: first will be presented the literature review that aims to define the essential literature in relation to the theme presented in this research. This section includes the definition of Social Entrepreneurship and its main schools of research, as much as presenting the role of social entrepreneurs in these companies. Concepts on Organisational Culture and Identity will also be discussed. The literature review will be followed by the methodology description that demonstrates the research design and provides grounding for the qualitative and sampling methods chosen to the analysis of the outcomes proposed, as the most suitable method of analysis to address the designated topics. Subsequently, will be presented the research findings that will underlying patterns or themes and key findings that were derived from the interviews will be presented, as much as its connections with the literature review presented. Finally, the discussion section presents new perceptions on reorganising the research findings into new approaches on how social entrepreneurs can impact social enterprises' culture and identity. Conveyed will also be, opportunities and challenges that might impact these business' future. Additionally, the conclusion, limitations, and suggestions for future research are provided.

2. Literature review

2.1. Social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs

2.1.1. Building business through social problems

Governments, non-profit organisations and private companies socially responsible have a significant role to the society, but innovation and business models' development contributed to the creation of hybrid companies that unite social values and for-profit designs. The first citation of the term Social Enterprises was published in a Yale Law Review, when an article discussed the role of entrepreneurs and questioning if all entrepreneurs are social entrepreneurs (Di, Santolo, 2017). It is important to observe that the first studies in the matter focused basically on the entrepreneur as the main source to generate social enterprises, as in Waddock & Post (1991) that defined social entrepreneurship as private individuals bringing social changes to the public sector agenda. In the same year, Roberts & King (1991) suggested that it was important to pay attention in entrepreneurial individuals who create and develop new ideas into practice, even if they are not being part of formal government positions.

However, the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship still lacks a clarified definition is in the core of the majority studies in the matter since it was first published (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010; Mair & Marti, 2005; Peredo & McLean, 2005; Cho, 2006). The main reason for that might relies on the fact that both social and entrepreneurial concepts are, for themselves, complex and heterogeneous; been applied in several different areas with distinct emphasis and playing different roles alongside the theoretical approach that is being followed. A universal agreement towards this definition is still unknown (Kraus, Filser, O'Dwyer & Shaw, 2014; Seelos & Mair, 2005) as much as the delimited boundaries and dimensions that would allow its analysis (Mair & Marti, 2005; Perrini, 2006).

The most accepted definition of the term social to the business perspective comes from the sociology area and can also be called *social value*, defined as the contribution to the welfare in a given human community (Peredo & McLean, 2005). In this sense it has been argued that social entrepreneurship starts with the foundation of social purpose enterprises (Wallace, 1999), made by businesspersons whose new ideas are focused at long-term social transformation (Hartigan, 2006). There is no social enterprise if the commercial profit is more

important that the mission value. On the other hand, the concept of profit can be unthinkable for many authors, such as Lasprogata & Cotton (2003), who say social entrepreneurship are non-profit organisations which use innovative strategies to create new financial strategies that will build sustainability while working based on their social mission.

On the other side of the SE concept it is a word that has been used as trendy for the majority of the new companies nowadays. According to Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern (2006) there are three groups of authors with different approaches to the study of entrepreneurship. The first will focus on the managerial aspects of the entrepreneurship, presenting research on how to foster innovation, venture capital and predictions of entrepreneurial success, such as Quinn & Cameron (1983). The second rely on the causes and results of the entrepreneurship, for instance in Schumpeter. Thirdly, the role of the entrepreneur as a bold and risk-taker figure that decides undertake business is also an object of study, as Collins & Moore (1964). However, social entrepreneurship distinguished itself from other types of Entrepreneurship, and can be defined as *“an actor who applies business principles to solving social problems”* (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010).

Mair & Marti (2005) distinguish three sets of schools that have different focuses on the matter. One group refers to SE not-for-profit initiatives that build innovative funding strategies, as Austin, et al. (2003) and Boschee (1998). A second group of researchers link it to corporate social responsibility, defining as the commercial business engaged in cross-sector partnership to fill their social missions, for instance Sagawa & Segal (2000) and Waddock (1991). And the last group defines social entrepreneurship as tools to catalyse social transformation in the society, as in Alvord, Brown & Letts (2004). The three approaches on the matter focus on different central points to differentiate social enterprises from other types of entrepreneurship: resources, sector and mission.

Focusing on the environmental sector as the main feature to define a social enterprise is problematic as several case studies already present companies in the not-for-profit as much in the for-profit sector that can be considered social enterprises. In fact, the choice for not-for-profit or for-profit business model depends more on the business model developed by the company than to their denomination (Mair & Marti, 2005). Wallace (1999) also have argued that organisations in this area aim to achieve the establishment of social purpose and trade, what also characterize other commercial establishments. However, SE will reinvest the profits

turned to a greater good (Mort, Weerawardena & Carnegie, 2003). Moreover, by law social enterprises can take any form in several countries (Bacq & Janssen, 2011).

Going further in the concept, it is stated that businessmen that choose launch social enterprises are driven firstly by a philanthropic mission and the objective of developing socially their community, also building a value competition towards their competitors through virtuous behaviour (Mort, Weerawardena & Carnegie, 2003). Several scholars argued that the main purpose of these entrepreneurs remains on the value creation for their clients, and SE prevail in the priority given to social achievement, placing economic wealth creation to a minor objective (Venkataraman, 1997; Dess, 1998; Mort, et al., 2003; Mair & Marti, 2006). However, a mission driven as the reason to the creation of the SE sector is also questioned by other authors. Following on from Mair and Marti (2005), although the base of these organisations is ethical and moral responsibility, their development can also include less altruistic motivations, such as personal fulfilment.

Moreover, the focus on social mission concept makes it difficult to differentiate SE from other fields of study, such as philanthropy and corporate social responsibility. In fact, authors as Austin, et al., (2003), Boschee (1998) and Dees, Emerson & Economy, (2002) defend the concept as located in the spectrum of not-for-profit organisations; that focus its efforts exclusively to achieve social goals. Nevertheless, social entrepreneurship can also occur in an established organisation, phenomena called 'social intrapreneurship' (Mair & Marti, 2006).

Finally, the use of the resources as the core of social enterprise definition also raise interesting discussions. There are examples of companies, such as Greyston Bakery, a high-end bakery that address homelessness (Boschee, 1998) and the Grameen Bank, a microcredit lending agency that extends loans to poor citizens (Peredo & McLean, 2006) that reinforce the importance of innovations used to solve social problems while generating steady revenue (Perrini & Fazzolari, 2006; Robinson, 2006; Thompson & MacMillan, 2006). According to Dacin, Dacin & Matear (2010), the origin and complexity of the social issues these ventures address incentivize innovative approaches to management, especially in more developed areas due to the constraints of professional and legal institutions, as government health-care policies, lobbying groups, and building and infrastructure codes.

Dess also supports the entrepreneurial nature of social entrepreneurship as one of the core objects to be taken into consideration when defining the matter. The author includes the *"recognition and 'relentless' pursuit of new opportunities to further the mission of creating*

social value, the continuous engagement in innovation and modification, and the bold action undertaken without acceptance of existing resource limitations” (Dess, 1998). There are several examples of social enterprises that mobilize resources in a different way of traditional businesses, building competitive barriers. Social entrepreneurs are more willing to use resources in a coordinate manner, often sharing this models with other companies, such as Aravind Eye Clinic, which established a program to teach people its techniques (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010).

However, the most accepted definitions unify these concepts to delimitate a more universal representation for the phenomenon. Austin, et al. (2006) interpret SE as a set of innovative activities that have as main objective the creation of social value despite the sector the enterprise fits. It is also highlight four ‘elements’ that entrepreneurs building SEs have to manage: human resources, environment, the deal, and the opportunity. In this context, external resource can become constraints, such as taxation, legislation and social infrastructures (Zahra, et al., 2009).

Several organisations also build a combined definition to the matter, as setting the main object of social entrepreneurship as the change on the citizen sector through the more efficient and innovative use of resources and the mission of pursuing an unjust balance (Ashoka United States, 2015). In addition, according to the European Union, a social enterprise must be a mechanism to incentivise the population’s participation in the management of businesses, fostering new opportunities to poor countries and marginalized citizens (Defourny & Nyssens, 2012; Collavo, 2017).

Contributing to the aim of this paper, it will be used the definitions that focuses on a mission driven to the social value creation aligned with innovative processes and resources, allowing a deeper examination of the activities. Through this, organisations achieve their specific goals and results (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010; Peredo & McLean, 2006; Seelos & Mair, 2005; Mort, et al., 2003; Mair & Marti, 2006; Waddock & Post, 1991).

2.1.2. Boundaries of social entrepreneurship

The main challenge of scholars interested in the social entrepreneurship research is to define what makes a social enterprise different from private companies with a strong social responsibility and also from non-profit organisations. According to Dacin, Dacin and Matear

(2010) various definitions of social entrepreneurship can also be applied to other forms of entrepreneurship. Mair (2006) also states that successful enterprises can achieve some kind of social impact - directly or indirectly - which makes the concept even more challenging to differentiate.

Some authors, as Austin, et al. (2006), Weerawardena & Mort (2006) and Murphy & Coombes (2009) defend that SE's mission driven model and its challenges of launching and development are different enough to other institutions to justify the formation of a different field of research. It is also suggested that social enterprises blur boundaries among the public, private and non-profit sector, they are more willing to stand as hybrid models that unify the three (Johnsson, 2000).

There are some differences between social and commercial entrepreneurship that might collaborate to clarify conceptual boundaries, including: *“(1) opportunity differences due to market failure; (2) mission differences resulting in differences in management, motivation, and tension between social and commercial activity; (3) different approaches in managing financial and human resources; (4) performance measurement in social ventures that complicates accountability and stakeholder relations”* (Austin, et al., 2006).

However, the most accepted boundaries to define the distinctiveness of social enterprises were presented by Peredo & McLean (2005). The authors present five main characteristics to the validation of a SE: (1) the aim to address social issues; (2) the ability to recognise and take advantage of new opportunities; (3) the employment of innovation in creation or distribution of social values; (4) compliance with above-average degrees of risk and; (5) be unusually resourceful. These characteristics may have greater or lesser degree depending on the organisation (Peredo & McLean, 2005).

The main highlighted points in these two presentations are their innovation, social change and sustainability (Xiaoti, Frank & Cohen, 2011). Towards innovation, for social entrepreneurship it should permeate the whole process, from the identification of social needs and the recognition of socially entrepreneurial opportunities at the very beginning of the process until the management and business model structuration (Perrini, 2006). Also, sustainability is vital for the survival of social enterprises in the long-term (Weerawardena & Mort, 2006).

Maybe the most contested factor to build boundaries in SE's studies is the social impact measurement, especially regarding the significance of the impact made. The

entrepreneurship approach limits the scale of social change to achieving “fundamental” social changes (Xiaoti, et al., 2011). However, the measurement of these changes are still basic and challenging (Grieco, Michelini, and Iasevoli 2015; Porter, Sachs & McArthur, 2002). Most importantly, Mass & Grieco (2017) identified through the analysis of more than three thousand participants surveyed in the GEM report of 2009, that although SEs target are known as social catalysers, little is known about their actual success in creating impact (Mass & Grieco, 2017).

2.1.3. The role of the entrepreneur in social enterprises

Several scholars approach the role of the entrepreneur to the effectiveness and efficiency of a business. In fact, although the concept of social enterprise relies on several different variables, such as the environment, use of resources, mission and vision focus and innovativeness in approach social problems, there are also links that employ the importance of the decision-making process toward the venture’s outcomes achievement. Zahra, et al. (2009) state that social enterprises are the unification of activities and processes ventured to develop social wealth by the creation of new ventures or managing existing organisations in an innovative matter. Drayton (2002) also sets social entrepreneurs as practical visionaries having entrepreneurial talent and committed to social change.

Although the alignment of the social entrepreneur as the main actor in the social entrepreneurship phenomenon build significant limitations to the understanding of the concept, it is important to recognise that the managerial practices implemented by these businesspersons are crucial not only in the creation of the organisations, but also in its development and growth. The process of how an opportunity can be recognised and developed, control over the resources and management of the network of resources are all crucial to the survival of these ventures (Stevenson, 1985; Stevenson & Jarillo, 1991). Moreover, commercial entrepreneurship tends to focus on new found needs while social needs often focuses on serving basic needs (Austin, et al., 2012) - what makes their decision-making different in its core.

In addition, Dart (2004) proposes the idea that SEs are bound for the concept of legitimacy rather than efficiency or effectiveness as primary organisational goals. This concept proposes legitimacy as an institutional mind-set that follows the management conform to social

expectations, more than the administrative effectiveness of the business. The aim of achieving social expectations surpasses the ordinary management practise. The external context becomes crucial to their outcome’s accomplishments, changing the way organisations interact with the environment (Austin et. al., 2012). Table 1, as shown below, maps the main distinction between social and commercial entrepreneurship based on Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern.

Variables	Commercial Entrepreneurship	Social Entrepreneurship
Opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on the economic return; • Entrepreneurs seeking breakthrough solutions and new needs • The opportunity must have large market size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on social return • Entrepreneurs seeking to serve basic and longstanding needs • The opportunity must have a recognized social need demand or market failure
Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less successful in inhospitable contexts • More impacted by operational contexts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More successful in inhospitable contexts • Less impacted by operational contexts
People and resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More opportunities to resource mobilisation • Incentivized by governments and private institutions (banks) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increased difficulty on resource mobilisation • More reliant on individual contributions
Deals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on financial returns, that are easily measured • Discretion to use capital 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes measurement are more difficult • Limitation on timing and flexibility to use capital

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of service/product focus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different stakeholders with discrepant goals
--	--	--

Table 1

The table above offers a perspective on the main differences between the two types of enterprises, highlighting the importance of the different actors from inside and outside the organisation, especially if the venture has a dual-identity (commercial and social) as many hybrid organisations present nowadays (Albert & Whetten 1985). Outside the organisation, the SE pursuing social goals must prove economic and social legitimacy to various stakeholders, which also hold different expectations (Battilana, 2018). Furthermore, the approaches can differ also if considering the geographical regions and local cultures (Barbosa, Moraes & Romani-Dias, 2017), as much as legislation (Battilana, 2018). The management capacity of the entrepreneur and the venture team members are crucial to deal with these challenges.

Although the understanding of a social enterprise is strictly related to the success or failure of these ventures, there is still a lack of research presenting the main characteristics of management in social ventures, and how these decisions differ from normal business. Yunhe & Smith (2014) produced a seminar paper presenting the challenges and skills of entrepreneurial leadership, stating that inconsistent demands, shifting boundaries, complex relationships and identity issues must be addressed by these entrepreneurs aiming to achieve success. Mass & Grieco (2017) also manifested a study analysing the social impact published for several enterprises worldwide to define a better measurement tool focusing on the social impact and innovativeness.

Overall, the main research on the subject still focuses on the entrepreneurial skills to define links between personality traits and skills to enterprise performance. For instance, Parrish (2010) engaged in an empirical study to investigate the organisational design necessary for sustainability-driven entrepreneurs achieving their goals. Corner & Ho (2010) studied opportunity identification in SE literature and related this phenomenon to the environmental-awareness of its practitioners. Liang, Peng, Yao & Liang (2015) built a model to analyse how interpersonal skills can impact SEs performance and finally Wronka-Pospiech (2016) also identified several skills which are crucial to effective management in social enterprises.

Regarding the management styles and skills to develop a social enterprise, Muller, Chambers & Neck (2013) identified seven different social entrepreneur's skills which are crucial to the development of a SE. First, building and administering complex relationships with numerous stakeholders; as much as mapping and articulating social impact. The author also highlights the development of financial strategies that supports the venture's social mission. In consonance with these authors, Wronka-Pospiech (2016) additionally identified the conflict resolution skills, creative use of minimal resources and ability to communicate with customers, suppliers and other stakeholders as crucial competences of social entrepreneurs. Despite unquestionable contributions to the social entrepreneurship research field, there is not a clear hypothesis or guideline on how these skills and competences contribute to the management practices on social ventures. Indeed, there is also a gap on research to define principles of management and resource assessments that might contribute to a model focused on the restrict characteristics of these businesses.

2.2. Organisational culture and identity

2.2.1. Defining organisational culture

Planning and development are important aspects of the organisation's decision-making processes. As a matter of fact, one of the first challenges of any company is to set a mission, a vision, goals and objectives that will guide its future actions. Strategic planning involves the development of goals, and the strategy to employ the resources available to their achievement (King & Cleland, 1978). The formulation of feasible and immediate goals moves an organisation to decide on a selection of specific actions to achieve these outcomes. (Steiss, 2003). The concept also can be defined as a systematic approach that provides a unifying basis to the organisation development over a determinant period of time (Scott, 1977).

The development of strategic planning contributes significantly with the decision-making characteristics of a business, as this process is carried out to determine how decisions are made in organisations, what causes failure and how to avoid these to build a successful organisation (Nutt, 1999). Moreover, the strategic mind-set of the institution also collaborates to define the most important milestones to be achieved, guiding decision-making

process to act as a tool to achieve results and to avoid failures and the building of an organisational culture is a crucial part for the development of these objectives.

Organisational Culture is a general concept with several distinct definitions. It is also challenging to be explained and underlined precisely by scholars (Mullins & Christy, 2010). The main discussion about culture in organisations has developed from anthropology and raised interest among organisational behaviour's students in the early 1980s (Griffin & Moorhead, 2009). The origin of culture as an independent variable that affects stakeholders' attitudes towards a business can be traced more than fifty years ago with the concept of institutionalisation (Robbins, Judge & Campbell, 2009).

While several authors state that there is no consensus on the impact and boundaries of culture on working organisations (Smircich, 1983; Schein, 1985; Griffin & Moorhead, 2009; Mullins & Christy, 2010), there are some definitions that are highly accepted by the scholars. Schein (1990) defines the concept as a pattern of invented, learned and developed assumptions shared into the group to explain its existence and solved its problems, and because of its consistency, transmitted to new members as the appropriate way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to the organisation. Following the same perspective, Atkinson (2006) explains organisational culture the main shared beliefs created to explain how work is performed, the acceptable and not acceptable actions in that group; and which are the encouraged and discouraged behaviours.

The perception of organisational behaviour also brings important factors to the study of the phenomenon. Ouchi (1981) states that organisational culture incorporates tools that communicate these values and beliefs to new members of the group. This set is formed by symbols, ceremonies and myths, such as stories, legends, symbols, slogans and histories shared by its members (Peters & Waterman, 1982).

Some variables are brought by this concept to the practitioners is also wide. Cartwright (1999) sees this culture as a tool for the management authority. Accepted cultural beliefs and values increase the power of management, as employees build identification and a belonging sense with the organisation, accepting its rules and working to achieve the organisation's objectives. Schein (1985) also suggests a view of organisational culture based on distinguishing three levels: the artefacts, which are the most visible level of the culture and relates to the constructed physical and social environment (as the environment and technology); the espoused values, that reflect someone's original values (including values and beliefs); and

basic underlying assumptions that relates to the repeatedly behaviours and actions that are unconsciously held learned responses, guiding future behaviour.

Although in its historical foundations, organisational culture is related basically to the behaviour of the employees towards the organisations in which they are involved with, modern research also suggests that its influences go way further human resources management. Firstly, in a strategic management view, it can affect processes, such as communication, conflict management, decision making and productivity (Mullins & Christy, 2010). These factors also can impact economic dimension of business efficiency and innovation (Griffin & Moorhead, 2010). Indeed, in previous research is also been tested the impact of culture on firm innovation (Naranjo-Valencia, Jiménez, & Sanz-Valle, 2011).

Peters & Waterman (1982) developed a framework to relate aspects of culture that are related to successful institutions in the United States. Among the eight points presented by the authors, it is important to highlight the proximity with customers, hands-on management, autonomy and entrepreneurship, and a bias for action. The authors' approach not only exemplifies applicable values that could be replicated by organisations, it also correlates several distinct parts of the company - from decision-making to resources management - that could contribute to the achievement of long-term outcomes.

2.2.2. The importance of organisational culture

The nature and history of businesses are built through the main footprint that characteristics of the association and its culture impress in its behaviour. The application of these organisational behaviours and their effective management are dependent and also transmit the main objectives and actions that these companies are willing to perform to its stakeholders (Mullins & Christy, 2010). The culture defines the boundaries to define one organisation to another (Robins, Judge & Campbell, 2009). It also serves as a control system that influences the behaviour and attitudes enabling to recognise the company as an individual. The institutionalisation of culture will have a significant impression on the company's processes such as management, motivation, decision-making, group behaviour, design of structure, as much as in the definition of outcomes and measurement tools (Mullins, 2005).

It is also related to culture the successful innovation, merge and acquisitions, technology implementation and team effectiveness (Reigle, 2001). Heller (1997) also highlights that culture is not accidentally built, and that culturally strong companies are linked to good performance. One of the main reasons for that might rely on the relation between culture and innovation, as innovative behaviour shared among the members of an organisation can lead to the incorporation of this value in the organisation's core, fostering commitment to it (Hartmann, 2006).

Chatman & Cha (2002) suggest that culture can arise spontaneously, existing in every company even without planning or strategy performed, however, long-term performance depends on the development of suitable culture, that must present some specific characteristics: *"it must be strategically relevant; it needs to be strong in order that people care about what is important; and the culture must have an intrinsic ability to adapt to changing circumstances"* (Chatman & Cha, 2002). This also highlights the culture as a liability. The values adopted by a company might not always relate to the environment inserted in, making the organisation resistant to changes (Sorensen, 2002). Another important point is that culture also can build barriers to diversity. Limiting the range of values and beliefs can effectively eliminate the strengths that people from different backgrounds bring to the organisation (Robbins, Judge & Campbell, 2009).

Overall, Allaire & Firsirotu (1984) present three schools of thought can be identified to better understanding of culture in organisations: cognitive, structuralism and mutual equivalence. For all of them, culture is a concept built in the mind of culture-bearers as a system of knowledge and learning standards for believing, evaluating and acting (Allaire & Firsirotu, 1984). It is also possible to evaluate organisational culture from two different perspectives: what an organisation has and what an organisation is (Ercuji, 2009). The first point of view is related to the managerial aspect of the organisation culture and behaviour, while the second is more focus on an anthropological understanding of the business as an entity, built with its individual characteristics and objectives. Both ways of thinking relate the concept of organisational culture to the idea of that which is 'common' or 'shared', building what can be called the organisational identity (Kirwin, 2000).

2.2.3. What an organisation is

The studies of culture in organisational management in the literature usually has similarities with the understanding of group identity (Ercuji, 2009). However, identity is one of the most complex and disagreeable subjects among scholars. The nature of identity and the definition of clear processes that define its creation, reproduction and transformation, especially in a global environment, have been extremely challenging to define. In fact, the advent of globalisation is creating a wider arena where the process of identity formation in companies are reflecting the interaction between local practices and the dynamics of global positioning (Lewellen, 2002).

To the comprehension of 'organisational identity' it is important to focus on the contextual aspect. Although the culture created by the group is the core of their identity, relationships between the group and the environment they are in are also significant factors to the organisation. Society can interfere on the homogeneity and stability of the culture in the group (Ercuji, 2009). Some scholars of the institutional tradition, as Friedland & Alford (1991) and Selznick (1957), relate this phenomenon with the role of individuals and organizations as social actors, impacting on its continuity, coherence, and distinctiveness (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Whetten & Mackey, 2002). *"These scholars perceive identity as the characteristics and processes that enable social actors to satisfy their inherent needs to be the same yesterday, today and tomorrow and to be unique actors or entities"* (Whetten & Mackey, 2002). In this context, it is possible to understand these actors as organisations.

Following the concept that the context influences the organisational culture, common cultural practices, icons and behaviours can be considered symbols of identity, building mutual and shared arrangements in the organisation processes (Kirwin, 2000). These symbols are created through the practices and experiences brought from the individual's in the group, being also modified and reinforced by their interactional context (Schein, 1990). Organisations that have a cultural identity create awareness and engagement among its workers by emphasising that there are values distinguishing them from others (Schein, 1985; Schein, 1990; Robbins, Judge & Campbell, 2009). From this perspective, it is important to highlight that cultural identity is not created through the self-perception of its participants and communicated to and among others, but is also consistent of the social responses and interactions performed by them (Whetten & Mackey, 2002).

Another main challenge in establishing the concept of corporate identity is the understanding that individuals living as parts of heterogeneous societies may have multiple identities, each of them related to different interactional contexts (Hannerz, 1990; Whetten & Mackey, 2002). According to Ravazi & Shultz (2006) there is a tendency towards homogenisation and standardisation supporting some functionalist views of establishments that limits shared values as the essence of organisational culture. Moreover, there are some assumptions that the society is facing a “crisis of community” (Hargreaves, 2003) that forces organisations to adopt the role of regenerating this community, providing a degree of certainty to the society through their common vision, mission, purpose, to which everybody within the business should be committed (Smircich, 1983).

For the aim of these research, it will be considered that identity is formed by two components: tangible and intangible assets. Tangibles relates to the external artefacts, such as name, symbols, rites and rituals and intangibles relates to the relationships, beliefs and values that exists through individual perception in relation to the organisation (Kirwin, 2000). These build the idea that organisations have their own characteristics but are also highly influenced by external factors, as employees and community in general.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design justification

To approach the main research questions and derivative questions it was chosen qualitative research methods, through the performance of in-depth interview and content analysis, as table 2 presented below.

Main research question	The organisational culture of social enterprises is strictly connected to its founder’s culture?
Sub-question 1	What is the role of the social entrepreneur in social enterprise development?

Sub-question 2	What are the identified opportunities and threats that this alignment or non-alignment presents to the future?
Sub-question 3	Could the detachment of social entrepreneur and social enterprise result in the organisation failure?

Table 2

In order to answer the defined questions, six social entrepreneurs were interviewed forming the research sample for this Master’s thesis. The social entrepreneurs contacted had built social enterprises on several fields in Dublin and also integrates the list of the Social Enterprise Awards, first established in 2015 to increase awareness of and support important SEs that present significant impact to the country. The profile of these entrepreneurs is provided in the table below (see table 3).

ID	INTERVIEWER	JOB POSITION	LOCATION
SE1	Male Social Entrepreneur	CEO/Founder	Dublin
SE2	Female Social Entrepreneur	CEO/Founder	Waterford
SE3	Male Social Entrepreneur	General Manager/Founder	Dublin
SE4	Male Social Entrepreneur	CEO/Founder	Dublin
SE5	Male Social Entrepreneur	Development Manager/Founder	Nationwide
SE6	Female Social Entrepreneur	CEO/Founder	Meath

Table 3

Research based on qualitative data offer insights that challenge theories and propose new directions to well-known subjects. According to Bansal, Smith and Vaara (2018), different from quantitative research, where the numeric data achieved is easiest manipulated to be transformed into efficient in detriment of the research made; qualitative data is non-

reducible text that demands interpretation of the information collected, aiming to determine patterns and insights. Qualitative investigations also often manipulate the environment and the informants to a less intrusive degree (Walle, 2015).

The main advantages of this type of analysis are presented from different authors. Shaw, Bansal, Smith, & Vaara (2018), state that qualitative research offers critical tools that breakthrough editorial team's ambitions to build new ways of seeing. It is also emphasised that the ability of 'study phenomena' is one of the main abilities of this field (Silverman, 2011). Through qualitative methods is also possible to understand the reasons why a behaviour or action occurs and its impacts while also analysing organisational development through practises (Sofaer, 1999). Furthermore, this method is able to investigate a study through a holistic description, although this description is unstructured, non-numeric and contextual (Gras, Moss & Lumpkin, 2014).

Aiming to deepen the analysis on social enterprises, presenting different approaches to the development of this type of businesses, this work intends to seek patterns on the existence of distinguishing characteristics between the social entrepreneur founder and the organisation as a single entity. Through this questioning, it is also an object of study to underline if it is possible to separate the figure of the individual to the organisation, or if the existence of the social enterprise is indivisible and only possible to exist due the figure of its founder. In this case, theorisation based on qualitative data are more appropriate to understand empirical contexts and complex environments. Additionally, a study conducted by Lee, Battilana & Wang (2014) presents that the qualitative data collection method used more frequently in social entrepreneurship research are in-depth interviews and content analysis, that permit the better understanding of the research field.

It is also possible to label this thesis as a process study. *"This genre explores change, emergence, adaptation, and transformation"* (Bansal, Smith & Vaara, 2018). The main objective of these studies is to analyse structural features of entities and identify the characteristics or factors that lead to outcomes, expected or not. The first identified process studies presented how entities changed from one-time period to the next.

3.2. In-depth interviews

In contrast to surveys, that have standardised question, in-depth interviews are conducted to a fewer quantity of subjects in a much more intimate, tailored, and detailed manner (Walle, 2015). Questions tend to be open-ended, giving the interviewee more freedom in their answers. It also allows flexibility to uncover implicit meanings (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). An in-depth interview also tends to be semi-structured, that can be defined as containing an organised and predetermined open-ended question, with possibility to implement more questions that address issues arising from the dialogue between the participants. (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006).

The main objective to the use of in-depth interviews is the search for rich and complex responses to the study. The possibility of adapting the questionnaire enhance the formation of questions that the interviewer is not able to anticipate (Dillman, 1991). It is also possible to avoid or postpone sensitive questions that might cause discomfort or inhibit future responses (Walle, 2015). The flow of the interview is controlled by the fieldworker in order to gather certain information (Drever, 1997). In addition, depending on the results obtained in the course of the interview the research can also modify the questions to explore more significant issues as they arise (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006).

For the aim of this research, in-depth and semi-structured interviews were chosen to better understand the entrepreneur main characteristics and then connected them to the company main characteristics, without lead the interviewee to present any conclusion about the survival of his/her enterprise. In addition, it is important to identify through the answers the main activities performed by the individual and other members of the company to gather conclusions to this study.

3.2.1. Sampling method and sample

In-depth interviews are typically conducted with small but specialised samples that were not chosen randomly (Walle, 2015). According to Morse (1994) these qualitative research requires a minimum of six interviewees, what Creswell (2013) delimited to a range between five and 25 participants. Corporate leaders who play an important role in their fields are often source of data due to their strong reputations and known expertise (Walle, 2015). Observing

research on social entrepreneurship, it is possible to find studies with this samples, as in Lee, Battilana & Wang (2004) and Weerawardena and Mort (2006).

Based on these studies, this thesis will use a similar sampling. After research on the winners of Social Enterprise Awards Dublin and identify the companies still relevant in business, these entrepreneurs were randomly contacted to be participants in this research. The sample consisted of six social entrepreneurs who had their still active business contemplated by the award in the last four years. The social enterprises studied perform in several geographical regions of the Irish capital, Dublin and have between three and ten years of existence. They also approach different social issues, as homelessness, education, rural development, learning improvement and immigrant support. Regarding the organisational characteristics, the majority were established between 2010 and 2016 and ranged from employing one to 150 workers.

3.2.2. Procedure

Aiming to collect the best information through the social entrepreneur's interviewed, an interview guide containing nineteen question was designed to guide the data collection process. All the questions are open-ended, not allowing answers as yes or no, and incentivise discussion about the participant's views and opinions (Creswell, 2013). The interview guide is divided in four groups: entrepreneurial background, social entrepreneurship focus, enterprise background and future suppositions. Every parcel of the research aimed to develop topics considered essential to the advancement of insights that can contribute to the conceptual framework. The corresponding semi structured guide used is provided in the appendix (see Appendix I).

The data collection was realized by conducting face-to-face or phone call interviews, each session starting with a general introduction to the main goals and researches expected outcomes. Following, it was request for permission to record the interview session, and also presented or forwarded the authorization form to be signed. In the interview closure, each participant was asked whether there was any additional information about the questions made that the interviewee would like to provide or any modifications to be made and it was then informed that the researcher might contact him/her again if necessary.

3.3. Data analysis

The process of developing new hypotheses and theories in the study of businesses' environments makes the process of data analysis crucial to any research. Firstly, data analysis does not happen (or should not happen) only in the conclusion of the research process, but during the entire process of gathering data (Silverman, 2005), what makes the study more complex and mutable. Secondly, although the choice of the research analysis method can change the first assumptions the scholar has, leading the study to different and not related outcomes (Silverman, 2005).

Aiming to develop new theories to the study of social entrepreneurship, instead of proceed conversation or discourse analysis, this thesis will be analysed through the Grounded Theory Analysis (GTA), method that was created by the sociologists Glaser and Strauss in 1965 (Charmaz, 2010). *“Grounded theory can be defined as the progressive identification and integration of categories of meaning from data, providing an explanatory framework with which to understand the phenomenon under investigation”* (Glaser & Strauss, 1965; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The process of categorizing a phenomena outcome in a theoretical understanding of the context and behaviour in the studied sector, validating or building new theories to the field (Charmaz, 2010).

Although there is no consensus in a single approach to the GTA even between the two founders of the concept, there are three strong perspectives in the method that might be used in different kinds of research. Glaser kept its perspective close to the original theory, with flexibility in data analysis and focuses in particular on the development of new theories. Strauss & Corbin (1990), however, created a new framework focuses on not only induction but also deduction and verification. On the other hand, the modern researcher Kathy Charmaz (2010) developed a new overview in the subject, integrating GTA with a constructivist perspective.

This paper will be based on the original approach developed by Strauss and Corbin, however, with necessary adjustments to the development of a more sustainable outcome. Firstly, the researcher will explore the collected data through an initial open coding, establishing linkages between categories. The semi-structured interviews proceed by the researcher will be crossed between themselves and with the main definitions of the social entrepreneurship phenomena to progressively verify current assumptions towards the connection between

social enterprises and social entrepreneurs. However, the development of new theories will still have been considered by the paper after the analysis of the data gathered.

The main reason to the use of this method is to create linkages among the entrepreneur and the social enterprise as two different individuals, building coding groups that are most presented in the experience of the interviewees and their businesses. Through this codes, will be made smaller unit of analysis, merging categories and highlighting the most important assumptions emerged in the analysis of primary (interviews) and secondary data (studies and literature review), aiming to answer the sub-questions presented in this work and concluding in the validity of the main hypotheses.

3.4. Ethical Considerations

It is the role of every researcher to protect all aspects of ethics and guarantee that information gathered is protected and respected. Overall, aspects as privacy, confidentiality and safety must be considered when proceed the data selection, sample and collection; as much as in its analysis and publication. According to Saunders et al. (2009), scholars need to manifest appropriate behaviour in all stages of the research which entail respect with the rights of the interviewees or other individuals that might be affected by that research. In this research the following aspects of ethics were taken into consideration and no ethical issues were identified.

Data collection was based on one to one interviews performed in person and through phone calls for this research purpose only, presenting the interviewees the objectives of this work in an objective and clear way. Prior to the interview each participant received information in regards to the research's objectives and procedures, as much as provide permission to record, transcribe and use the information provided signing the consent form, presented in the Appendix II. The consent form explained the rights of the participant as well as the purpose and method of this research. When asked in the end of the interview, all participants confirmed they felt comfortable and were satisfied with the process on completion of the interview. The publication of the interviewee's identification was authorized and chosen for not present sensitive information that could harm the participants.

4. Findings and discussions

4.1. Data presentation

To the aim of this study, six social entrepreneurs that fund and still keep current roles inside their social enterprises, based on the criteria of selection presented in the section 3.2.1, were interviewed. Due its qualitative characteristics and time constraints, it was judge appropriate to maintain the sample of interviewees below seven, although 25 companies were contact in the course of the study, aiming to analyse deeply the content provided by these entrepreneurs and to present more qualified outcomes.

The business studied were founded between 2010 and 2016, been recognised by the Social Enterprises Ireland Award as examples of successful models of SE in Ireland. Most of the business studied are based in Dublin, with the exception of one based in Waterford, one based in Meath and one with nationwide range. Regarding the interviewees, 75% is male – what reflect a reality of the business, as from the 25 founders contacted, only 30% are female. All of them have second-level education. The entrepreneurs were aged between 30 and 50.

4.2. Research findings

This section presents the analyses of the findings in accordance with the research question, which attempt to identify if the organisational culture in social enterprises are strictly connected to its founder's culture, and in which extent this can affect these organisations longevity. To be able to build hypothesis and theories in this theme, the grounded theory was used to pinpoint the main characteristics these entrepreneurs and their business share, identifying patterns that will lead to the answers to the main questions presented.

In the first stage of the analysis, it was proceeded a substantive coding linked to the main interest areas: culture, entrepreneur's role, decision-making and leadership. One of the main reasons to use coding in the classic grounded theory is to create abstract concepts, aligned with human thinking (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Identifying the main codes in each interview it was possible to unify similar concepts, with selective coding. This concepts unification allowed the researcher to identify opposite characteristics in each interested area approached.

Aiming to clarify the secondary questions presented and build a panorama to present a theory to the main research question, the findings will be approached from three perspectives: entrepreneur's role, entrepreneur's impact strategic processes and entrepreneur's impact on culture. The understanding of the correlation between social entrepreneur's culture and organisation's culture will be explored before all else, alongside with opportunities and threats of this alignment or non-alignment.

4.2.1. Entrepreneur's role in social enterprises

Determining the role of the founder in a business can be done by analysing their bargain power, participation and decision-making in the company, especially in traditional business with clear hierarchies and structures. However, social enterprises are unique organisations that not always have a well-structured basis of analysis. Following the SE2, *"As we have a team basically formed by volunteers, we seek to get together to transmit the core of the company and to the partners and stakeholders. So we focus on perform a lot of activities (really numerous), especially to get to know each other"*.

In the analysis of this research, it was identified four main concepts that were coded as essential to define the role of the entrepreneur in the company, according to the interviewee's answers: "development of the mission and vision", "manage the company's processes and outcomes", "act as the face of the company" and "development of the team members". The ideas presented in the role of the entrepreneurs in their business can be delimit in two main roles with their own characteristics, weaknesses and strengths: the entrepreneur as the **leader** and the entrepreneur as the **mentor**. Although some social entrepreneurs seems to share characteristics from the both sides, the majority of the speech analysed will approach more one or another roles.

Both of spheres have their own characteristics which contribute to this research. The *mentorship* aspect more clearly separates the figure of the enterprise and the entrepreneur, creating well-defined barriers between individual's interests and organisation's interests. In fact, in the social enterprises studied, mentors present more analytical characteristics, as *management of resources, management of staff, strategy building and maintenance of processes*, integrating the several components composing the SE, as management, staff, community and board. For instance, SE1 states that *"we (company) work towards be as*

egalitarian as possible, show that everybody's voice matters, so we have monthly staff meetings to improve our operations". According to the SE3, "We have weekly meetings that allow us to analyse the financial and operational processes, to see what has been done this week that have to change to the next one".

Another important component of the mentorship style is that, although the interviewees were the founders of the company, they highlight mostly their role as managers and workers, emphasizing their participation in the daily basis of the venture: *"I am the hand job man, so everything that gets broken, they come to me to fix it" (SE1)*. Or even, as proposed by SE5, *"We are only representatives of our volunteers and partners. They are actively doing the job, we provide them with the support, making things happen".*

The non-personification of the business is a differential and attribute not only in the formation of the company, as also in its development. Among the organisations interviewed in this study, the ones who present the strongest mentorship characteristics already faced changes in board and management, and nowadays share responsibilities in the decision-making process. As stated by SE1, *"I actually do not decide what is going on now, I not the key decision maker anymore, and I not have been for a while".* On the other hand, this distance between founder and social enterprise can also weaken the visibility of the company in the mainstream, as there is no face connected to it. As stated by SE3, *"people will come to you for the first time because of your mission, the second time because they feel part of something bigger, but if they don't like the service, the food does not add value, and they will go somewhere else".*

On the other hand, leaders are roles of inspiration and passion, who involve and connect other individuals in a mutual goal. In fact, the one of the main differences among the leader and the mentor will be the resource used to engage people. Leaders use personal experiences and mission and vision, while mentors rely more on outcomes and results. *"My job is really sail the ship",* as stated by SE4. The social enterprises identified to have its founder as a leader are also more community driven, relying on the transmission of the founder's vision and mission to an organic movement building. *"I am very aware that people look at me and see the standard. And that is a concern for me as well. People try to replicate (what I do), because they see how much I am putting in" (SE4)*

The emotional involvement and mission statement is a stronger asset to the business, building the path to their growth. *"My main beliefs are courage, inspiration to be stronger, and the*

necessity of guidance to achieve our dreams, that if you do the right thing, you inspire people” (SE2) are personal drivers that are intrinsic connected to the company mission. It is also usual the use of personal experiences to engage and inspire people. *“Knowing that being in this age and environment is difficult leads me to build a line of support and encouragement...; we can learn from other people experiences to make your life easier”* (SE2). *“It is weird that there is not even a language for this issues. We do not learn to talk about it. Because the only feelings you are allowed to have when you are a boy is anger. You don’t cry, you get over it, you don’t show. For me it was just self-destructive”* (SE4). The life experience shared by the leader becomes a common statement that build the basis of the social enterprise.

Even though leaders are seen as social movers – among the SEs studies, the ones with strong leadership figures are based on volunteering and work with 50 to 150 team members per year – there are also identified challenges presented by the correlation between leader and organisation. *“Bring fresh eyes to the company is always good, and definitely at some point I will look for another opportunity. But, we need to find the right person, the right history, that don’t allow the SE lose its main characteristics”* (SE2). *“One of the things that we work on the board it is to build strategies right now is to establish an organisation that exists pass me. Find the right people that have the same passion and commitment”* (SE4).

Despite the differences among the SEs representatives studied, several congruencies also were identified in the analysis of the interviews. The great majority of the interviewee have a volunteering background, coming from other projects, especially in the charity sector. It is also a constant that all companies developed a board in the first years of its launch for the development of strategies and policies.

4.2.2. Entrepreneur’s impact on strategies

The role and impact of the founder in their social enterprises shows to had been decreasing with the time, especially in relation to its nature and formation. Statements as: *“I never had heard about social enterprises, however, my main idea was launch a business with a social purpose”* (SE1); *“I had always an interest in social enterprise and always wanted to create some sort of change in terms of the culture that many stakeholders experience”* (SE2); *“We got the idea that we could inspire a conversation about it, to disrupt the conversation that was not been had”* (SE4) are main examples of the ideas that resulted in the social enterprises

presented. There were not clear opportunities presented, as stated by SE6: *“I start to see what solutions were there for this particular problem, I felt that they weren't relevant, they weren't suitable”*.

It can be concluded through the data collected that the active presence of the social entrepreneurs in the SE were crucial in the first years of businesses. *“When I launched the enterprise, I had to manage balancing it with my full time job, it was quite challenging”* (SE2). *“I was basically a volunteer in our organisation, having to make 60h week between my full-time job and here”* (SE4). *“At the beginning, everyone used to say: do not open anything in this location, it is dangerous... and I used to say: but it is exactly why we want to open there”* (SE1). *“I'm started this to try solving a national social problem, like a social activist... we are only a bridge between the stakeholder and the community”* (SE5). The mission-driven behaviour led to opportunities, although the main business actors were not able – or interested – in pursuing it at the time.

The main codes identified in the questions about the foundation and development of the social enterprise in the first years were related to three main ideas: “creation of a solution to a social problem”, “approach differently a negative past experience” and “wish to make an impact”. Most of the examples and situations related to the beginning of the business are in relation to the problem-solving and decision-making on addressing the values and beliefs of the founders.

However, the totality of the social enterprises interviewed developed directive boards to collaborate with the creation of policies, development of future strategies, measurement of results and management of challenges and opportunities. *“When we select the board, I selected them based on the following criteria: they have to be actively involved in their own community and they have to tell us what we need to hear rather than what we want to hear”* (SE5). It is also highlighted that *“the board support us to shape ideas and decisions that are made by the group (staff)”* (SE2 and SE1).

There is a swift in the coding presented in the questions at the point the SEs achieve some maturity and success, mostly, with answers presenting more strategically pointed answers. The main codes identified at this point of the interview were: “building a plan of scale”, “development of new projects” and “identification of new opportunities”; what shows a professionalization of the companies in analysis.

Overall, the role of the board in the social enterprises researched is to bring professional overviews to allow the development of the social purposes aimed by the organisation. *“The board meet every three months and they have strategic focus. They got an overall picture and look for business opportunities where we can expand”* (SE3). *“Our board is working at the moment in how to scale”* (SE1). *“The main focus of the board nowadays is to build a three year’s project to help us promoting the next projects we have in mind. We are measuring the staff needed, the resources needed, how we will manage to achieve our goals”* (SE4).

The clear distinction between the director’s board and general management is also a significant characteristic of these business, as both have separated roles in all interviewed companies. However, it is significant that despite of being part of both spheres, none of the social entrepreneurs questioned in this paper pinpointed their own importance in the board - despite from its formation - positioning themselves more visibly in the daily-basis management of the organisation, as the participation in the volunteering and staff training, management of daily-basis resources and relationship with partners and stakeholders.

4.2.3. Entrepreneur’s impact on culture

“It is all quite organic. We do not have formal events or parties. It is done naturally when the team decide to do it” (SE1). The majority of the entrepreneurs interviewed had similar answers about the main rituals acquired by the organisations and codes as “spontaneous meetings and events”, “family kind atmosphere” and “sense of belonging” are numerous during the interviews. *“The main reason people are part of the team is because they want to”* (SE4).

An important point is that when questioned about social gatherings and personal projects to the staff are promoted by the company or their staff to engage in the company, the majority point the work itself as one of them. *“All the staff have as one of their most important roles to support other people in the daily basis”* (SE3). *“We organise a monthly event when we can hear about other projects in the community, and the staff volunteer for that, even though is not their obligation, it is just part of the commitment the company is”* (SE1). *“We are all friends and they like to build a community around this issue, we build an amazing tribe around it”* (SE4).

Notwithstanding the creation of the core of the business is made by the founder and that makes a significant impact in the SE's culture, the role of the team members and community is as important as the social entrepreneurs ones, especially by their own belonging needs. *"The community volunteers have busy lives, but they find time to come to the meetings and participate in the decisions, because they know this is important to them"* (SE5). *"We have young ambassadors that are really engaged and participate in the role process"* (SE2). *"They bring ideas, and really good ideas, that have an impact in the way we do things. They have a sense of ownership"* (SE1). *"They (volunteers) had built the company as much as me. And the more attached they are towards the organisation, more responsibility they take on"* (SE4).

The fact that team members also can have a different interpretation of their role in the business also can make an impact in the organisation culture. In the totality of the interviews proceeded, it was presented that team members and stakeholders are also clients of the social enterprise. *"When we succeed in achieving some goal, the first impacted are the team members and the community"* (SE3). *"Most of the staff develop processes and activities to develop efficiency that were not requested, just because they feel that achieving our goals are personally important to them"* (SE1).

On the other hand, there are not clear mentions to stories, symbols or rituals created by the company or staff that can collaborate to a clear overview on its foundations. In fact, the main values and beliefs brought by the founders to the company are pointed as still the base for its development. *"They identify themselves with our proposal first, then they start participating"* (SE2). *"It is challenging to achieve who does not understand what we do. Or who do not relate to it"* (S1).

In fact, it is possible to state that these social enterprises were developed by stakeholders with the same values and beliefs that the SE's founders, increasing the relevance and visibility of the social enterprise. However, this scenario might bring difficulties when approaching scaling, as the similar mind-set shared by the founder and his/her team created the bound that attract other individuals with similar mind-sets to the business, being one of the main reasons to the growth of the organisation, especially for the SEs focused in very specific issues.

4.3. Discussion

This research main findings provide evidences to build the hypothesis that social entrepreneurs can be interpreted as the foundation in the formation of organisation culture, building companies that are mirrors of their aims and objectives, although the development and growth of the social enterprise are also connected to other important factors, as its stakeholders and environment. This finds support the work of Schein (1983 and 1985), Chatman & Cha (2003), Zhao et al. (2012) who suggests that the founders are the main actors in the formation of organisational culture and in its development. It also supports the researches made by Kirwin (2000) and Ercuji (2009) that highlight the importance of culture in the formation of organisation identity. However, there is no past works that present studies relating social-enterprises and organisational culture that can be compared nowadays.

Based on the data collection, it is possible to relate two main approaches aiming to answer the research question presented in this paper. Firstly, it is possible to assure that the formation of the organisational culture in social enterprises is, as in other forms of business, related in a wide extent to its founder's culture and beliefs. In fact, one of the main assets to the development of this types of business relies on the construction of this strong culture, as a tool to differentiate it from other charities or not-for-profit organisations. In fact, as already stated by Dart (2004), Alvord, Brown, & Letts (2004), Cho (2006) and Battilana (2018), the social-driven mission is one of the strongest assets social entrepreneurs have to develop their business.

On the other hand, it is not possible to assure that the founders are the only responsible for the construction of the organisation's culture and identity, as most of the values and beliefs brought into the business are common shared among wide parcels of the society. One of the main examples of that relies on the stakeholder's engagement to the achievement of its goals, as the development and launch of the Social Enterprises Policy in Ireland, which aims to build more awareness and support among these organisations. Social enterprises can be seen as reflections of the main needs of a society, that are developed not by an opportunity identification that was made by an entrepreneur to create a new need, but the use of new tools to address old needs towards the creation of opportunities.

Alongside to that, it is possible to identify that the strong culture created by SEs is also a differential considering commercial businesses with strong CSR, as it becomes the product of

the field. By their funders' vision, the result to be achieved is the social impact and environmental change, while in commercial ventures the impact can be configured as a consequence of the development of a product or service. The focus on the society rather than profitability professionalized the delivery of positive social changes, building better strategies of their measurement and engagement.

Going further in the secondary questions, it is possible to identify the social entrepreneurs as social-catalysers that develop new ideas of business, and positioning themselves as symbols of their own companies to achieve their development. The role of the social entrepreneurs in the business is to build the foundation to the SE and its main objectives, as much as the creation of their first partnerships and sponsorships. However, it is also the role of the founder to lead the company to the professionalization, what builds a clear boundary that separates SEs and charities. The diminishing role of the founder in their social enterprise also agrees with the main characteristics addressed by Busenitz & Barney (1997), Sarasvathy (2001) and Dyer, Gregersen, & Christensen (2008), which define entrepreneurs as social changers always seeking new opportunities.

Defining the social entrepreneur as the start-point in the formation of the company also highlights their diminishing role on the decision-making process alongside the development of the business. Must presented as the natural professionalization and development of the company, as also the concern in establishing a clear decision-making line, It is also possible to state that social entrepreneurs are hardly disconnected from the social outcomes of their business, often changing bureaucratic and strategic roles for daily basis activities that allows a nearer contact with the stakeholders. Often these entrepreneurs positioning themselves as spokesperson and communicators to the company growth.

The main threats presented by the connection of the founder and its business in the social enterprises' environment relies on the possibility of misdirecting the company's focus to other issues, mischaracterizing their main values and weaken its engagement power, important asset to the development of the business. It is also possible to state that as social entrepreneurs are also the company main spokesperson, the disconnection between the business and its founder can result in a crisis of identity due the change in the image and identity building through the years.

On the other hand, the connection between social enterprises and their social entrepreneur founder can also incentivise the engagement of the community the organisation is inserted

in, building a common shared values and objectives, which leads to the transference of ownership from the owner to the society. Building a link between personal experiences lived by the social entrepreneur and its business can more easily achieve individuals that identify themselves with the same experiences, beliefs and values. The ownership shared among founder, team members and community can develop a strong collaboration alliance working towards the success of the social enterprise.

5. Conclusion

5.1. Social Enterprises building new overviews on organisational culture

Aiming to address a lack in the empirical studies about culture in social entrepreneurship and build more perspectives alongside the main characteristics of these businesses, this research collected data from six social entrepreneurs currently in business in Ireland, applied the Grounded Theory to their analysis and developed some new perspectives in the SE field, especially in relation to the role of the social entrepreneur in the business and his impacts in the company decision making, planning, strategies and scaling.

Regarding the main research question, it is possible to conclude that the social entrepreneur is a significant part of the enterprise culture and identity. It is through their role that the main essence of the organisation – mission and vision – is built and also by the right allocation of time and resources that the business is developed, although there is not clear data about opportunities in the field raising by the time of the SE foundation. However, culture and identity in social enterprises are also aspects shared by a wide number of stakeholders, not been exclusively related to team members and management.

In Social Enterprises' field, organisational culture is built also through the community vision, values and experiences, as the main output of the organisation is to promote social impact to the stakeholder chosen. In addition, aspects as values and beliefs become the product delivered by these business, as the tool which represents the company responsibility and engagement with the customers, designing a different relationship among stakeholders and company that designed as shared ownership. The existence of a community interested in the social issue approached will sustain the social enterprise's existence and development, however founders and managers had already moved to other businesses.

It is also possible to conclude towards the completion of the data analyses that organisational culture and identity have a different meaning and impact in Social Enterprises than the presented in studies of commercial and private business. While cultural aspects can impact all business, building positive or negative perspectives to the behaviour of team members and management; in SEs cultural aspects are the core factors that maintain the business and make them distinct – collaborating to the formation of a new business model. The differences towards culture in social enterprises and other types of enterprises can be considered one more boundary that separate it to the other types of enterprises.

5.2. Limitations and future research

Although the rich qualitative data analysed, this research is still limited by time and resources constraints, which build barriers in collecting data from more social enterprises in Ireland, what could contribute to deeper the study and development of new theories and perspectives. It is of significant importance the production of more research about internal and external processes developed by social enterprises to widen the area and to build more clear boundaries and characteristics to this type of business.

Furthermore, correlating characteristics from charities and not-for-profit organisations and social enterprises through empirical research can also collaborate to the comprehension of this phenomena, and delimit main reasons for its success or failure. It is also important to address social enterprises as new business models that can bring significant insights to the business studies nowadays. Building research towards social enterprises measurement system, strategy development and funding development is important to present these hybrid organisations as new innovative ways to unify profit and social aims.

References

- Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). *Organizational Identity. Research in Organizational Behavior*, JAI Press, Greenwich, 7, pp. 263-295
- Allaire, Y., & Firsirotu, M. E. (1984). *Theories of Organizational Culture*. *Organization Studies*, 5(3), 193–226. DOI: [10.1177/017084068400500301](https://doi.org/10.1177/017084068400500301)
- Alvord, S., Brown, L., & Letts, C. (2004). 'Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study'. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40, pp. 260-282. DOI: 10.1177/0021886304266847.
- Ashoka's Impact. (2015). Ashoka Everyone a Change maker. Retrieved from <https://www.ashoka.org/en/ashoka%27s-impact> [Accessed in 29 June 2019]
- Atkinson, H. (2006). *Strategy implementation: A role for the balanced scorecard?*. *Management Decision*, 44(10), pp. 1441–1460.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). 'Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both?'. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), pp. 1-22
- Bacq, S. & Janssen, F. (2011). *The Multiple Faces of Social Entrepreneurship: A Review of Definitional Issues Based on Geographical and Thematic Criteria*. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*. DOI: 23. 373-403. 10.1080
- Bansal, P., Smith, W. & Vaara, E. (2018). *New Ways of Seeing Through Qualitative Research*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61, pp. 1189-1195. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2018.4004.
- Barbosa, A., Moraes, E. & Romani-Dias, M. (2017). *The social and the economic in social business: proposition of a conceptual model*. *Revista Capital Cientifico*, 15(4). DOI: 10.5935/2177-4153.20170027
- Battilana, J. (2018). *Cracking the organizational challenge of pursuing joint social and financial goals: Social enterprise as a laboratory to understand hybrid organizing*, *M@n@gement*, 21(4), pp. 1278-1305.

Beal, B. D. (2013). *'Corporate Social Responsibility'*. Sage. Los Angeles, CA. Sage Publications Inc.

Boschee, J. (1998). *'Merging Mission and Money: A Board Member's Guide to Social Entrepreneurship'*. Retrieved from: <http://www.socialent.org/pdfs/MergingMission.pdf> [Accessed in 15 May 2019]

Bowen, H. (1953). *'Social responsibilities of the businessman'*. New York, Harper.

Bowen, H., Bowen, P., & Gond, J. (2013). *'Social Responsibilities of the Businessman'*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt20q1w8f>

Burke, C. B. (2001). *'Nonprofit history's new numbers (and the need for more)'*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(2), 174-203

Busenitz, L. W. & Barney, J. B. (1997) *'Differences between Entrepreneurs and Managers in Large Organizations: Biases and Heuristics in Strategic Decision-Making'*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12, 9-30. DOI: 10.1016/S0883-9026(96)00003-1

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). *'Using thematic analysis in psychology'*. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2), pp. 77-101.

Bridge, S., O'Neill, K. and Martin, F. (2009). *'Understanding Enterprise: Entrepreneurship and Small Business'*. Third Edition, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke.

Carroll, A. B. (1999). *'Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct'*. *Business & Society*, 38(3), pp. 268–295. DOI: 10.1177/000765039903800303

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Grounded Theory in Global Perspective: Reviews by International Researchers*. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(9), pp. 1074–1084.

Chatman, J., & Cha, S. (2003). *'Leading by Leveraging Culture'*. *California Management Review*. DOI: 45. 10.2307/41166186.

Cho, A. H. (2006). *'Politics, Values and Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Appraisal'*. In: Mair, J., Robinson, J. & Hockerts K. *Social Entrepreneurship*. Palgrave Macmillan, London

Collavo, T. (2018). *'Unpacking Social Entrepreneurship: Exploring the Definition Chaos and Its Consequences in England'*. Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation, 14(2), pp. 49-82.

Collins, O. F. & Moore, D. G. (1964). *'The Enterprising Man'*. Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Corner, P. D., & Ho, M. (2010). *'How Opportunities Develop in Social Entrepreneurship'*. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 34(4), pp. 635–659. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00382

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *'Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches'*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Dacin, P., Dacin, M., & Matear, M. (2010). *'Social Entrepreneurship: Why We Don't Need a New Theory and How We Move Forward From Here'*. Academy of Management Perspectives, 24(3), pp. 37-57.

Dart, R. (2004). *'The Legitimacy of Social Enterprise'*. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 14, pp. 411 - 424. DOI: 10.1002/nml.43.

Dees, G. J. (1998). *'Enterprising non-profits'*. Harvard Business Review, 76(1), pp. 54-67

Dees, G. J., Emerson, J., & Economy, P. (2002). *'Strategic Tools for Social Entrepreneurs: Enhancing the Performance of Your Enterprising Nonprofit'*.

Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2012). *'Chapter 3: Conceptions of Social Enterprise in Europe: a comparative perspective with the United States'*. In Gidron, B., & Hasenfeld, Y. (2012). Social Enterprises, an Organizational Perspective. Palgrave Macmillan

DiCicco-Bloom, B. & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). *'The qualitative research interview'*. Medical Education, 40, pp. 314-321. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x

Dillman, D. (1991). *'The design and administration of mail surveys'*. Annual Reviews Inc, 17, pp. 225-249.

Di Santolo, L. (2017). *'Social Entrepreneurship: A Buzzword ready to be delineated?'*. School of Rotterdam.

DiMaggio, P. J. & Powell, W. W. (1983). *'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields'*. American Sociological Review, 48 (2), pp. 147-160.

Drayton, W. (2002). *'The Citizen Sector: Becoming as Entrepreneurial and Competitive as Business'*. California Management Review

Drever, E. (1997). *'Using semi-structured interviews in small-scale research'*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Dyer, J., Gregersen, H. B., & Christensen, C. M. (2011). *'The innovator's DNA: mastering the five skills of disruptive innovators'*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business Press

Ercuji, J. (2009). *'Organisational Culture as Organisational Identity – Between the Public and the Private'*. Organizacija, 42(3), pp. 69-76. DOI: 10.2478/v10051-009-0004-3

European Commission (2017). Social Enterprises and their Eco-systems: A European mapping report. Updated country report: Ireland. Available at: www.ec.europa.eu/social [Accessed in 24th June 2019]

Farmer, R. & Hogue, W. (1985). *'Corporate Social Responsibility'*. Science Research Associates, University of Michigan.

Flammer, C. (2015). *'Does Corporate Social Responsibility Lead to Superior Financial Performance? A Regression Discontinuity Approach'*. Management Science, pp. 1-20.

Frederick, W. (1960). *'The growing concern over business responsibility'*. California Management Review, 2, 54-61.

Friedland, R. & Alford, R. R. (1991). *'Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions'*.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1965). *Awareness of dying*. Chicago, Aldine.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Goldin, C. & Margo, R. (1992). *'The Great Compression: The U.S. Wage Structure at Mid-Century'*, Quarterly Journal of Economics, 107, pp. 1-34. DOI: 10.3386/w3817

Gras, D., Moss, T. & Lumpkin, G. T. (2014). *'The Use of Secondary Data in Social Entrepreneurship Research: Assessing the Field and Identifying Future Opportunities'*. *Research Methodology in Strategy and Management*, 9, pp. 49-75. DOI: 10.1108/S1479-83872014000009011.

Grieco, C., Michelini, L., & Iasevoli, G. (2015). *'Measuring Value Creation in Social Enterprises: A Cluster Analysis of Social Impact Assessment Models'*. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(6), pp. 1173–1193. DOI: [10.1177/0899764014555986](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764014555986)

Griffin, R. W. & Moorhead, G. (2009). *'Organizational Behaviour: Managing People and Organizations'*. 9th Edition, Cengage Learning, USA.

Hall, S. (2011). The neo-liberal revolution. *Cultural Studies*, 25(6), pp. 705-728

Hannerz, U. (1990). *'Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. Theory, Culture & Society'*. 7(2–3), 237–251.

Harrison R., & Stokes H. (1992). *'Diagnosing Organizational Culture'*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.

Hartigan, P. (2006). It's about people, not profits. *Business Strategy Review*, 17(4), pp. 42-45.

Hartmann, A. (2006). *'The role of organizational culture in motivating innovative behaviour in construction firms'*. *Construction Innovation: Information, Process, Management*, 6, pp. 159-

Hargreaves, A. (2003). *'Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity'*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Heller, R. (1997). *'In Search of European Excellence. The 10 Key Strategies of Europe's Top Companies'*. Harper Collins Business.

Ireland, R. & Webb, J. (2007). *'Strategic Entrepreneurship: Creating Competitive Advantage through Streams of Innovation'*. *Business Horizons*. DOI: 50. 49-59. 10.1016

Johnson, S. (2000). *'Literature Review on Social Entrepreneurship'*. Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, Edmonton

Junaid, M., Durrani, M., Mehboob-ur-Rashid, & Shaheen, N. (2015). *'Entrepreneurship as a Socially Constructed Phenomenon: Importance of Alternate Paradigms Research'*. *Journal of*

Managerial Sciences, 9(1), 35–48.

Juhn, C. & Murphy, K. (1995) '*Inequality in Labor Market Outcomes: Contrasting the 1980s and Earlier Decades*', Federal Reserve Bank of New York Economic Policy Review, pp. 26-34.

Kallman, M., Clark, T., Wu, C., & Lin, J. (2016). '*The Third Sector: Community Organizations, NGOs, and Nonprofits*'. Springfield: University of Illinois Press. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/j.ctt1hd18tn> [Accessed in 10th June 2019]

Killian, S. (2012). '*Corporate Social Responsibility: A Guide, with Irish Experiences*', Institute of Chartered Accountants in Ireland.

King, W. R., & Cleland, D. I. (1978). '*Strategic planning and policy*'. Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, New York.

Kirwin, A. (2000). '*The Function of Corporate Identity in Organizational Culture*'. Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting, 44(10), pp. 265–268.

Korosec, R. L. & Berman, E. M. (2006). '*Municipal support for social entrepreneurship*', Palgrave Macmillan.

Kotler, P. & Lee, N. (2004). '*Corporate Social Responsibility: Doing the Most Good for Your Company and Your Cause*'. John Wiley & Sons.

Kraus, S., Filser, M., O'Dwyer, M., & Shaw, E., (2014). '*Social Entrepreneurship: An Exploratory Citation Analysis*'. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.26011909

Kwiatkowski, S. (2004). '*Social and Intellectual Dimensions of Entrepreneurship*'. Higher Education in Europe, 29, pp. 205-220. DOI: 10.1080/0379772042000234848.

Lasprogata, G. & Cotton, M. (2003). '*Contemplating “enterprise”: the business and legal challenges of social entrepreneurship*', American Business Law Journal, 41(1), pp. 67–113.

Lee, M., Battilana, J., & Wang, T. (2014). '*Building an infrastructure for empirical research on Social enterprise: Challenges and opportunities*'. Research Methodology and Strategy Management, 9, PP. 241-264. DOI: 10.1108/S1479-838720140000009017

Lewellen, T. C. (2002). '*The Anthropology of Globalization*', London, Bergin & Garvey.

- Liang, C., Peng, L., Yao, S & Liang, C. (2015). *'Developing the social enterprise performance scale and examining the effects of entrepreneurs' personality traits'*. Journal of Entrepreneurship. Management and Innovation, 11, pp. 89-116.
- Mair, J. (2006). *'Social Entrepreneurship'*. Palgrave Macmillan, UK
- Mair, J. & Marti, I. (2006). *'Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight'*. Journal of World Business. DOI: 41. 36-44. 10.1016
- Manfred, F. R. & de Vries, K. (2013). *'Organizational Paradoxes: clinical approaches to management'*. Routledge.
- Maas, K., & Grieco, C. (2017). *'Distinguishing game changers from boastful charlatans: Which social enterprises measure their impact?'*. Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 8(1), pp. 110-128.
- McCarthy, B. (2000). *'The cult of risk taking and social learning: A study of Irish entrepreneurs'*. Management Decision, 38(8), pp. 563-574
- McWilliams, A. & Siegel, D. (2001). *'Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theory of the Firm Perspective'*. The Academy of Management Review, 26(1), pp. 117-127. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/259398>
- Morse, J. M. (1994) *'Designing funded qualitative research'*. In: Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., (Eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Inquiry, Sage Publications Ltd., Thousand Oaks, pp. 220-235.
- Mort, S., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003). *'Social Entrepreneurship: towards conceptualisation'*. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 8, pp. 76 - 88. DOI: 10.1002/nvsm.202.
- Mullins, L. J. (2005). *'Management and Organizational Behavior'*. London: FT Pitman.
- Mullins, L. J. & Christy, G. (2010). *'Management and organisational behaviour'*. Financial Times Prentice Hall, Harlow, Essex.
- Mueller, S., Chambers, L. & Neck, H. (2013). *'The distinctive skills of social entrepreneurs'*. Journal of Enterprising Culture, 21(3), pp. 301-334. DOI: [10.1142/S0218495813500131](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218495813500131)

- Murphy, P. J., & Coombes, S. (2009). 'A model of social entrepreneurial discovery'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87(3), pp. 325–336.
- Naranjo-Valencia, J., Jimenez-Jimenez, D. & Sanz Valle, R. (2011). 'Innovation or imitation? The role of organizational culture', *Management Decision*, 49(1), pp. 55-72. DOI: 10.1108/002517411111094437
- Naudé, W. (2010). 'Entrepreneurship and Economic Development: Theory, Evidence and Policy'. IZA Discussion Paper No. 7507.
- Nutt, P. (1999). 'Surprising but true: Half the decisions in organizations fail'. *Academy of Management Executive*. DOI: 13. 75-89. 10.5465
- O'Connor, E. (2006). Location and relocation, visions and revisions: Opportunities for social entrepreneurship.
- Ouchi, W. (1981), 'Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge'. *Business Horizons*, 24(6), pp. 82-83.
- Parrish, B. (2010). 'Sustainability-driven Entrepreneurship: Principles of Organization Design'. *Journal of Business Venturing*. DOI: 25. 510-523. 10.1016
- Peredo, A. & Mclean, M. (2006). 'Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Review of the Concept'. *Journal of World Business*. DOI: 41. 56-65. 10.1016
- Perrini, F. (2006). 'SMEs and CSR Theory: Evidence and Implications from an Italian Perspective'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67, pp. 305. DOI: [10.1007/s10551-006-9186](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9186)
- Perrini F. & Fazzolari S. (2006). 'San Patrignano: A Sustainable Model for Social Entrepreneurship'. Edward Elgar: Northampton (MA).
- Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H. (1982). 'In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies'. Harper & Row, New York.
- Porter, M. E., Sachs J. D., & McArthur, J. W. (2002). 'Executive Summary: Competitiveness and Stages of Economic Development'. In Porter, M.E., Sachs, J. D., Cornelius, P. K., McArthur, J.

W., & Schwab, K. (eds.), *The Global Competitiveness Report 2001–2002*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 16–25

Quinn, R. E. & Cameron, K. (1983). '*Organizational life cycles and shifting criteria of effectiveness*', *Management Science*, 29(1), pp. 33–51.

Rabiei, M. (2011). '*An empirical research on the relationship between entrepreneurship and economic growth*'. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(8).

Reigle, R. (2015). '*Measuring Organic and Mechanistic Cultures*. *Engineering Management Journal*'. DOI: 13. 3-8. 10.1080/10429247.2001.11415132.

Roberts, N., & King, P. (1991). '*King, Policy Entrepreneurs: Their Activity Structure and Function in the Policy Process*', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1(2), pp. 147–175. DOI: [10.1093/ 037081](https://doi.org/10.1093/037081)

Robins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Campbel, T. (2009). '*Organizational behaviour*'. Pearson, 1st European Edition.

Robinson, J. (2006). '*Chapter 7: Navigating Social and Institutional Barriers to Markets: How Social Entrepreneurs Identify and Evaluate Opportunities*'. In Mair, J., Robinson, J., & Hockerts, K. N. (Eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Sagawa, S. & Segal, E. (2000). '*Common Interest, Common Good: creating value through business and social sector partnerships*'. *California Management Review*, 42, pp. 105-122. DOI: 10.2307/41166035.

Sarasvathy, S. (2001). '*Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency*'. *The Academy of Management Review*. 26. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.2001.4378020.

Salamon, L. (1992). '*America's Non-profit Sector: A Primer*', the Foundation Center, New York.

Scott, W. L. (1977). '*Effectiveness of organizational effectiveness studies*'. In: Goodman, P. S., & Pennings, J. M. (Eds.), '*New perspectives on organizational effectiveness*', San Francisco, pp. 63-95.

Seelos, C. & Mair, J. (2005). '*Social Entrepreneurship: Creating New Business Models to Serve the Poor*'. *Business Horizons*. DOI: 48.241-246. 10.1016

Shane, S. & Venkataraman, S. (2000). *'The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research'*. The Academy of Management Review, 25(1), pp. 217-226. DOI: [10.2307/259271](https://doi.org/10.2307/259271)

Schein, E. H. (1983). *'The role of the founder in creating organizational culture'*. Organizational Dynamics, pp. 13-28

Schein, E. H. (1985). *'Organizational Culture and Leadership'*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schein, E.H. (1990). *'Organisational Culture'*. American Psychologist, 43, pp. 109-119. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066x.45.2.109

Selznick, P. (1957). *'Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation'*. Harper & Row, New York, 62, pp. 67-68.

Short, L. E., & Dunn, J. P. (2011). *'A Pragmatic Approach to the Study of Entrepreneurship'*. Leadership & Organizational Management Journal, 2011(2), p. 102–116, 2011.

Short, J., Moss, T. & Lumpkin, G. (2009). *'Research in Social Entrepreneurship: Past Contributions and Future Opportunities'*. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 3, pp.1 61 - 194. DOI: 10.1002/sej.69.

Shumpeter, J. (1934). *'The Theory of Economic Development'*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Silverman, D. (2011). *'Interpreting qualitative data: A guide to the principles of qualitative research'*, Sage, London

Smircich, L. (1983). *'Concepts of culture and organizational analysis'*. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, pp. 339-358. DOI: 10.2307/2392246

Sofaer, S. (1999). *'Qualitative methods: what are they and why use them?'*. Health Services Res., 34(5), pp. 1101–1118.

Sorensen, J. N. (2002). *'Safety culture: a survey of the state of the art'*, Reliability Engineering and System Safety, 76, pp. 189-20

Steiss, A. W. (2003). *'Strategic management for public and non-profit organisations'*. Taylor & Francis Inc., New York.

Stevenson, H. H. (1985). *'The heart of entrepreneurship'*. Harvard Business Review, 63, pp. 85-94.

Stevenson, H. H., & Jarillo, J. C. (1991). *'A new entrepreneurial paradigm'*. In Etzioni, A. & Lawrence, P. (Eds.), *Socio-economics: Toward a new synthesis*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 185-208.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications

Sulek, M. (2009). *On the Modern Meaning of Philanthropy*. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 38. DOI: 10.1177/0899764009333052.

Yunhe, E. T & Smith, W. (2014). *'Entrepreneurial Leadership of Social Enterprises: Challenges and Skills for Embracing Paradoxes'*. Journal of Leadership Studies, 8, pp. 42-45. DOI: 10.1002/jls.21339.

Thompson, J. D., & MacMillan, I. C. (2006). *'Local Feed: Societal wealth generation in Southern Africa'*. In Perrini, f. (Ed.), *The New Social Entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 122-144,

Thurik, R. & Wennekers, S. (1999). *'Linking Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth'*. Small Business Economics. DOI: 13. 27-55. 10.1023

Venkataraman, S. (1997). *'The Distinctive Domain of Entrepreneurship Research Advances in Entrepreneurship'*. Firm Emergence and Growth.

Waddock, S. (1991). *'A Typology of Social Partnership Organizations'*. Administration & Society, 22(4), PP. 480–515. DOI: 10.1177/009539979102200405

Waddock, S., & Post, J. (1991). *'Social Entrepreneurs and Catalytic Change'*. Public Administration Review, 51(5), pp. 393-401. DOI: 10.2307/976408

Wallace, S. (1999). *'Social entrepreneurship: the role of social purpose enterprises in facilitating community economic development'*. Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, 4(2), pp. 153-174

Walle, H. (2015). *'Qualitative Research in Business: A Practical Overview'*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, New Castle, UK.

Weerawardena, J., & Mort, G. (2006). *'Investigating social entrepreneurship: a multidimensional model.'* Journal of World Business, 41(1), pp. 21-35.

Whetten, D. A., & Mackey, A. (2002). *'A Social Actor Conception of Organizational Identity and Its Implications for the Study of Organizational Reputation'*. Business & Society, 41(4), pp.393–414. DOI: [10.1177/0007650302238775](https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650302238775)

Wilson, N., & Stokes, D. (2004). *'Small business management and entrepreneurship'*. Seventh edition. Cengage Learning.

Wronka-Pośpiech, M. (2016). *'The identification of skills and competencies for effective management in social enterprises. A managerial perspective'*. Management. DOI: 20.10.1515/manment-2015-0023.

Xiaoti, H., Frank, R., & Cohen, L., (2011). *'Social entrepreneurship: setting boundaries for a conceptual framework'*. 6th European Conference on Innovation and Entrepreneurship.

Yolaç, S. (2015). *'An Empirical Study Regarding Entrepreneurship in Europe and Central Asia'*. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. DOI: 195. 1097-1103.10.1016

Zahra, S., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D., & Shulman, J. (2009). *'A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges'*. Journal of Business Venturing, 24(5), pp. 519-532

Zhao, Y. L., Erekson, O. H., Wang, T. & Song, M. (2012). *'Pioneering advantages and entrepreneur's first-mover decision: an empirical investigation for the United States and China'*. Journal of Product Innovation Management, pp. 190-220

APPENDIX I

Interview Guide

Focus	No.	Question
Entrepreneurial background	1	What inspired you to become an entrepreneur?
	2	What beliefs did you bring to your businesses?
	3	In general, what are your main drivers?
	4	What are your main strength and main weakness as an entrepreneur?
	5	What are your vision and mission to become an entrepreneur?
Social Entrepreneurship	6	Why did you decide to build a social enterprise?
	7	What challenges did you face to set this business?
	8	How did you choose the problem that should be addressed?
Enterprise background	9	What is your current role in this enterprise?
	10	How many collaborators do you have?
	11	Do you have a decision-making process or hierarchy?
	12	How do you measure results?
	13	What are the main challenges of this enterprise?
	14	What are the main symbols and rituals you have?
	15	How do you set new processes and routines?
	16	Which were the main changes that happened since you launched this enterprise?
Future suppositions	17	Do you see yourself leaving the company? Why? How would you do it?
	18	Do you think that the enterprise would be impacted for that? In which extent?
	19	What are your plans to the future of this business?

APPENDIX II

Social Enterprises and Organisational Culture

Consent to take part in research

I..... voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

I understand that even if I agree to participate now, I can withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any question without any consequences of any kind.

I understand that I can withdraw permission to use data from my interview within two weeks after the interview, in which case the material will be deleted.

I have had the purpose and nature of the study explained to me in writing and I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study.

I understand that participation involves one to one interviews, consisted of twenty questions.

I understand that I will not benefit directly from participating in this research.

I agree to my interview being audio-recorded.

I understand that all information I provide for this study will be treated confidentially.

I understand that disguised extracts from my interview may be quoted in a Master's Thesis of the MSc on Entrepreneurship course.

I understand that if I inform the researcher that I or someone else is at risk of harm they may have to report this to the relevant authorities - they will discuss this with me first but may be required to report with or without my permission.

I understand that signed consent forms and original audio recordings will be retained until 1st November 2019.

I understand that a transcript of my interview in which all identifying information has been removed will be retained for 1st November 2021.

I understand that under freedom of information legalisation I am entitled to access the information I have provided at any time while it is in storage as specified above.

I understand that I am free to contact any of the people involved in the research to seek further clarification and information.

Signature of participant - date

I believe the participant is giving informed consent to participate in this study

Signature of researcher - date