

Constructing Social Entrepreneurship

**Social Psychological Perspectives
on Hong Kong's Social Enterprise Policy**

Junli Jossta, ZHANG
University of Helsinki
Faculty of Social Sciences
Social Psychology
Master's Thesis
May 2019

Tiedekunta– Fakultet – Faculty Social Sciences		Laitos – Institution – Department Social Research (Social Psychology)	
Tekijä – Författare – Author Junli Jossta, ZHANG			
Työn nimi – Arbetets titel – Title Constructing Social Entrepreneurship: Social psychological perspectives on Hong Kong’s Social Enterprise Policy			
Oppiaine – Läroämne – Subject Social Psychology of Entrepreneurship			
Työn laji – Arbetets art – Level: Master’s Thesis	Aika – Datum – Month and Year: May 2019	Sivumäärä – Sidoantal – Number of pages: 60	
Tiivistelmä – Referat – Abstract			
<p>This research focused on studying how government constructs the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship in the context of Hong Kong. Social psychological perspectives were applied to develop the theoretical and methodological framework of the research. Seven pieces of government papers and one piece of government speech, in total 28 pages of content, ranging from the year 2007 to the year 2017, were selected as research materials. These official materials were chosen because they explained the government’s social enterprise policy in government’s own language.</p> <p>The main research question “how social entrepreneurship is constructed in Hong Kong?” was divided into three subquestions, respectively, concerning on what repertoires were used by the government to construct roles and positions; on how agency was constructed by the government; and on the effects and consequences that might be brought by the government’s construction of social entrepreneurship.</p> <p>The major findings of the empirical study include: eight subject categories were identified from the government’s construction, and eight repertoires were found being used by the government to construct roles and positions for the subject categories. The study revealed that the goals government constructed for social enterprises were twofold: to become competitive to achieve financial sustainability in the long run, and to provide more low-skilled job opportunities for the socially disadvantaged people. Besides, the study found that the government was positioning itself as the principal of the social enterprise sector, and using the ideology of “helping the socially disadvantaged people to become self-reliant” to justify its policy preference for the Work Integration Social Enterprise. The study further revealed that the success of the social enterprise sector was being attributed to the government’s support and effort, rather than to the effort of the social enterprise operators and the social entrepreneurs.</p> <p>Based on the research findings, two major conclusions were drawn: first, in the context of Hong Kong, the government is using the social enterprise sector as a vehicle to tackle its welfare-reform problems, so the social enterprise sector is treated as a subsystem subjugated to the state’s welfare system; second, the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship in Hong Kong has been constructed by the government as a narrow pursuit, and this construction of social entrepreneurship is being too narrow in scope to accommodate the diversified values of social entrepreneurship.</p>			
Avainsanat – Nyckelord – Keywords Social Entrepreneurship, Social Enterprise, Social Constructionism, Agency, Interpretative Repertoire, Discourse Analysis.			
Ohjaaja tai ohjaajat - Handledare - Supervisor or supervisors: Kari Mikko Vesala			

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Docent Kari Vesala for his continuous support and encouragement in the process of completing my thesis. He told me every single progress I might have made and helped me overcome the struggles that I met during the study process. His effective supervision and constructive feedbacks helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis.

I would like to thank my friends Liu Yan, Martin Briggs and Zeinab Karimi for their emotional support and understandings. Liu Yan provided her comments on the first draft of writing. I am indebted to Martin Briggs for his help in proofreading the final draft. Zeinab Karimi shared me her enthusiasm and passion for social research.

I am grateful to my mentor and my friend Dr. Percy Lui for commenting on the drafts and suggesting the ways to revise the thesis. His personal guidance, support and friendship will always be appreciated.

I am thankful to my personal assistant Law Sinn for taking good care of my work on my behalf during the time when I was concentrating on my study.

And I would like to express my special thanks to my boyfriend Peter Song who had kept motivating me. I am thankful for his inspiration, support, encouragement and love.

I would like to show my appreciation to Helsinki University Main Library (Kaisa House), the major revisions of this thesis were done there. Kaisa House is the best library building in the world in my heart.

Last but not the least, my gratitude also goes to the city of Helsinki, for her calmness and for the gracious space she provides. I have always found a sense of belonging here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	1
1. The Study of Social Entrepreneurship	1
1.1. Definitions and Issues	1
1.2. Actors and Discourses	4
1.3. Government and Social Enterprise	5
1.4. Social Enterprise in Hong Kong	8
1.5. About the Thesis	10
2. Social Psychological Perspectives	12
2.1. Social Psychology of Entrepreneurship	12
2.2. Social Constructionism	13
2.3. Discourse Analysis	16
2.4. Theories of Agency	18
2.5. Frame Approach of Agency	19
2.6. Discourses, Agency and Power Relation	22
3. Discursive Psychology	23
3.1. Components of Language	23
3.2. Interpretative Repertoire	25
3.3. Research Questions	27
4. Materials, Coding and Analysis	29
4.1. Materials	29
4.2. The Selected Papers	30
4.3. Primary Coding	31
4.4. Analytical Strategies	32
5. Findings	34
5.1. The Identified Categories	34
5.2. Descriptions of Category	35
5.3. The Identified Repertoires	40
5.4. Analyses by the Agency Approach	45
5.5. Analyses by the Power Relation Approach	48
6. Discussion and Conclusion	50
6.1. Answers for the Research Questions	50
6.2. Social Enterprise: A Vehicle for Welfare-Reform	54
6.3. Social Entrepreneurship: A Narrow Pursuit	56
6.4. Strengths and Limitations	57
6.5. Implications and Future Research	59
REFERENCES	61
APPENDICES	67

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. Social Enterprise Start-up Funds	9
TABLE 2. Frame Approach of Agency	20
TABLE 3. Table of the Selected Papers	30
TABLE 4. Table of the Identified Categories	34
TABLE 5. Table of the Identified Repertoires	40

1. The Study of Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship is a social phenomenon which has raised enthusiasm among governments, nonprofit organisations (NPOs), commercial organisations, academia and the media. Governments from developed countries and regions such as the United Kingdom (UK) and Hong Kong, have recognised promotion and support of the social enterprise sector development as their policy strategies in tackling social problems (Office of the Third Sector, 2006, UK; Home Affairs Office, 2007, Hong Kong).

The European Commission (2018) has indicated that employment is a key element in reducing poverty, and decent work is a crucial factor in achieving high level of social cohesion. Unemployment among the socially disadvantaged people is one of the social problems to be solved. Social enterprises have been playing an increasingly important role in solving social problems of this sort.

This thesis focuses on the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship in the context of Hong Kong. In this chapter, it will first review the definitions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship; then, the actors and the main discourses of social entrepreneurship will be mentioned; thirdly, the relationship between government and social enterprise in general will be reasoned; after that, it will look into the social and political contexts in which Hong Kong's social enterprises are situated; and finally it will briefly talk about the study aims and the structure of this thesis.

1.1. Definitions and Issues

Hulgard (2010) has asserted that the concept of social enterprise is related to different social and political phenomena in different sectors, primarily in these three sectors:

- In the commercial sector, social enterprise is related to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Corporate Social Innovation (CSI), demonstrating that commercial organisations play a role in social participation;

- in the public sector, social enterprise is related to an experimental turn in social policy and planning that has been taking place in European countries and the EU since the 1980s, both in relation to urban planning and participatory social policies;
- in the third sector, social enterprise is related to a transition within non-profit organisations (NPOs) and voluntary associations, becoming agents on the market and providers of welfare services in Europe, and in the USA which has seen a dramatic growth in the impact of the third sector since the mid-1980s.

Social enterprise definitions by governments

Although social enterprise can be related to different sectors, it appears that the governments tend to relate social enterprise to the third sector or the nonprofit sector only. This point can be illustrated by the ways governments define social enterprise. Definitions provided by the UK government and the Hong Kong government are selected as examples.

The definition provided by the UK government is as follows:

“Social enterprise is a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximize profit for shareholders and owners.”
(Office of the Third Sector, 2006).

The definition provided by the Hong Kong government is as follows:

“Social enterprise is a business to achieve specific social objectives such as providing the services (such as support service for the elderly) or products needed by the community, creating employment and training opportunities for the socially disadvantaged, protecting the environment, funding its other social services through the profits earned, etc. Its profits will be principally reinvested in the business for the social objectives that it pursues, rather than distribution to its shareholders”
(Social Enterprise Hong Kong).

In both definitions, social enterprise is defined as a business driven by its economic objectives and its social objectives simultaneously. The profits earned by a social enterprise must be used to achieve its social objectives, or to be reinvested into its business development, rather than to be distributed to its shareholders or owners. In

other words, social enterprise is non-profit in nature. It makes profit to sustain itself, and it is supposed to deliver social goods and services in the same manner as NPOs.

Social entrepreneurship definitions: inclusive vs. exclusive

Light (2005) pinpointed that people may apply different perspectives in defining social entrepreneurship. They may apply an inclusive definition or apply an exclusive one.

For example, Hulgard (2010) has applied an inclusive definition of social entrepreneurship, in which social entrepreneurship is defined as follows:

“the creation of a social value that is produced in collaboration with people and organisations from the civil society who are engaged in social innovations that usually imply an economic activity.”

This definition has contained social value creation, civil society collaboration, social innovation, and economic activity as the four indisputable characteristics of social entrepreneurship.

On the contrary, if one looks at the ways governments define social enterprise, one will find that only the social value creation characteristic and the economic activity characteristic of social entrepreneurship have been addressed. Governments tend to apply an exclusive or narrow definition of social entrepreneurship. In view of this, there seems to be some gaps that exist in the understandings of what social entrepreneurship is between governments and others, such as social entrepreneurship advocates and scholars. These gaps of understanding have brought at least two issues into the study of social entrepreneurship.

Issues of social entrepreneurship

In the first issue, just as its “social” part may have implied, social entrepreneurship is closely related to notions such as social change, social impact, social innovation, civil society collaboration, social inclusion, and social empowerment (e.g. see Austin et. al., 2006). Applying an exclusive definition of social entrepreneurship may rule out further discussion on these notions and provide no further investigative possibilities on them.

On the other hand, as Light (2006) has pointed out, an inclusive definition of social entrepreneurship may bring many interchangeable terms to the study of social entrepreneurship, such as intra-entrepreneurship (public organisations' adoption of an entrepreneurial orientation), and corporate social responsibility (commercial organisations engaging in some nonprofit activities). These similar concepts may take the study of social entrepreneurship out of focus.

The second issue is, the concept of social entrepreneurship consists of the "social" part and the "entrepreneurship" part. Scholars (e.g. Lehner, 2012; Chell, 2007) claim this combination has made "social entrepreneurship" become an ambiguous, hybrid and dichotomous concept. For example, at the social enterprise level, social enterprise involves creating social values (the "social" part) and creating economic values (the "entrepreneurship" part) at the same time. But its social objectives and its economic objectives are so diverse that they can be in conflict with each other sometimes. For instance, to use the profit for its social objectives or to reinvest the profit into its business development? Di Domenico et. al. (2010) criticised the value creation process of social enterprise as actually a process of creating "social bricolage".

For these considerations, the current study will take both the inclusive sense and the exclusive sense of social entrepreneurship into account, and it also will pay attention to the potential conflicts that may exist in social enterprise's value creation process.

1.2. Actors and Discourses

The study of social entrepreneurship is a multidisciplinary one — sociology, public management, finance, political institutes, business, business ethics, and psychology to name a few (Lehner, 2012). But scholars (e.g. Dey, 2006; Hervieux et al., 2010; and Nicholls, 2010) have argued that the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship is being actively constructed by its powerful actors, such as business schools (Dey, 2006), institutional actors (Hervieux et al., 2010), and paradigm-building actors/ resources-rich actors (Nicholls, 2010). The actors' focal points of construction are diverse, some of them may focus on applying business approaches and practices to the social enterprise

sector, and others may emphasise more on bringing up the moral and ethical aspects of social entrepreneurship when talking about social enterprise development.

Among them, the prominent business schools (e.g. Harvard and Oxford), the business community, and the social venture capitalists have considerable influence on the field of social entrepreneurship (Dey, 2006). The prominent business schools may have popularised the 'business model' of social entrepreneurship (social enterprise) globally. For instance, through their social entrepreneurship courses that are included in their MBA programs (Dey, 2007). At the same the business community and the social venture capitalists may have been collaborating with business schools in promoting their 'business model' in developing the social enterprise sector.

Nicholls (2010) has expressed concern about the discourse on developing the social enterprise sector in a 'business-like' model and how it may have gradually dominated the social entrepreneurship field. While the alternative discourses, such as to develop the social enterprise sector from an 'advocacy/social change' perspective, may have been marginalised.

As discussed above, the governments tend to relate social enterprise to the third sector or the nonprofit sector only, and they tend to apply an exclusive or narrow definition of social entrepreneurship. So it would be interesting to look at the governments' side, have they also embraced a business-like model in developing the social enterprise sector? This question will be investigated in the empirical part later.

1.3. Government and Social Enterprise

Governments are found being supportive in developing the social enterprise sector. For instance, in the year 2001, the Hong Kong government launched the 'Enhancing Employment of People with Disabilities through Small Enterprise Project' (the 3E's project) to provide local non-governmental organisations (NGOs) with seed money to found their social enterprises. In 2010, the 3E's project released \$150 million HKD and

created 1600 jobs (LCQ14, 2010). Why do governments support the social enterprise sector?

Government, the non-profit sector and social enterprise

Hulgard (2010) argued that in the western world, the states, with an aim to create a “work better and cost less” government, have applied “market” to a broader realms of society, especially in the public sector and in the nonprofit sector. He highlighted that as a result, two trends are having an impact on governments’ interest in promoting social enterprise:

- Public responsibility for public welfare is being privatised;
- civil society, community and social capital have entered high politics.

These two trends are inter-related. In the first trend, when governments cut cost from public spending by privatising their public responsibility, some alternative “actors” need to take up the public responsibility. And then it follows the second trend, that civil society, community and social capital have come in to share the public responsibility.

In line with Hulgard’s observations, having reviewed the previous studies, Bull (2008) has summarised several reasons for the emergence of the term “Social Enterprise”:

- The decline of state involvement in social provision, and the introduction of “market” into a broader realm;
- the focus of a culture that emphasises self-reliance and personal responsibility; and the rise of entrepreneurship more generally;
- changes in funding opportunities within the community, voluntary and nonprofit sectors, specifically the move from grant giving to contract/competitive tendering and the devolution, deregulation and privatisation of welfare states globally.

In other words, Bull (2008) has argued that the state’s declining involvement in social provision, the declining funding opportunities for the non-profit sector, and the promotion of a self-reliance and self-responsibility culture, are the three major reasons

for social enterprise to gain popularity among the governments and the non-profit sector.

Combining the observations of Hulgard's and the observations of Bull's, the relationship between government, the non-profit sector and the social enterprise sector can be reasoned in this way:

- Government wants to spend less on social provision (by cutting costs);
- the non-profit sector takes up some public responsibilities;
- the non-profit sector needs funding to deliver social goods and services;
- social enterprises are capable of making profits from the market;
- government supports and promotes social enterprise development.

Critiques of government involvement

Based on the above explanations, it is logical for the governments to promote social enterprise development. In their study, Shockley & Frank (2011) demonstrated that government has played many roles in achieving large-scale social change through developing social entrepreneurship, such as “originator and implementer, bungler, imitator and adopter, or adapter and promoter” (Shockley & Frank, 2011. P.182).

Nevertheless, government's active promotion of social enterprise has brought up critiques. Scholars criticise government for putting its own logic and agendas into its promotion of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship, and they see the emergence of social enterprise as government's new institutional logic to address social problems in ways that avoid longstanding bureaucratic approaches (Lounsbury & Strang, 2009). Dey (2012) has argued that government positions social enterprise as a remedy for its lack of financial resources to provide welfare service. Social entrepreneurship is believed to represent the state's reflectivity towards its welfare problems (Hervieux 2010; Nicholls, 2011).

1.4. Social Enterprise in Hong Kong

Hong Kong is a city with relatively low social welfare spending. The Centre for Civil Society & Governance of the Hong Kong University (The Centre HKU) summarised the Hong Kong government subvention (not including public health care and education) to social services organisations (CSOs) from the year 1998 to the year 2010, and the statistics show that the public expenditure on CSOs accounted for about 3% to 3.5% annually of the actual spending in government's budget (The Centre HKU, 2010, p. 15).

This is no coincidence given the fact that in Hong Kong, the non-government organisations (NGOs) with philanthropic backgrounds (e.g. religious) are active in providing social welfare services. According to the Hong Kong Council of Social Service (HKCSS), an umbrella non-governmental organisation, the local NGOs have provided over 90% of the city's social welfare services (HKCSS, 2006).

For social enterprise, official statistics are unavailable, though it is estimated that 90% of local social enterprises in Hong Kong are currently run by these NGOs. In mid-2006, there were 48 NGOs operating 187 social enterprise units (Li & Wong, 2007). The number was 457 in mid-2014, according to the survey conducted by Center for Entrepreneurship, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (The Center CUHK, 2014).

Work Integration Social Enterprise (WISE)

In its 2007 Commission on Poverty (CoP) Report, the Hong Kong government stressed that social enterprise 'is an innovative approach to promote self-reliance and to provide community employment opportunities for the unemployed to integrate into the job market' (CoP Report, 2007).

In Hong Kong, the type of social enterprise that aims to facilitate the employment of the socially disadvantaged people for better integration in the society is called Work Integration Social Enterprise (WISE). In its survey in the year 2014, the Center for Entrepreneurship, Chinese University of Hong Kong, found that 83.3% of the local social enterprises surveyed (145 out of 174 respondents) state that work integration is their social objective (The Center CUHK, 2014).

The WISE type social enterprise is used as an important tool to fight poverty. For example, the ESR Programme provides seed money (a lump-sum mode is applied) for the eligible NGOs and NPOs to set up social enterprises. In return, the grantee social enterprises are supposed to provide suitable employment to the socially disadvantaged people, thus to help them enhance self reliance. There are several public funds for the NGOs and NPOs to establish their own social enterprises in the Hong Kong.

Public funds for social enterprise start-ups

Table 1 is listing the name and funding objectives of the current major public funds:

Fund Name	Fund Objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Enhancing Self-Reliance Through District Partnership Programme (ESR Programme) 	<p>... to promote sustainable poverty prevention and alleviation effort at the district level by provision of job opportunities to the socially disadvantaged groups... to enhance self-reliance...</p> <p>https://www.esr.gov.hk/en/about_esr.html#overview</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2. Enhancing Employment of People with Disabilities through Small Enterprise Project (3E's Project) 	<p>... to enhance employment of disabled people through market-driven approach... provide seed money to NGOs... to ensure disabled people...sympathetic working environment.</p> <p>https://www.mcor.swd.gov.hk/en/project/overview.htm</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3. Community Investment and Inclusion Fund (CIIF) 	<p>... to pursue social solidarity, social inclusion, self-help, mutual help, and social participation.</p> <p>https://www.ciif.gov.hk/en/about-ciif/fund-objectives.html</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4. Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship Development Fund (SIE Fund) 	<p>...to solve social problems faced by the government, especially poverty problem.</p> <p>https://www.sie.gov.hk/en/who-we-are/sie-fund.page</p>

TABLE 1. Social Enterprise Start-up Funds

Table 1 reveals that poverty alleviation is the primary objective of these funds. In other words, government's primary consideration on setting up these funds is about helping the socially disadvantaged people, especially about helping them to enhance self-reliance (e.g. ESR programme). In view of this, government's funding on the social enterprise sector can be deemed as one of its welfare reform strategies.

Based on the aforementioned information, characteristics of the social and political context for Hong Kong's social enterprise sector can be summarised as follows:

- Hong Kong governments tends to spend less on social provision (counts for about 3%-3.5% of public subvention);
- the non-profit sector provides 90% of Hong Kong's social welfare services;
- approximately 90% of social enterprises are run by the non-profit sector organisations;
- 83.3% of the local social enterprises are WISE type social enterprises;
- the primary objective of the local social enterprise funds is poverty alleviation;
- social enterprise is deemed as “an innovative approach to promote self-reliance and to provide employment to the socially disadvantaged people”.

1.5. About the Thesis

Chiu & Wong (2010) argued that the emergence of social enterprises is an institutional innovation to tackle the welfare-reform problems. They studied the relationship between the state and social enterprise development from a structured approach, and from which they found that there is a strong connection between a state's welfare reform and the development of social enterprise. The resources available, the activities suitable, and the new space/ market-niches available for social enterprises, are largely determined by a state's welfare reform agenda (Chiu & Wong, 2010).

This view of Chiu & Wong (2010) will be examined by the empirical evidence provided by this study. The current study will apply the social psychological perspectives, such as the social constructionist perspectives and the discursive psychological approach of discourse analysis, to develop the theoretical and methodological framework of the research. The aim of the study is to explore how may government construct the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship in the context of Hong Kong.

The following has summarised the tasks to be performed in the coming chapters:

Chapter 2 will examine how entrepreneurship has been studied in the discipline of social psychology. It will discuss the tenets of social constructionism and present some important characteristics of discourses analysis as a qualitative research method. After that, it will elaborate the theory and approach of agency, and then briefly outline the entrepreneurship discourses from the power relation approach.

Chapter 3 will explain the basic ideas of discourse analysis from the discursive psychological perspective, and then it will summarise the method of interpretative repertoire provided by Potter & Wetherell (1987). Based on the theoretical and methodological framework that has been developed from both Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, the main research question evolves into three subquestions, and the subquestions will be discussed according to their own focal points and considerations.

Chapter 4 will provide the descriptions and justifications of the selected research materials, and then it will explain the primary coding processes of the research in details. After that, it will briefly illustrate the analytical strategies applied in the study.

Chapter 5 will first describe the identified subject categories with linguistic instances from the research materials, and then it will explain the functions of the identified repertoires on the government's construction of social entrepreneurship. After that, it will present the research findings that were analysed by the agency approach, and then the research findings that were analysed by the power reaction approach.

Chapter 6 will answer the three subquestions by making reference to the key research findings. Then it will further discuss the effects and consequences of the government's construction of social entrepreneurship by looking at the social enterprise sector first, and then by focusing on the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship in general. Thesis conclusions will be drawn on the basis of the discussions of effects and consequences of the government's construction of social entrepreneurship. After that, it will continue discussing the strengths and the limitations of the whole study, and then provide some thoughts and considerations for the future research of social entrepreneurship.

2. Social Psychological Perspectives

2.1. Social Psychology of Entrepreneurship

Vesala (2012) and his research team studied entrepreneurship from an agency and self perspective. Their approach considers entrepreneurship discourses as evolving but controversial frames for experience, action and policy in modern life.

Their entrepreneurship studies mainly occur in a farm context, in which traditional family farms are facing challenges confronted by trends of market-oriented business, promoted particularly by the neo-liberal policies. The study topics range from the changing patterns of farm business practices, issues of farmer's self-identity, entrepreneurial values and skills, to the construction of entrepreneurial agency at both individual level and structural level. Social psychological approaches such as the ones from cognitive approaches and social constructionist approaches, qualitative methods and quantitative methods, are widely applied (Vesala & Vesala, 2010).

The conception of entrepreneurship is investigated from a micro level of exploration, such as individual's self-identity, values, skills and other personal aspects, to a macro level of exploration which concerns on constructions and discourses in the political and social contexts (Vesala, 2012). At the individual level, entrepreneurship constructions and discourses are available to entrepreneurs, they can either accept the discourses or reject them. While at the structural level, entrepreneurship constructions and discourses can make influence on social structures and social relations (Burr, 2003).

In her study of entrepreneurship discourses, Chell (2007) pinpointed that the term 'enterprise' was used to identify depressed areas first occurred in the early to mid 1980s, when Thatcherite government in the UK promoted 'enterprise culture' and 'free-market' philosophy. Chell argued that the enterprise discourse implies people may be and should be enterprising with good qualities such as being responsible, hard-working, and practicing self-help; in addition, people are also supposed to acquire business skills and knowledge in order to create wealth and self-employment.

Chell (2007) criticised the term ‘enterprise’ itself is a “highly malleable construct”, which is subject to the change of the political climate and institutional influences that attempt to shape its meaning for particular social and political ends (Chell, 2007, p11). This argument encourages entrepreneurship study to be conducted in a critical way.

A similar argument is put forward by Cornwall (2010) in her introductory article for the book *Deconstructing Buzzwords*. Cornwall noted that the widespread buzzword of “enterprise culture” is an oxymoron in which “enterprise” stands for individual excellence, effort, hard work and the assumption of personal responsibility for actions, while “culture” refers to attitudes and values that are socially derived. When “enterprise” and “culture” are put together, they contradict each other. Cornwall agreed with the point of Chell, that the discourse of “enterprise culture” is used to fulfil the language user’s social and political ends.

By reviewing the study of entrepreneurship in the field of social psychology, the current social entrepreneurship study can find itself situating at the macro level of exploration. Its main focal point is on the constructions and discourses of social entrepreneurship in the political and social contexts. And its main aim is to see how government’s construction of social entrepreneurship may influence the relations between government and the social enterprise sector.

Like Chell’s study, the current study will apply a social constructionist perspective as its theoretical framework to study government’s construction of social entrepreneurship in Hong Kong. Moreover, the qualitative methodologies introduced by social psychology of entrepreneurship, which have their focus on the use of language will be applied. The following sections will elaborate in detail the social constructionist perspectives, discourse analysis, discursive psychology and the related concepts of the study.

2.2. Social Constructionism

According to Burr (2003), social constructionism is a theoretical orientation under the umbrella of which, there are different approaches, such as critical psychology,

discursive psychology, and discourse analysis. Although they may understand discourses, research aims and methods, as well as empirical focal points differently, they share the same key premises of social constructionism.

Premises of social constructionism

Gergen (1999) outlined four of these key premises. First, social constructionism challenges the assumptions that scientific knowledge reflects 'reality', and it is critical towards positivism (what exists is what we perceive to exist) and empiricism (the only valid knowledge is derived from observation and experiment). For instance, the notion of the colour green can refer to very different subjects: 'green silk' is black hair; 'green smoke' is white smoke; and 'green sky' is blue sky. It seems that the notion of 'green' means different things in different frames of reference it may appear in.

Second, social constructionism maintains that the way we understand the world is situated historically and culturally. For instance, the notion of 'beauty' is changing across times and cultures: what is considered to be desirable body shape for women is different in the past and in today, such as 'being plump' versus 'being skinny'; same is true to the tone of skin. In northern Europe, females may prefer to have a 'brown' figure, some girls may even turn to brown cream in the winter time when the sunshine is inadequate; while in Eastern Asia during the summer time, to stay in 'fair-skinned' is a daily lesson for all the beauty-conscious women. This means that what we consider as 'beautiful' is not naturally existing, rather it is historically and culturally constructed.

Third, social constructionism believes that our understanding of things is sustained by social processes and human interactions. For instance, we come to understand 'being frank and telling the truth directly' through our social interactions with individual according to certain standards which are historically and culturally constructed. The same individual who always speaks straightforwardly can be viewed as being frank in 'getting something off his chest' in the United States, while in Mainland China, this person may be viewed as 'immature, unsophisticated and even childish for not having learnt to contain his feelings. Therefore, what we regard as normal maybe only reflecting our current accepted ways of understanding through social processes.

Fourth, knowledge and social action negotiate with one another. Our understandings of the world are subject to change over time and place. For instance, the American Medical Association (the AMA) in 2013 recruited 'obesity' as a new disease, which suggests that our understanding of 'being too fat' should now be shifted from a personal image problem to a social health problem. Individuals who are overweight can be seen as victims of obesity, which may imply medical treatment is needed. In the new representation or discourse of obesity provided by the AMA, overweight people may no longer be held accountable for their 'being too fat' which may also imply that taking pills is better than food intake reduction or exercise, and so on.

In summary, social constructionists believe that social reality is not neutrally reflecting the world, it is historically and culturally constructed. Our understanding of the world is shaped by social processes and is always subject to change over time and place.

Micro level and macro level of social construction

Micro level social construction takes place within everyday discourses between people in interaction. For instance, in everyday interactions people take up positions or roles such as a 'lover' or a 'friend', which implicitly expect the other person to fit into a reciprocal position. The other person can either accept or reject to be a lover, or a friend. Social constructionists use the notion of positioning to acknowledge this active mode in which people locate themselves during social interaction. Multiple versions of realities are available through this discursive and constructive interaction process (Blur, 2003 p21 - 23, p113-114; Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

Macro level social construction emphasises the influence of social structures, social relations, and institutionalised practices on the construction of language, and power relationship is at the focal point of research and study (Fairclough, 2003).

The main objective of the current study is to see how government's construction of social entrepreneurship may influence the relations between the government and the social enterprise sector, thus the current study will apply the macro level of social construction as its theoretical framework.

2.3. Discourse Analysis

Social constructionists recognise the power of culturally available discourses as resources and constraints to frame our experience, to constrain our behaviours, and to allow us to apply them in social situations (Blur, 2003). Fairclough (2003) defined discourses from two senses. In abstract noun sense, discourse involves people's diverse ways of acting in social life and producing social life. So discourses can refer to interviews, everyday conversations, and meetings. When discourse is used as a count noun, it refers to the ways of representing aspects of the world. For instance, the processes, relations and structures of the material and social world, the psychological world of thoughts, feelings, beliefs, and so forth.

On the contrary, Potter & Wetherell (1987) approached the term discourse in a simpler way. They defined discourse as including all forms of spoken interaction, formal and informal, and written texts of all kinds. The current study will recruit discourse definitions provided by both Fairclough's and Potter & Wetherell's, in an inclusive way.

Discourse analysis can refer to different methods of doing analysis. Jorgensen & Phillips (2002) pinpointed that a discourse analysis approach is not just a method for data analysis, but a theoretical and methodological whole. Discourse analysis is a complete package containing the philosophical premises, the methodological guidelines to approach a research domain and specific techniques to analyse.

For example, Van Dijk (2010) provided a socio-cognitive approach of discourse analysis. Dramatically different from what the social constructionist believe, this socio-cognitive approach assumes that there are collectively shared internal entities out there to be explored. Such as beliefs, knowledge, attitudes, norms, values and ideologies. Discourses are treated as mental models which are constituted in the social interaction processes. For example, a politician as a discourse participant in his own group, his speech may be seen as revealing the collective mental model of his group.

On the contrary, discursive psychologists, such as Potter & Wetherell (1987) have moved away from analysing these internal entities, and focused more on language/ the

discourse itself, such as people's speaking and writing. They do not see discourse as a reflection of any underlying mental models by one's self or by one's social self. Instead, they see discourse is being constructed by its users to make things happen. They are interested in understanding the effects and consequences of using discourse.

Example: Fox-hunting discourses

Burr (2003) proposed a social constructionist perspective of discourse analysis. She suggested that people can construct many different versions for the same thing. She illustrated her view with the example of Fox-hunting.

Supporters of Fox-hunting may use the discourse of 'Pest Control', which represents the activity as a natural method of controlling the fox population, to articulate their position. So they tend to use accounts such as 'if it wasn't for the hunt, the fox population would run out of control'. Likewise, they may create the image of 'the farmers as victims of foxes' and 'foxes are a pest to farmers who lose thousands and thousands of pounds.' On the contrary, the Animal Rights activists may use the 'Anti-Fox-hunting' discourse to bring up opposite representations and accounts. Such as criticising the activity as immoral and barbaric by using accounts 'fox hunting as the contravention of basic morality', 'only animals need fur', and 'foxes have basic rights to life just like humans'.

By using different discourses, people are able to bring up diverse aspects and focal points of the same object, and these different discourses are competing guidelines for social actions and policy making. Therefore, social constructionist approaches of discourse analysis provide a critical alternative to study social phenomenon (Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Jorgensen and Philips, 2002; Burr, 2003; Fairclough, 2003).

Social constructionist perspective of discourse analysis is suitable for the current study. This study will further explore the effects and consequences of government's construction by identifying what discourses have been used by the government in its construction of social entrepreneurship, and by analysing the meanings of these discourses. These discourses are guidelines for government's social enterprise policy.

2.4. Theories of Agency

The previous sections have provided an overview of the theoretical and methodological frameworks of the current study. In this section, the theory of agency will be elaborated. From the agency approach, to understand how government constructs social entrepreneurship, questions can be asked in this way: how is agency constructed for the social enterprise sector by the government?

Rhetorical agency

Social constructionists believe that social life involves a set of distinct yet complementary social positions. Actors can take different positions in their interaction, which are always defined in part by the complementary social position, such as giving-receiving, commanding-obeying, assigning-fulfilling. Facing the positioning of roles, actors can either to accept or to resist such roles in social life interactions (Burr, 2003).

Campbell (2005) defined agency from a rhetorical way. Rhetorical agency is an actor's capacity to act, the competence to speak or write in a way that will be recognised or paid attention to by other members in one's community. Campbell argued that rhetorical agency is essential for public participation because only with such competence, actors can enter into the ongoing cultural conversations within one's community, that is because the external materials, symbolic elements of the context and culture constitute and constrain one's actions. Consequently, in order to gain rhetorical agency, actors must be able to negotiate among powers and articulate for themselves (Campbell, 2005). In other words, with better rhetorical agency, actors will be more capable of either accepting or resisting any roles that are constructed for them.

Positioning: a way to describe agency

Gillespie (2012) provided a position exchange approach to explain agency. He approached agency by seeing how far away actors are acting independently of their immediate situations. That is, to see how much one's agency is motivated by concerns beyond the situation, such as a distant goal, an abstract principle, or for someone else. Agency is found both where actors are able to step out of the ongoing actions by

reflecting on what is going on; and on where actors are able to participate vicariously in the actions and experiences of others, such as in the case of empathy and sympathy.

So position exchange is about actors' ability in integrating the perspectives of their own and other's. Actors do not have to share the same perspective with others, instead, they can maintain their own perspective while also taking an alternative perspective into account. Therefore, position exchange enables actors to reflect on their own situations and participate in the situations of others (Gillespie, 2012).

Social constructionists believe that subject position is a process for individuals to produce identities. When people recognise themselves as the person hailed in a particular ideology, they have already become that person (Burr, 2003 p. 111). Burr maintained that the function of discourses is the same as ideologies, which will address individuals with particular positions, and it is difficult for individuals to escape from those positions. The only choice is either to accept them or to resist them, that is, if people accept or if they are unable to resist a particular position, then they are locked into the system of rights and obligations that are carried with that position.

Gillespie (2012) argued that, even though his model of agency is being highly social, it is not as pessimistic as the one provided by the social constructionist perspectives. Actors gain agency through social interaction, still they possess agency to the degree that they can escape themselves from these interactions (p.45). And position exchange helps an actor to see the perspectives of his own and other people's perspective at the same time. The actor may choose to integrate the perspectives to execute other's wishes, or to be self-directed and act for one's own purposes. With this ability of perspective taking, one can become a better agent and principal.

2.5. Frame Approach of Agency

In his course of social psychology and agency, Vesala (2012) suggested a frame approach to analyse agency. A frame excludes irrelevant messages, and implies a background to understand the content. Frames can be psychological, such as cognitive

contexts shaping our perceptions, and be social (communicative), such as discourses in the process of communication, and these different frames can be used to analyse experiences, interactions and communications (Vesala, 2012).

Frame	Individualistic	Relationalistic
Executive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An agent makes things happen - agency is located in the agent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agent/others make thing happen - agency is located in the relation.
Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individualistic principal; - Agency to serve oneself; - agency is located in the agent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relationalistic principal; - Agency to serve others; - agency is located in the relation.

TABLE 2. *Frame Approach of Agency*

In the first dimension of the frame approach of agency, the individualistic frame refers to an actor making things happen through intentions, autonomy, and decision-makings. The events are caused by the actor. Agency is attributed to the actor.

The relationalistic frame refers to an actor making things happen through relations, such as by something or somebody else. So agency is attributed to the relation between an individual and something/somebody. Based on the individualistic and relationalistic framing, two questions can be asked:

- on what conditions are the individualistic frame and the relationalistic frame are applied?
- where is the agency located?

When an individual is believed to make things happen by herself or himself, agency is located in the agent, it's individualistic framing. When something or somebody is believed to be involved in making things happen, then agency is located in the relation, it's relationalistic framing.

In the second dimension, the frame approach of agency brings up the executive frame and the principal frame. The executive frame is related to the concept of autonomy. Actors are seen as being autonomous, self-directed, and acting for their own purposes.

The executive frame is used to describe things happening by one's autonomous qualities.

The principal frame refers to an actor making things happen to serve for somebody or something. An actor may execute the wishes of the self or others. An actor is defined as an instrument for carrying out the wishes of the self or others. To be specific, the principal can be the self, other person, government, society, and abstract values. The principal frame can shift from the individualistic dimension (the self as the principal-the individualistic principal) to the relationalistic dimension (others as the principal, the relationalistic principal).

The frame approach of agency is useful in understanding the way government constructs the agency of the social enterprise sector in the context of Hong Kong. This approach provides two analytical dimensions. On the government's construction of agency, one can first look at the goals assigned to the social enterprise sector, and on what conditions the individualistic frame and the relationalistic frame are applied; second one can further identify who are the principals of the social enterprise sector's agency. The current study will apply the frame approach of agency as one of the analytical strategies in analysing the government's construction of social entrepreneurship.

The concept of position exchange and the frame approach of agency have both shed lights on the way to study how government constructs the relationship between itself and the social enterprise sector. Thus the question "how is agency constructed for the social enterprise sector by the government?" can be investigated from the perspective of government on three levels:

- Exerting the agency of the social enterprise sector to make what happen?
(concerning on the goals)
- Exerting the agency of the social enterprise sector for what, or for whom?
(concerning on the principals)
- Making the agency of the social enterprise sector happen by what means?
(concerning on the conditions)

2.6. Discourses, Agency and Power Relation

Entrepreneurship studies that follow the critical discourse analysis tradition are found focusing on how government may use discourses to construct positions, roles and agency for itself and for others. In their study of government's entrepreneurship discourse in the commercial context, Perren & Jennings (2005) have identified three discourses used by the government:

- Discourse of power, an assertion of influence or authority to control others, reveals a structural grand narrative of entrepreneurs and small businesses having a role in the 'economic machine' and an implicit responsibility to deliver results imposed at macro-level; while the government is portrayed as having the right to impose its wishes and desires upon entrepreneurs and small businesses.
- Discourse of legitimacy, the justification and vindication of action, beliefs, and attitudes, is a discourse of the 'supremacy of structure over entrepreneurial agency', calling upon the wider 'taken for granted' ideology of rational economic behaviour and enterprise (e.g. striving for growth, profitability, and competition.), colonising an entrepreneur's own search for social space, imposing functions on their life-worlds, and re-directing towards a new dominating agenda.
- Discourse of subjugation, the subordination and suppression of perspectives alternative to the dominant ideology, maintaining that entrepreneurs and small business are dependent, and in order to succeed, they need government help and government actions meet such needs.

It indicates that in the government's discourses of entrepreneurship, government constructs itself as having the power and legitimacy to direct others. The entrepreneurial agency of entrepreneurs and enterprises is constructed for 'economic development', and they are subordinated to government's will.

Therefore, the construction of agency is related to power relations. When government constructs itself as the principal of other actors' agency, it has already put itself in a high position, and other actors in a lower one. So the power relation approach will also be one of the analytical strategies of the current study.

3. Discursive Psychology

From social psychological perspectives, language is the most basic form of human interaction, so the study of language can bring better understandings on social life and social interactions. The way we understand our experience, perceive ourselves and others, and describe the world are all structured by language (Burr, 2003).

Discursive psychology moves away from analysing human internal entities such as attitude, beliefs, and personality, but to focus on language itself such as people's speaking and writing. Discursive psychologists don't access language as a pathway to understand human internal mental models, instead, they look at how language is being constructed by its users. Different from other methods in traditional conversation analysis, the discursive psychological approach of discourse analysis focuses less on grammatical structures, but more on the functions, effects, consequences and variation of language construction (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

3.1. Components of Language

According to Potter & Wetherell (1987), language is functional and used to do things, such as ordering, persuading, and justifying. But the functions of languages are not explicitly expressed by its users, sometimes deliberately and intentionally in the making sense process, so it requires analysis. People's talks and texts can orient to multiple functions. For example, someone's request is achieved by asking a question: "don't you think the music is too loud?". People may not always state about what they mean or tell directly what they are doing such as requesting the listener to turn down the volume.

The content of talks and texts and the styles of presenting them are intentionally or naturally adjusted by people, all depending on the circumstance of occurring and the speaker's purpose of speaking. For instance, someone can intentionally self-present oneself by disguising one's meaning in a plain description: "I read *The Economist*", "I eat anti-inflammatory foods". Mentioning one's habit of reading *The Economist* to

present oneself in an intellectual air, and revealing one's eating an anti-inflammatory diet as presenting oneself in a favourable lifestyle light.

Context of language

Context is important in analysing functions. As discourse has an action orientation, such contextual information is helpful in clarifying the orientation of talk and its involvement of acts. For instance, when someone notices he may have broken the dress code in an occasion, he may then make an account to excuse his behaviour in a certain way if he wishes. If the man says "I am back from Honolulu" to the lady sitting next to him, and it's her facial expression that the man realises his dress code error. But one is unlikely to understand the statement's function if one does not know the context. In this case attending an all-black party and he is in a colourful Hawaiian outfit. The statement here is used to excuse the 'difference' (dressing in Hawaiian style).

Construction of language

When people are describing a certain social phenomenon, they are not merely describing it, but actively constructing it. People tends to choose "particular words, phrases, terms of reference, metaphors, rhetorical styles, and systematisations of knowledge" over others, and arrange the chosen ones together in a certain way (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Eventually a certain version of reality is constructed. In other words, when people are making accounts of events, they are using a variety of pre-existing linguistic resources by choosing some resources but omitting others, and "reality" is thus constructed.

In the example of 'Discourse of Immigration', Potter & Wetherell (1987) elaborated their view that people's description, evaluation and explanation of attitudinal objects are directed towards specific formulations. When being asked to talk about the 'Polynesian crime', respondents were not merely providing a neutral description of a 'Polynesian immigrant' and then giving their views. Instead, they were actively constructing their own versions of a 'Polynesian immigrant' by displaying some evaluations. For example, one respondent displayed his evaluations in this way:

“... and the problem’s that a lot of people coming in with mental disease I think it is, because there is a lot of interbreeding in those... islands. And that brings a big, high increase of retards and then people who come over here, retards perhaps and they...”

In this account, Polynesian immigrants were portrayed as a group of people with mental diseases and whose settling in New Zealand may bring social problems (Potter and Wetherell, 1987, p. 51). This example demonstrates that people’s description, evaluation and explanation of attitudinal objects create different versions, and they will bring different consequences.

Variation of language

Variation of language is another key point of analysis. The same phenomenon can be described in various ways (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Analysing variation of language is useful for two reasons. First, variability is an expected usual feature of conversation and social texts, even though people may try to conceal it. Second, consistency and inconsistency are both negotiable according to occasions. For example, on some occasion variations in accounts may be seen as inconsistent, while on other occasion, variations can be seen as sensible and rational. So discourse analysis is interested in the ways consistency and inconsistency are used variably as argumentative or rhetorical strategies (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

In summary, discourse analysis provided by discursive psychology is more about analysing the functions of texts, the ways accounts are constructed, the consequence of such functions and constructions, and the strategies behind language users’ consistency or inconsistency in accounts. Interpretative repertoire is used as a qualitative research tool to do discourse analysis in discursive psychology.

3.2. Interpretative Repertoire

According to Potter & Wetherell (1987), interpretative repertoire is a lexicon of terms and metaphors produced to characterise and evaluate actions and events. It indicates that texts do not merely reflect or describe objects and events, they also actively construct versions of objects and events. Thus interpretative repertoires can bring social and

political implications To identify interpretative repertoire is to systematically look at the organisation of phenomena which social psychologists have traditionally understood through attitudes, beliefs, and attributions (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). This process will involve identifying the culturally available linguistic resources that speakers use in building their constructions. Identifying interpretative repertoires is part of the analytical approach of discourses analysis (Burr, 2003).

Repertoire involves flexibility of accounts to be put together in different ways to suit the occasion (Burr, 2003). For instance, researchers can look for the various metaphors, images, and representations are used in constructing versions of the same objects and events. That is, to examine the talks and texts of different people about the same topic. On the other hand, repetition of patterns can also be found in the way that some metaphors, images and representations recur among the texts produced by different people on the same topic. That is, these patterns can be seen as belonging to a particular repertoire. Both variability and repetition are features of repertoire (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

In their study, Potter & Reicher (1987) analysed the way the terms “community” and “community relations” were used in different accounts of the St Paul’s riot of 1980. Their research started from all instances that used the word ‘community’ and synonyms and these instances were analysed by looking at the words describing ‘community’ and synonyms in each case. They found some descriptions were repeatedly used across different accounts, then they grouped these accounts into further categories, such as characterising the community as embodying a particular cohesive style of social relationship (e.g. ‘harmonious), as having an organic nature (it ‘grows’ and evolves’) and as having agency (it acts and knows) (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

They found that the community repertoire was used by different people in different accounts on the riot, and the purposes of using the repertoire were quite different. For example, in some instances the riot was characterised as a problem of “community relations”, in these accounts the police were constructed as forming a part of a wider community, and the community was constructed as suffering from difficulties in interpersonal relations and trust. In other accounts, the community repertoire was used

to characterise the event as an open conflict between the “black community” and the police. The use of community repertoire in contrasting ways eventually gave different versions of the event, thus providing different solutions to the problem (Potter & Reicher, 1987)

The study of “community repertoire” above indicates that researchers can gain insight about events, social actions and social constructions by analysing the ways repertoire are used by people. So interpretative repertoire is a method about analysing how discourse is constructed in relating to social actions, how people construct their understandings of the world in social interaction, and how these understandings work ideologically to support social structures and power relations (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

In summary, when doing discourse analysis from the discursive psychology approach, the focal points will be on the function, constructions, consequences and variations of the texts. The analysis of texts also involves forming hypotheses about the effects and consequences of constructions, especially the ones related to the ideological aspects. As the method of interpretative repertoire is capable of analysing ideological implications and power relations of language accounts, therefore it is particularly suitable for research with a focal point at the structural level, such as the current one whose concern is on governmental level of construction on the social entrepreneurship phenomenon.

3.3. Research Questions

The previous review on the literature has demonstrated that governments are playing an active role in promoting social entrepreneurship and social enterprise. The aim of study is on understanding the relationship between government and the social enterprise sector from the perspective of the government itself. So from the social constructionist perspectives, it would be reasonable to assume that, on the subject of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise, there will be many different constructions. Accordingly, the main research question is to be asked in this way:

- How government constructs social entrepreneurship in the context of Hong Kong?

From the perspective of discursive psychology, the government's construction of social entrepreneurship is likely to involve different subject categories, so one can first look for the subject categories and consider what roles and positions may have been constructed for them. The method of interpretative repertoire ((Potter & Wetherell, 1987) indicates that language users tend to apply different repertoires in constructing roles and positions for itself and for other subjects, therefore in this research, based on the main research question, the first sub-question can be asked as follows:

- What repertoires are used by the government to construct roles and positions for itself, for the social enterprise sector, and for other actors?

Interpretative repertoire is a method about analysing how discourse is constructed in relating to social actions, how people construct their understandings of the world in social interaction, and how these understandings work ideologically to support social structures and power relations. Discourse analysis from the discursive psychology approach, the focal points will be on the function, constructions, consequences and variations of the texts (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

So in order to understand how government constructs social entrepreneurship at the structural level, one then needs to see how the government's construction may ideologically support the power relations. The research focal point will then be put on to see how government constructs agency for the social enterprise sector and for other actors. The effects and consequences of these constructions of agency will be further analysed by the power relation approach. Therefore, the main research question can be divided into two more sub-questions as below:

- How is agency constructed for the social enterprise sector and other actors by the government?
- What effects and consequences may be brought by the government's construction of social entrepreneurship?

4. Materials, Coding and Analysis

4.1. Materials

The selected materials are official papers obtained from the government website. This choice is based on two reasons. First, government papers are formal and they are explaining government policies in the language of government's own. They are the best materials available about government accounts. Second, for the labour of research, as these papers can be easily accessed from government website, so less time is required in collecting data by this method, when compared with other methods, such as interviews.

To obtain the relevant papers from the database, the key words: "social enterprise" and "social entrepreneurship" were searched. Then all the relevant papers in English appeared, ranging from the year 2007 to the year 2017. They fell into three types:

- Legislative Council Questions and Answers about social enterprise (LCQ papers), 2007 - 2014, seven papers, presented by government administrative officers.
- Legislative Council Issue Paper of social enterprise (LC papers), 2009 - 2012, four papers, presented by Legislative Council Secretariat.
- Speech on Social Entrepreneurship summit (Speech), 2017, two speeches, presented by the Chief Executive and the Chief Secretary.

After reading through all these thirteen papers, seven papers from the LCQ paper, and one speech delivered by the Chief Secretary, were selected, for a total eight pieces.

This choice was made on two grounds: first, these LCQ papers and the speech produced by the government administrative officer were found to be more relevant to the current study, because the research questions concern the way government constructs social entrepreneurship. While the LC papers are mostly reports based on the government's information; second, the seven papers and one speech have provided sufficient data for the current study to analyse, so no more papers are needed.

4.2. The Selected Papers

There were eight papers selected, in total 28 pages of content, ranging from the year 2007 to the year 2017. A detailed list is also available on the government webpage for social enterprise: <https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/en/info-pub/speeches.html>.

	Year/Code	Total Pages	Main issues covered
1	2007-10 LCQ3	3ps	- Progress of current government SE programs; - Details about the SE which have applied for seed funding and how applications are examined.
2	2008-04 LCQ19	5ps	- Scheme on facilitating and examining SE in bidding on government contracts and procurement; - Activities and works on promoting and assisting SE development in the market and in capacity.
3	2010-05 LCQ14	3ps	- Current measures of promoting SE by government. - About the establishment of SE advisory committee.
4	2010-10 LCQ4	4ps	- Regarding to the amount of funds that have been granted, numbers by application, jobs created, the subsidized SEs operation statue, and other support provided by the three schemes launched.
5	2011-03 LCQ17	1ps	- ESR Program of granting funds to SE; reasons for non-approval of those unsuccessful applications; - Criteria and considerations of granting SE funds.
6	2014-04 LCQ18	5ps	- Details on how ESR Program provides seed grants for NPOs to set up SE: types of business, number of applications, and total amount of grants. - Details on government requirements to SE applicants.
7	2014-12 LCQ15	3ps	- Governmental measures in supporting SE development over the past few years; current SE numbers, SE business types, total jobs created, data of SE making profits and remaining n business.
8	2017-11 CS Speech	4ps	- Chief Secretary for Administration delivers speech at the Social Enterprise Summit 2017.

TABLE 3. Table of the Selected Papers

4.3. Primary Coding

Primary coding is a preliminary step of analysis. Its aim is to arrange the material body into manageable chunks. Results of the primary coding will be presented in Chapter 5 as findings. Coding is a way of finding themes and categories appearing in the materials. The process of coding does not provide analysis in depth, so there will be an intensive analysis after that. In the intensive analysis, the aim is to look for discourses contained in the texts and how these discourses are constructed, and its processes and strategies will be elaborated in the next section. Below are the steps of coding. Guided by the methods of Potter & Wetherell (1987), the coding process is divided into three steps.

Step 1: Identifying repeated subjects

Step 1 is to identify important elements of the material body, even though it is not yet known what the first set of themes/categories may look like. The main task is reading and rereading the materials for themes, codes, elements, and categories that may emerge with specific examples. In the course of reading and rereading, some subjects were found repeatedly appearing in the material body, such as social enterprise, community, employment, partnership, and self-reliance. They were labeled for the next step of coding.

Step 2: Identifying repeated themes and topics

Step 2 focuses on the recurring themes across different materials. For example, themes such as government's promotional activities, social enterprise's application for funds, and cross-sectoral collaboration activities, are mentioned repeatedly in papers from different years. Attention was paid on how the themes are exemplified, how they connect to each other, and how they relate to the subjects. At the end, a large quantity of category chunks were found. For instance, social-enterprise-disadvantaged-community employment-self-reliance. The irrelevant themes were deleted, and the repeated ones were synthesised into the existing ones.

Step 3: Categorising repeated subjects and repeated themes

In Step 3, the subjects found in Step 1 were related to the themes identified from Step 2, and four big categories emerged, namely the government, the social enterprise, the

community, and the exceptions. It is clear that the category of government includes any government's departments, administrative agencies and organisations. But the social enterprise category and the community category are too broad, that they were divided into sub-categories.

Categories emerged

The social enterprise category includes at least three different subjects: social enterprise as a venture, the operators, and the employees. The same is true of the community category. It refers to at least three different groups of people and organisations, so the subcategory of community A was labelled to accommodate the sophisticated community, such as actors from the business sector and the academia. Community B included the socially disadvantaged people. And community C was used to refer to the general public out there. As a result, eight categories were identified from the primary coding process. The categories will be further elaborated with instances in Chapter 5.

4.4. Analytical Strategies

Based on the results of the primary coding, an extensive analysis was conducted. The analysis consisted of four steps, and each with its own tasks.

Step 1: Finding roles and positions

Step 1 is about finding the roles and positions constructed for all the eight categories. In the commercial context, Perren & Jennings (2005) have indicated that government constructs a role for itself as a director of 'economic development', and constructs entrepreneur/ the small business as an agent for the 'economic development'. The current study seeks to identify roles and positions constructed in the context of the social enterprise sector.

Step 2: Identifying repertoires

Step 2 examines the linguistic evidence that is used in the construction of roles and positions, thus to identify the repertoires that are used in the construction process. As Nikander (2006) has recommended, research studies that follow a social constructionist

version of discourse analysis should make cross-reference to other studies and to make use of the existing discourse studies as a comparison point for one's research material, as by doing so, it will bring relevant and sustainable interpretations into one's analyses (Nikander, 2006). The social entrepreneurship literature sheds light on this process. The identified repertoires will be presented in Table 5, Chapter 5.

Step 3: Analysing agency

In this thesis, positioning is used as a way to describe agency (Burr, 2003; Gillespie, 2012). In step 3, the findings on roles and positions constructed by government were further analysed by the frame approach of agency. The aim is to understand government's construction of agency in a specific way (about the goals, the means and the principals of social enterprises). At the same time, it analyses agency through understanding the meanings of the repertoires, and the relationship of roles and positions constructed. For instance, to see how government positions itself and the social enterprise sector, and the repertoires used to support these positions.

Step 4: Analysing power relations

Step 4 further analyses the government's construction on agency by relating to power relations. The study of Perren & Jennings (2005) indicated that, government demonstrates power and authority by assigning the small and medium business sector with the goal and aim of exerting its entrepreneurial agency for the engine of 'economic development'. That is, government has portrayed itself as the principal of the entrepreneurial agency of entrepreneurs and the business sector. So the power relation between government and entrepreneur/ business sector is supreme vs. subordinate.

In order to achieve a broader perspective in hypothesising the consequences may be brought by the government's construction, the findings from the study of Perren & Jennings (2005) is used as reference and comparison points to this study.

5. Findings

5.1. The Identified Categories

Table 4 demonstrates the eight categories identified from the primary coding process.

Each category includes the roles and positions that may have been constructed for it.

Category	Subject / Actor	Roles / Positions
1. Government	Government, including administrative departments, agencies, and committees.	- SE promoter - SE facilitator - Fund provider - Social investor - Contracts provider
2. Social enterprise	Social enterprise organisations, ventures.	- Employment provider - Social services provider - Products and services provider - Products and services contractor
3. SE operators	SE administrative and managerial operators who found and operate SE business. Including NPOs.	- Lack of business acumen - Need capacity building - Need business mentorship - Subordinates to government
4. SE employees	People whom the SE business are expected to create employment for.	- Underprivileged people - Low-skilled people - Disabled people
5. Community A	The sophisticated community which has capital and resources.	- Cross-sectoral collaborators - Government partners - Assessment committees - SE operators's Mentors
6. Community B	Socially disadvantaged community which is in need of social welfare.	- Disadvantaged people - Social welfare dependents - People who needs self-reliance and social integration.
7. Community C	The general public, SE products consumers and clients (divergent, could be any forms of organisations)	- Customers in the market - Potential consumers including any form of organisations
8. The exceptions	Culture, collaboration, entrepreneurship.	- Caring culture to be promoted - Collaboration to be sought - Entrepreneurship to be taught

TABLE 4. Table of the Identified Categories

5.2. Descriptions of Category

The goal of this Chapter is to present results of the primary coding with excerpts and examples that are directly cited from the government's texts. They are arranged as cohesively and readable as possible, according to their own category in sequence.

1. Government

Throughout the material, the usage of "Government" could be referring to different administrative departments, agencies, and committees. For instance, the Home Affairs Department (HAD), the Social Welfare Department (SWD), and the Social Enterprise Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee). These departments may do different jobs, they represent the government, thus they are labeled under the government category.

Government is found constructing many roles for itself in the texts, for instance, as social enterprise promoter and social enterprise investor:

"...has pledged to promote the development of social enterprises...has provided seed money..." (LCQ3: 2007-10)

The texts portray that the government understands the multiple issues involving social enterprise's participation in the market competition:

"...issues such as how SEs should be positioned in the market...whether the government should have special policies in favour of SEs and how to avoid unfair competition to small and medium enterprises..." (LCQ3: 2007-10)

The texts further demonstrate that government supports the social enterprise industry by purchasing SE products and services:

"...to give eligible SEs priority in bidding 38 government cleaning service contracts... to encourage bureaux and departments to make more use of the goods and services provided by SEs..." (LCQ19: 2008-04)

It also demonstrates that the government knows the needs of the social enterprise sector:

"...provide the Social Enterprises Mentorship Scheme... to offer business advisory services...to increase the competitiveness of SEs..." (LCQ19: 2008-04)

“...adopt a four-pronged approach to promote the development of SEs...to enhance public understanding of SEs, to promote cross-sector collaboration, to nurture more social entrepreneurs, and to strengthen support for SEs...”(LCQ14: 2010-05)

The texts reveal government’s goals in developing the social enterprise sector:

“...promote the development of social enterprises, not only for providing jobs for the socially disadvantaged and enhancing their self-reliance, but also introducing innovative approaches in achieving social objective... (LCQ15: 2014-12)

When government constructs a certain position for itself, some related positions are found being constructed for other actors. For example, when government constructs itself as a contracts provider, then social enterprises are constructed as contractors. This point will be illustrated by later linguistic evidence.

2. Social enterprise

Social enterprises are constructed from different aspects. To begin with, the government’s texts define social enterprise in this way:

“One major characteristic of social enterprise (SE) is achieving social goals with entrepreneurial thinking and commercial strategies...SE is a business, but its objective is not to make profits for the shareholder. Instead, it puts the achievement of certain social goals as its ultimate objective.”(LCQ3: 2007-10)

The social enterprise definition given by the government is an important one, as it serves as the assessment criteria for social enterprise funding applications. An application gets approval or get refusal, depending on how well it demonstrates that its business matches the government’s criteria:

“...applications are not approved mainly because they focus too much on training or providing services rather than operating as a business, or because of low business turnover or high risk...” (LCQ3: 2007-10)

As for government’s goal of funding social enterprise, job opportunities for the socially disadvantaged people are in a major concern:

“...has embarked HKD 150 million for enhanced district-based poverty alleviation work... The purpose was to promote self-reliance amongst the socially

disadvantaged...a total grant of around \$100 million to about 100 new SE projects, creating some 1600 jobs for the underprivileged...”(LCQ14: 2010-05)

To obtain the social enterprise fund, the ability to create job opportunities for the socially disadvantaged people must be stated in the business proposal:

“...requires applicant to set out a number of targets. In addition to financial and sales targets, the number of staff employed and the target group...” (LCQ17: 2011-03)

After getting the seed fund, social enterprises need to achieve sustainability. If a social enterprise underperforms, it is obligated to report regularly to the government:

“...these SEs are then required to submit proposals to improve their business and report periodically...will arrange mentors to provide voluntary professional and business advisory services to these SEs...” (LCQ4: 2010-10)

3. Social enterprise operators

Social enterprise operators refer to the managers and administrators who operate their social enterprise daily. In the texts, these managerial people are constructed as in need of building up business related capacities:

“...voluntary mentors from the business and professional sectors...to offer business advisory services...increasing the competitiveness of SEs.” (LCQ19: 2008-04)

“...senior executives and professionals as mentors in order to advise on the problems encountered by mentees in business operations...” (LCQ19: 2008-04)

SE operators are obligated to report to the government agencies:

“...the grantees are required to keep the ESR Secretariat informed of the position of the approved projects including the use of the grant, the employment of socially disadvantaged, and the financial condition, through reports...”(LCQ18: 2014-04)

4. Social enterprise employees

Social enterprise employees are a group of people closely related to community B (the socially disadvantaged people). The SE employees are mainly low-skilled people, such as the social welfare dependents and new immigrants.

Government emphasises on creating the low-skilled jobs for these people:

“...are expected to provide about 280 jobs to CSSA recipients, the non-engaged youth, grass-root women, rehabilitated offenders, new arrivals and single-parent families...job category...low-skilled jobs like shop assistants, planters, female garment workers, beauticians...” (LCQ3: 2007-10)

5. Community A: (the sophisticated people)

In considering that the concept of community in the government’s texts is wide, community is divided into three sub-categories: community A, community B, and community C.

Community A refers to the sophisticated group of people who have resources and capital, such as experts from the business sector. Community A is found in relating with concepts such as partnership, and collaboration.

They are constructed as government’s partners to explore the future of the social enterprise sector together:

“...will organise a summit on SE...will invite...the academia, the business sector, NGOs and the public sector to participate and jointly explore the way forward for the further development of SEs and to formulate action plans...” (LCQ3: 2007-10)

They have the business expertise to help the social enterprise operators:

“...the mentors will examine and advise on the problems encountered by mentees in business operations...” (LCQ19: 2008-04)

They help government assessing social enterprise funding applications:

“...all applications...are assessed by the ESR Advisory Committee...nonofficial members from the business, professional and academic sectors... (LCQ18: 2014-04)

6. Community B: (the socially disadvantaged people)

The socially disadvantaged people are found in the center of government’s social enterprise policy. Community B is constructed in a way that it is related to poverty and in need of job opportunities to become self-reliant:

“...to promote self reliance of the socially disadvantaged groups...with the aim of reinforcing the work in alleviating poverty...to create more employment opportunities for the disadvantaged and enhance their self-reliance...” (LCQ 3: 2007-10)

7. Community C: (the general public)

Community C (the general public) is often associated with government’s promotional activities, marketing campaigns, the notion of public awareness, and the notion of public understanding:

“...organise promotional activities such as market fairs...produce promotional coupons for free distribution...arrange press interviews with SEs and produce SE booklets...to enhance public understanding on SEs...” (LCQ14: 2010-05)

And people and organisations from community C are seen as potential consumers and clients of the social enterprise sector, by purchasing and using its products and services:

“...with the support of various sectors, we have witnessed increased public awareness of SEs...about 80 percent of respondents were familiar with SE, and about 70% of them said they would procure services or products provided by SEs..”(LCQ15: 2014-12)

8. The exceptions

Some constructions are found unsuitable to be put into any of the above categories, accordingly they are labelled as the exceptions. For instance, caring Culture:

“The Hong Kong SAR Government is committed to serving as the "promoter" and "facilitator" for the development of social enterprises in Hong Kong...to fostering a new caring culture and enhancing social harmony...(Speech: 2017-11)

Cross-sector collaboration :

“...to foster better understanding and encourage closer cooperation amongst relevant stakeholders in the development of social enterprises...” (LCQ14: 2010-05)

“...supporting SE support platforms to promote cross-sector participation, particularly the participation of the business sector...” (LCQ15: 2014-12)

Entrepreneurship is rarely being mentioned. Here is an example of one of the few places in where entrepreneurship is mentioned:

“...to promote social entrepreneurship among the younger generation, we have commissioned...business plan writing...” (LCQ14: 2010-05)

5.3. The Identified Repertoires

Based on the review of the linguistic evidence that is used in the government’s construction of roles and positions for the categories, eight repertoires were identified.

Repertoires Identified	Categories	Roles/Positions Constructed
1. Director Repertoire	Government	Promoter, Facilitator, Fund-Provider, Contract-Provider
2. Business-like Repertoire	Social Enterprise	Products and Service Provider, Contractor, Employment provider
3. Employment Repertoire	Social Enterprise	Employment Provider
4. Social-objective Repertoire	Social Enterprise	Social Services Provider
5. Capacity-building Repertoire	SE Practitioners	Subordinates, Mentees
6. Collaboration Repertoire	Community A	Cross-sector Collaborators, Government Partners, Mentors
7. Self-reliance Repertoire	Community B (& SE Employees)	In need of Self-reliance and Social Integration
8. Caring-culture Repertoire	Community C	Individual Customers, Organisational Clients

TABLE 5. Table of the Identified Repertoires

As Burr (2003) has illustrated it, interpretative repertoires can be seen as a kind of culturally shared tool kit of resources for people to use for their own purposes. The functions of repertoires enable people to justify their construction of events, to justify and validate their behaviours, and to fend off criticism (Burr, 2003, P. 25). In this section, attempts are on trying to reveal the meaning of each repertoire. And if any competing aspects of the repertoires are found, they will also be discussed.

1. Director Repertoire

The director repertoire is used to portray the government as a leader, who is leading many different actors into developing the social enterprise sector.

The director repertoire is used to construct that government has power and authority in assigning tasks for different actors of the social enterprise sector. For example, social enterprises are assigned to create many low-skilled job opportunities for community B; community A is assigned with duties to be a joint-force of government in achieving government's goal of developing the social enterprise sector, and this point will be further discussed in the collaboration repertoire.

From the social constructionist's perspective, positioning would involve reciprocal positions. When government constructs a position for itself, it simultaneously creates a position for others. Thus the director repertoire should be related to other repertoires.

2. Business-like Repertoire

Social enterprises are constructed with different roles and positions. The basic role constructed for social enterprise is to operate like a business venture. That is to compete in the market to win business contracts, thus to make profits.

“One major characteristic of social enterprise (SE) is achieving social goals with entrepreneurial thinking and commercial strategies...SE is a business... it puts the achievement of certain social goals as its ultimate objective.”(LCQ3: 2007-10)

In accordance with social entrepreneurship literature, business discourse is dominant. In this excerpt, entrepreneurial thinking and commercial strategies are highlighted, and business-like repertoire serves the government's policy preference in a certain type of social enterprise. For instance, a fund application can get approval or not, depending on how well the applicant social enterprise can demonstrate its business abilities in achieving profit. Business-like repertoire includes the employment repertoire and the capacity-building repertoire. Both of them reflect the government's preference in promoting business-like social enterprises.

3. Employment Repertoire

The employment repertoire follows the logic of the business-like repertoire. It constructs social enterprise as a form of business, which is able to create employment. In addition, it reflects government's policy preference on the Work Integration Social

Enterprise (WISE) type of social enterprise, which can bring many low-skilled jobs for the socially disadvantaged people.

The employment repertoire is in accordance with the “*enterprise discourse*” provided by Chell (2007), which stresses that individuals should be enterprising with good qualities such as being responsible, hard-working, and practicing self-help. And in the case of Hong Kong, it is about being self-reliant. By this repertoire, one can see the government is treating the social enterprise sector as a subsystem of its welfare system.

For instance, government gives funds to the social enterprise sector, in return the grantee social enterprises must provide employment to the socially disadvantaged people. Such as in the Enhancing Employment of People with Disabilities through Small Enterprise” Project (3E’s Project) which is set up by the Social Welfare Department (SWD), government requires the ratio of employees with disabilities for each grantee social enterprise must not be less than 50% (LCQ4: 2010-10).

4. Social-objective Repertoire

On the one hand, the social enterprise sector is supposed to play the same role as NPOs and NGOs in the non-profit sector. That is to deliver social services and social goods, but by its own money.

On the other hand, creating job opportunities for the socially disadvantaged people is constructed as the basic social objective of the social enterprise sector. As mentioned above, 83.3% of the local social enterprises state that the work integration as their social objectives. In light of this, the social-objective repertoire can be seen as an extension of the employment repertoire.

5. Capacity-building Repertoire

Social enterprise operators, those practitioners who are administrators and managers with NPO and NGO backgrounds are constructed as lacking in business acumen and in need of capacity building through mentorship and business training:

“...supporting capacity building of SEs by granting subsidies to SE organisations for providing training programmes support services...” (LCQ15: 2014-12)

Capacity-building repertoire is one aspect of the business-like repertoire, the capacities to be built are mostly business related skills and strategy training for social enterprise operators, in the hope that social enterprises thus become more business-like in making profit and more competitive in the market in providing products and services

6. Collaboration Repertoire

Community A (the sophisticated people) are constructed as government's joint force in developing the social enterprise sector. As illustrated in the following excerpt:

"...to facilitate interested business organisations to team up with NGO...the partnership can be in the form of outsourcing certain operations to SEs or providing concessionary rental of their premises or vacant land for use by SEs..." (LCQ19: 2008-04)

Business experts and skilled managers are potential mentor candidates for social enterprise operators. And Key NPOs leaders for instance, can help to define the current social problems and issues in society. Social capitalists and philanthropists can become investors, investing in the social enterprise sector. The collaboration repertoire validates the director repertoire, as in both repertoires, the government plays the director's role.

7. Self-reliance Repertoire

Community B people such as the welfare recipients, the non-engaged youth, grass-root women, and rehabilitated offenders, are portrayed in such an image that they are low-skilled people, they are in poverty, and they are not self-reliant. If relating the employment repertoire to the self-reliance repertoire, one can see government's logic. That is, the government expects the community people to take up the low-skilled jobs created for them. It implies that when the socially disadvantaged people are provided with jobs, they can become self-reliant and move out of poverty.

This repertoire is in line with the literature (e.g. Bull, 2008), it reflects the decline of state involvement in social provision and an emphasis on self-reliance and personal responsibility, linguistic evidence as follows:

“.. to promote self-reliance amongst the socially disadvantaged...a total grant of around \$100 million to about 100 new SE projects, creating some 1600 jobs for the underprivileged...”(LCQ14: 2010-05)

Social enterprise is seen ‘as an innovative approach to promote self- reliance (CoP Report, 2007). In its aims of funding the social enterprise sector, the government has already revealed its policy preferences for developing a social enterprise sector which is capable of providing many low-skilled job opportunities. The more jobs a social enterprise is able to create, the more resources it is likely to gain from the government. This finding supports the view of Wong & Chiu (2010), that the resources available, the activities suitable, and the new space/ market-niches available for social enterprises, are largely determined by a state’s welfare reform agenda.

8. Caring-culture Repertoire

Caring-culture repertoire has several meanings. First, it is about community C (the general public) start choosing and purchasing the products and services provided by the social enterprise sector. Second, it is about community A organisations joining the government, and giving business contracts to social enterprises.

“...has pledged to promote the development of social enterprises and to foster a new caring culture in Hong Kong... (LCQ3: 2007-10)

Caring-culture is also linked with the idea of ‘enhancing public understanding’, ‘enhancing public awareness’, and ‘cross-sectoral collaboration’. It is about enhancing public acceptance of the products and services of social enterprises, and setting up more WISE type social enterprises, thus to create more jobs opportunities for community B.

5.4. Analyses by the Agency Approach

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the question “how is agency constructed for the social enterprise sector by the government?” can be investigated from the perspective of government on three levels, respectively:

- Exerting the agency of the social enterprise sector to make what happen?
(concerning on the goals)
- Exerting the agency of the social enterprise sector for what, or for whom?
(concerning on the principals)
- Making the agency of the social enterprise sector happen by what means?
(concerning on the conditions)

The previous findings and explanations of the eight repertoires have provided answers for these agency questions.

Goals of the social enterprise sector

At the organisational level, business rationality is applied. Indicating by the business-like repertoire and the capacity repertoire, social enterprise is supposed to operate entrepreneurially and its operators are supposed to improve their business management capacities, thus to make the social enterprise become competitive enough to win more contrasts from the market. If a social enterprise underperforms, its operators will be required to acquire capacity building training, such as business managerial skills training, from the mentorship scheme provided by the government, in the hope that the training can thus enhance the social enterprise’s performance.

At the same time, , the employment repertoire indicates that social enterprises must create more job opportunities, especially the low-skilled ones, to accommodate the socially disadvantaged people. Such as to the grantee social enterprises of the “Enhancing Employment of People with Disabilities through Small Enterprise” Project (3E’s Project), their ratio of employees with disabilities must be over 50%.

However, to become competitive and to provide more low-skilled job opportunities can inherently contradict each other. Only the labour intensive industry can manage to hire many low-skilled workers, but the labour intensive industry is not necessarily an entrepreneurial option for social enterprise if the concern is on the venture's viability. Thus in the context of Hong Kong, at the organisational level, the goals government constructs for social enterprises can be a contradiction.

Principal of the social enterprise sector

At the structural level, the director repertoire shows that government has the power and authority in assigning tasks to the social enterprise sector, therefore the government has positioned itself as the principal of the social enterprise sector. While the social enterprise sector, on the other hand, has been placed on a position of government's agent. That is, the social enterprise sector is supposed to exert its agency for the government, and to deliver the results (creating many low-skilled job opportunities and achieving financial sustainability in the long run) on behalf of the government. To some extent, the social enterprise sector is treated as a vehicle for the government to drive, rather than as a sector of its own.

Conditions of the social enterprise sector

In the frame approach of agency, when an individual is believed to make things happen by herself or himself, agency is located in the agent, it's individualistic framing. When something or somebody is believed to be involved in making things happen, then agency is located in relation, it's relationalistic framing. So on the government's construction, agency either will be framed by the individualistic frame or by the relationalistic frame, or by both.

In the director repertoire and the collaboration repertoire, the agency of the social enterprise sector is constructed to be only possible under the conditions of relationalistic factors such as government's support and effort. So the agency of the social enterprise sector is attributed to the relation. The success of the social enterprise sector is constructed as only possible by means of government's support and effort, rather than by means of the autonomous and intended aspects of the social enterprise sector, such as social entrepreneurs' aspirations and their pursuit of social entrepreneurship values.

Rhetorical agency in the social enterprise sector

The conception of rhetorical agency provided by Campbell (2005) brings insights and new understandings on government's construction of agency from the social level. In the caring-culture repertoire and the collaboration repertoire, government is exerting its rhetorical agency in urging both community A and community C to take their moral responsibilities for the socially disadvantaged people.

For instance when government claims to foster a caring-culture and to raise public awareness, it is actually stressing that the general public should take the public responsibilities for caring the socially disadvantaged community, by choosing and purchasing the products and services provided by local social enterprises.

Another example is, when government claims to promote cross-sectoral collaboration in developing local social enterprises, it is persuading the community A people to become a "partner" or "joint-force" of the government in sharing the burden, such as promoting the WISE type social enterprise, building up capacity for the social enterprise operators, and enhancing the business performance of the social enterprises. Community A people are persuaded to invest their capital and resources into the social enterprise sector.

By means of the collaboration repertoire, community A (the sophisticated people) is constructed by the government as its partner and joint-force in developing the social enterprise sector. Community A people therefore have a gracious space to express their rhetorical agency in the development process of the social enterprise sector.

On the contrary, there is no such space for the community B people. The socially disadvantaged people are not expected to participate into the development process of social enterprise sector. They are not government's active partners, instead, they are passive recipients of the government's construction results. The self-reliance repertoire has illustrated that, to get out of poverty, the socially disadvantaged people should take up any job opportunities offered to them, which are mostly the low-skilled ones, implying that going to work to escape poverty is a moral responsibility for these people.

The social enterprise operators and the social entrepreneurs alike, also do not have much space to articulate their rhetorical agency. As reinforced by the business-like repertoire, the employment repertoire, and the social-objective repertoire, people in the social enterprise sector are managers of the social enterprise vehicle, and they must be capable enough to operate their social enterprises. Their personal aspirations and personal pursuits of the social entrepreneurship values, if any, such as social empowerment, social innovation and social change, are rarely given the space to be articulated in the development process of the social enterprise sector.

5.5. Analyses by the Power Relation Approach

In order to further analyse the government's construction on agency from the power relation approach, thus to hypothesise what effects and consequences may be brought by the constructions, the findings from the study of Perren & Jennings (2005) will be used as reference and comparison points in the analysis.

Perren & Jennings (2005) have identified three discourses used by the government in its constructions of entrepreneurship in the small and medium business context: the power discourse, the legitimacy discourse and the subjugation discourse. These discourses can be identified from the findings of the current study as well.

First, on the power discourse, the government has demonstrated its power and authority in constructing goals for the social enterprise sector through the director repertoire, the business-like repertoire, and the employment repertoire. That is, social enterprises are supposed to create many low-skilled job opportunities for the socially disadvantaged people, and to achieve financial sustainability in the long-term. Being assigned goals (creating many low-skilled job opportunities and achieving financial sustainability in the long run) by the government, the social enterprise sector has been positioned as an agent or as a vehicle of its principal (the government).

Second, legitimacy discourse indicates that the government has justified its policy preference for developing more WISE type social enterprises by using the social-

objective repertoire and the self-reliance repertoire. Both repertoires have strengthened the government's position. Creating more low-skilled job opportunities to help the socially disadvantaged people to become self-reliant has become an ideology used by government to legitimate its social enterprise policy.

Third, on the subjugation discourse, the government has constructed itself as a supreme system, while the social enterprise sector is positioned as a subsystem under the state's system. And as a subsystem, the social enterprise sector is only possible to carry out wishes and goals from the supreme system. Therefore, to the social enterprise operators and entrepreneurs, they are supposed to carry out the government's goals, rather than to pursue their own goals. In other words, on the social enterprise sector development process, as the wishes and goals from of the state have dominated the social enterprise sector, there is no space for the social enterprise operators and social entrepreneurs to pursue their personal aspirations and other social entrepreneurship values, such as social empowerment, social innovation and social change.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter will first answer the three subquestions according to the previous findings, explanations and analyses; then, it will further discuss the effects and consequences of the government's construction of social entrepreneurship, after that, a short conclusion of the thesis will be provided. Lastly, it will comment on the strengths and limitations of the study, and then give suggestions on future research.

6.1. Answers for the Research Questions

Subquestion one:

“What repertoires are used by the government to construct roles and positions for itself, for the social enterprise sector, and for other actors?” This study has identified eight repertoires used by the government. The essential functions of each repertoire are revealed and summarised as follows:

- The director repertoire is used to construct that the government has the power and authority to assign tasks to the social enterprise sector and other actors;
- the business-like repertoire is used by the government to construct that social enterprises should be operated in an entrepreneurial and competitive way;
- the employment repertoire is used by the government to justify its policy preference for the WISE type of social enterprises, which are supposed to be capable of creating many low-skilled jobs for the socially disadvantaged people;
- the social-objective repertoire is used to construct that the creation of many low-skilled job opportunities for the socially disadvantaged people is the basic objective of the social enterprise sector;
- the capacity-building repertoire is used by the government to urge the social enterprise operators to acquire business related skills and capacities, hence to make their social enterprises become more business-like and competitive;
- the collaboration repertoire is used to persuade the community A people to invest their capital and resources in developing the social enterprise sector;

- the self-reliance repertoire is used by the government to imply that going to work to escape poverty is a moral responsibility for the socially disadvantaged people;
- the caring-culture repertoire is used by the government to convince the people and organisations from both community A and community C to choose and purchase the products and services provided by the local social enterprises as the responsible ways to help the community B people to become self-reliant.

Subquestion two:

“How is agency constructed for the social enterprise sector and other actors by the government?” First, this study has analysed construction of agency in the social enterprise sector from the perspective of the government on three levels of investigation, including, on the goals, on the principals and on the means of agency. So the second question can be answered as follows:

- Employment creation for the socially disadvantaged people is constructed by the government as the primary goal of social enterprises. The social enterprise sector is constructed as a vehicle to create many low-skilled job opportunities;
- the government has positioned itself as the principal of the social enterprise sector. The agency of the social enterprise sector is to deliver results (creating many low-skilled job opportunities and achieving financial sustainability in the long run) on behalf of the government;
- the agency of the social enterprise sector is constructed to be located in the relationalistic factors, such as government’s support and effort, rather than in the autonomous and intended aspects of the social enterprise sector, such as social entrepreneurs’ aspirations and their pursuit of social entrepreneurship values. People’s aspirations and their pursuit of social entrepreneurship values are not mentioned in the government’s construction of social entrepreneurship agency.

Second, by applying the conception of rhetorical agency provided by Campbell (2005), this study has further analysed the rhetorical agency of different actors in the social enterprise sector. Four key actors were found involving in the development process of the social enterprise sector, namely the government, the community A, the community

B, and the social enterprise operators and social entrepreneurs. The analyses of rhetorical agency are presented as follows:

- The government is found expressing its rhetorical agency freely, such as it can convince the people and organisations of the community A and the community C to take up their moral responsibilities for the socially disadvantaged people;
- the community A (the sophisticated people) is highly valued by the government as its partner. So the community A has space to express its rhetorical agency in the development process of the social enterprise sector, as long as its expression of rhetorical agency is under the government's leadership;
- the community B (the socially disadvantaged people) has no rhetorical agency in the development process of the social enterprise sector. They are not the active partners of the government, instead they are passive recipients of the government's construction results, and going to work to escape poverty is constructed by the government as a moral responsibility for the socially disadvantaged people;
- the social enterprises operators and the social entrepreneurs do not have much space to articulate their rhetorical agency either. They are treated as managers of the social enterprise vehicle, and they must be capable enough to operate their social enterprises. Their personal aspirations and personal pursuits of the social entrepreneurship values, if any, such as social empowerment, social innovation and social change, are rarely given the space to be articulated in the development process of the social enterprise sector.

Subquestion three:

“What effects and consequences may be brought by the government's construction?”

To hypothesise what effects and consequences may be brought by government's construction of social entrepreneurship, the approach of power relation was applied in the analysis of the findings, and the analysis also made reference to the power discourse, the legitimacy discourse and the subjugation discourse from the study of Perren & Jennings (2005). These discourses were used to explain the power relation between the government and the social enterprise sector.

First, on the power discourse constructs the government has the power and authority in deciding goals for the social enterprise sector. Social enterprises are supposed to create many low-skilled job opportunities for the socially disadvantaged people, and to achieve financial sustainability in the long-term. By doing so, the government has thus positioned itself as the principal of the social enterprise sector, and positioned the social enterprise sector as a vehicle to deliver results on the government's behalf.

Second, legitimacy discourse indicates that the government has justified its policy preference for developing more WISE type social enterprises by using the social-objective repertoire and the self-reliance repertoire. Both repertoires have strengthened the government's position. Creating more low-skilled job opportunities to help the socially disadvantaged people to become self-reliant has become an ideology, and the government has used this ideology to legitimise its social enterprise policy.

Third, on the subjugation discourse, the government has constructed itself as a supreme system, while the social enterprise sector is positioned as a subsystem under the state's system. As a subsystem, the social enterprise sector is only possible to carry out wishes and goals from the supreme system. Therefore, to the social enterprise operators and entrepreneurs, they are supposed to carry out the government's goals, rather than to pursue their own goals. In other words, on the social enterprise sector development process, government's wishes and goals have dominated the social enterprise sector, there is no space for the social enterprise operators and social entrepreneurs to pursue their personal aspirations and other social entrepreneurship values, such as social empowerment, social innovation and social change.

By combining the explanations of the power discourse, the legitimacy discourse, and the subjugation discourse, one will find that in the social enterprise context, the power relation between the government and the social enterprise sector / the social enterprise operators/ social entrepreneurs is also supreme vs. subordinate, just the same as it is in the commercial context indicated by the study of Perren & Jennings (2005).

The effects and consequences of this supreme vs. subordinate power relation between the government and the social enterprise sector will be further discussed below.

6.2. Social Enterprise: A Vehicle for Welfare-Reform

Chiu & Wong (2010) argued that the emergence of social enterprises is an institutional innovation to tackle the welfare-reform problems, and there is a strong connection between a state's welfare reform and the development of social enterprise. The resources available, the activities suitable, and the new space/ market-niches available for social enterprises, are largely determined by a state's welfare reform agenda.

This study has provided considerable empirical evidence to support the view of Chiu & Wong (2010). In the context of Hong Kong, based on the previously mentioned findings and analyses, one can fairly conclude that the government is using the social enterprise sector as a vehicle to deliver particular results. The government's current social enterprise policy preferences are twofold: to promote a business-like social enterprise sector to increase its chance of achieving financial sustainability in the long run, and to promote the WISE type social enterprises to develop a social enterprise sector, which is capable of creating many low-skilled job opportunities for the socially disadvantaged people. These preferences have illustrated that the government is using the social enterprise sector as a vehicle to tackle the welfare-reform problems.

Approximately 90% of social enterprises are run by the non-profit sector organisations, so, a financially sustainable social enterprise sector will indirectly help the government to reduce its spending on the non-profit sector.

On the other hand, the more WISE type social enterprises are established and become financially sustainable, the more low-skilled job opportunities will be available for the socially disadvantaged people, especially those who are currently dependent on social welfare. Therefore, with suitable employment, the welfare-dependent people will become self-reliant financially, and eventually leave the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme provided by the Social Welfare Department. On this account, the social enterprise sector will directly help the government to reduce its welfare spending.

The social enterprise sector has thus become a vehicle to tackle the welfare-reform problems faced by the government. The government has identified social enterprise as

‘an innovative approach to promote self-reliance and to provide community employment opportunities for the unemployed to integrate into the job market’ (CoP Report, 2007). To Hong Kong’s social enterprises, in order to obtain resources and support from the government, they have to fit themselves into the state’s welfare reform agenda, and to perform within the space of “to promote self-reliance and to provide community employment opportunities for the unemployed”. The research findings have explained why in Hong Kong 83.3% of the social enterprises have stated that work integration is their social objective (The Center CUHK, 2014).

To the government grantee social enterprises, though the labour intensive industry is neither an entrepreneurial option for them, nor an ideal place for them to pursue their social entrepreneurship values. As Work Integration Social Enterprises, in order to manage to hire more low-skilled workers, they still have to choose the labour intensive industry, such as factories, restaurants, and cleaning services.

Based on the previous discussions, one can further conclude that in Hong Kong, the government has treated the social enterprise sector as a subsystem subjugated to the state’s welfare system. Therefore, as a subsystem, the goals of the social enterprise sector must fit into the goals of the state’s welfare reform. Government’s funding on the social enterprise sector can thus be seen as one of its welfare reform strategies.

The findings of this research are in line with the critiques of government’s involvement in social entrepreneurship. The government is putting its own logic and agendas into its promotion of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship (Lounsbury & Strang, 2009). Social enterprise is positioned as a remedy for the state’s lack of financial resources to provide welfare service (Dey, 2012). So social entrepreneurship is reflecting the state’s response to its welfare problems (Hervieux 2010; Nicholls, 2011).

6.3. Social Entrepreneurship: A Narrow Pursuit

“How government constructs social entrepreneurship in the context of Hong Kong?”

Conceptually, social entrepreneurship has involved social value creation, civil society collaboration, social innovation, and economic activity as its four indisputable characteristics (Hulgard, 2010). However, only the social value creation and the economic activity characteristics of social entrepreneurship have been addressed by the government. This study has investigated the government’s construction of social entrepreneurship from different aspects, and based on the previously mentioned findings and analyses, one can fairly conclude that in the context of Hong Kong, social entrepreneurship is constructed as a narrow pursuit by the government.

First, the primary social objective constructed for the local social enterprises is to create more low-skilled job opportunities for the socially disadvantaged people. The government prefers the WISE type social enterprises and this policy preference has been justified by the government’s ideology of “helping the socially disadvantage people become to self-reliant”. Besides, the primary economic objective constructed for the local social enterprises is to achieve financial sustainability, both for the social enterprise sector itself and for the non-profit sector in general. In other words, in the context of Hong Kong, the government has set a narrow framework for the local social enterprises to pursue their social objectives and economic objectives.

Second, the government has attributed the agency of the social enterprise sector to the relationalistic factors, such as government’s effort and support. That is, from the perspective of the government, the social enterprise sector needs government’s help to succeed. On the other hand, the autonomous and intended aspects of agency of the social enterprise sector, such as social entrepreneurs’ personal aspirations and personal pursuits of social entrepreneurship values are not in the government’s construction.

However, from the impressions brought by the mass media and the social media, social entrepreneurs are people with passion to change the world. They have their own cherished values that motivate their endeavours. For instance, they could be motivated by the belief of fair opportunity in education and going to bring fairness of educational

opportunity for the underprivileged kids through establishing a volunteering platform (e.g. Teach4HK). Their endeavour may not create any low-skilled job opportunities or bring any economic values. So its social objective cannot be measured by the WISE standard, and its economic objective cannot be measured by the business turnover standard. On this account, government's construction of social entrepreneurship are not attuned to the diversified values of social entrepreneurship. In other words, in the context of Hong Kong, the government's version of social entrepreneurship is too narrow to accommodate the diversified values of social entrepreneurship.

Third, the government has positioned itself as the principal of the social enterprise sector and has constructed the social enterprise sector as a subsystem of the state's welfare system, and as a subsystem, the social enterprise sector must fit its goals into the state's welfare reform agenda. As the director and principal, the government has demonstrated that it has the power and authority in imposing its goals and wishes upon the social enterprise sector. The agency of the social enterprise sector and social entrepreneurship is subject to the goals and wishes of the government, thus the power and authority of the government will dominate the life-worlds of social enterprise operators and social entrepreneurs as well. And there will be no space for them to articulate their personal aspirations and personal pursuits on the diversified values of social entrepreneurship, such as social empowerment, social innovation and social change, in the development process of the social enterprise sector. And arguably, social entrepreneurship in Hong Kong has become a narrow and pragmatic pursuit, and the diversified values of social entrepreneurship will eventually be marginalised.

6.4. Strengths and Limitations

There are several strengths and limitations of this study to be discussed.

First, the thesis has provided a clear and comprehensive literature review from the beginning: the definitions of both social enterprise and social entrepreneurship are clearly outlined; the relationship between government and the emergence of social enterprise is critically reviewed; the backgrounds and some information regarding to the

research topic are fully examined; and some important discussions of the topic are critically reviewed, such as the major critiques and issues in the study of social entrepreneurship. In summary, this study has grounded itself on the social entrepreneurship literature framework.

However, some weaknesses are left to be improved in regarding to literature review. For instance, in its review of the previous studies, some important and interesting aspects of the studies are not mentioned or related to the research topic. Besides, it would be better if it had provided real social enterprise cases to illustrate the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship in the real world.

Second, this research has chosen a social psychological approach to explore the social entrepreneurship phenomenon, which is a novel one. The research is theoretically grounded on social constructionism. It follows a methodological framework of exploration which is provided by both discursive psychology and critical discourse analysis. It applies interpretative repertoire as a research method. These theoretical and methodological decisions are well-grounded for the research topic. Moreover, the research has developed some effective analytical strategies to analyse the materials, especially the application of the approach of agency and the approach of power relation.

Nevertheless, the selected research materials have their own limitations. This study only used the government's texts, and these texts could be insufficient in showing a full picture of Hong Kong's social enterprise policy. The texts did not provide a comprehensive set of government's accounts in its construction of the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship.

Another inadequacy of the selected materials is related to their nature. The texts are in written form so they are not able to make the best use of some tools provided by the interpretative repertoire toolkit. Interpretative repertoire is resourceful for analysing social interactions, such as conversations between people. Interpretative repertoire is capable of capturing spontaneousness produced in the social interactions, but this capability of the research method does not display itself in written texts. Having said that, interpretative repertoire as a research method, is sufficient for the current research.

Third, this study has relied on the concept of positioning to describe agency, which has made the exploration of agency and the constructions of agency easier. The concept of positioning enables a deeper level of analysis, as it allows the analysis of agency to directly make use of the findings, such as the roles and positions that are constructed, and the repertoires are used by the government.

This empirical study has ambitiously attempted to expand the research territory of the social psychological perspectives and theories, through its research design and research analytical strategies, into the field of social entrepreneurship research.

But due to the scope of the study, social entrepreneurship studies which have applied social psychological perspectives were not in the literature review. This thesis would become more interesting if it had made reference to more social psychological studies of social entrepreneurship.

6.5. Implications and Future Research

This study has identified some major repertoires used by the government in its constructions of social entrepreneurship, and through analysis, government's logics and intentions of developing social enterprise in Hong Kong have been revealed. That is, the social enterprise sector is treated as a vehicle to deliver results assigned by the government. Therefore, this study invites practitioners and key actors in Hong Kong's social enterprise sector to maintain an informed attitude towards government's social enterprise initiatives, schemes and policies. As the findings have indicated that, the policy makers tend to overemphasis on the pragmatic values social enterprises may create for the government, such as creating job opportunities for the socially disadvantaged people, but they tend to ignore other values of social entrepreneurship, such as the values of social empowerment, social innovation and social change.

Only when the diversified values are respected, the social enterprise sector could become innovative, so this study would like to advocate the policy makers to take the views from different actors of the social enterprise sector, such as those from the social

enterprise practitioners, into account. At the same time, in the policy making process, the alternative discourses from different actors, such as the ones from the social change perspective, should be respected and be encouraged to express freely as well.

This research has provided empirical evidence to support the major critiques found in the social entrepreneurship literature. Future research can further explore the potential impacts may be brought by government's active promotion of the WISE type social enterprise. But data collection can become one major challenge for further research in this area. Government's texts are limited in their content, and government's practices are unlikely to be announced in advance by its texts, not to mention that these texts would not always be available. For this reason, future research is suggested to focus on government's practices directly, to see how government may assess social enterprise startup funding applications and how it may evaluate social enterprise performance for instance.

Social psychological approaches are suitable for conducting empirical research in social entrepreneurship. This study has investigated the government's construction of social entrepreneurship at the structural level, and future research may find interesting results at the individual level by looking at social entrepreneurs' accounts on their agency and social entrepreneurship. For instance, future research may focus on the ways social enterprise practitioners construct agency for themselves as well as for their social enterprises; do they agree with government's construction of social entrepreneurship? And from their perspective, what are the goals of the social enterprise sector. The social psychological approaches are resourceful for more future studies of social entrepreneurship, at the structural level, the individual level, or at both structural and individual levels.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 30(1): 1-22.
- Bull, M. (2008). 'Challenging Tensions: Critical, Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives on Social Enterprise', *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research* 14(5): 268-275.
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social Constructionism (2nd Ed)*. London: Taylor & Francis Routledge.
- Campbell, K. (2005). Agency: Promiscuous and Protean. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 2, 1, 1-19.
- Chell, E. (2007). "Social enterprise and entrepreneurship: towards a convergent theory of the entrepreneurial process", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 25, pp. 5-26.
- Centre for Civil Society & Governance (2010). Serving Alone: The Social Service Sector in Hong Kong, *Annual Report on the Civil Society in Hong Kong 2009*. Department of Politics and Public Administration, the University of Hong Kong.
- Chiu, S.W.K. and Wong, R.K.C. (2010). *Welfare Reform and Social Enterprise: Towards an Institutional Theory of Social Enterprise*. Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, the Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Commission on Poverty (2007). "From Welfare to Self-Reliance" – Development of Social Enterprises, (CoP Paper 4/2007).
- Corner, P.D., & Ho, M. (2010). How opportunities develop in social entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* 34(4): 635-659.

- Cornwall, A. (2010). "Introductory overview - buzzwords and fuzzwords: deconstructing development discourse", in Cornwall, A., & Eade, D. *Deconstructing Development Discourse Buzzwords and Fuzzwords*, pp. 1-18.
- Dey, P. (2006). The rhetoric of social entrepreneurship: Paralogy and new language games in academic discourse. In C. Steyaert, & D. Hjorth (eds.), *Entrepreneurship as social change: A third movements of entrepreneurship book*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Dey, P. (2007). On the name of social entrepreneurship: Business school teaching, research, and development aid. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Basel.
- Di Domenico, M., Haugh, H., & Tracy, P. (2010). Social bricolage: Theorising social value creation in social enterprises. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 681–703.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *The Dialectics of Discourse*. Texas, XIV(2), 231-242.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Gergen, K.J. (1999). *An Invitation to Social Construction*. London: Sage.
- Gillespie, A. (2012). Position Exchange: the social development of agency. *New ideas in psychology* 30, 32–46.
- Hervieux, C., Gedajlovic, E., & Turcotte, M. B. (2010). 'The Legitimisation of Social Entrepreneurship', *Journal of Enterprising Communities* 4(1): 37-67.
- Hong Kong Council of Social Services (2006). *Background Paper on the Current Situation of Social Enterprises in Hong Kong*.

Hulgard, L. (2010). Discourses of Social Entrepreneurship: Variations of the Same Theme?, *EMES European Research Network 2010, WP no. 10/01*.

Lehner, O. (2012). Manfred Social Entrepreneurship Perspectives. *Triangulated Approaches to Hybridity*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2012, 94 p.(Jyväskylä Studies in Business and Economics ISSN 1457-1986; 111)

Light, P. (2005). Searching for Social Entrepreneurs: Who They Might Be, Where They Might Be Found, What They Do. *Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meetings of the Association for Research on Nonprofit and Voluntary Associations, November 17-18, 2005*.

Lounsbury, M., & Strang, D. (2009). Social entrepreneurship: Success stories and logic construction. In Hammack, D., & Heydemann, S. (Eds.), *Globalisation, Philanthropy and Civil Society: 71-94*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Nicholls, A. (2010). The Legitimacy of Social Entrepreneurship: Reflexive Isomorphism in a PreParadigmatic Field, *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, Vol 34, 4 (1042-2587)*.

Nikander, P. (2006). "Constructionism and Discourses Analysis", in Holstein, J. & Gubrium, J. *Handbook of Constructionist Research*. Guilford Publications.

Perren, L., & Jennings, P. L. (2005). Government discourses on entrepreneurship: Issues of legitimization, subjugation, and power. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 29 (2), 173-184*.

Potter, J. & Reicher, S. (1987). Discourses of community and conflict: The organisation of social categories in accounts of a 'riot'. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 26, 25-40*.

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology*. London: Sage.

Shockley, G.E., & Frank, P.M. (2011). 'The functions of government in social entrepreneurship: theory and preliminary evidence', *Regional Science Policy & Practice Journal*, 3(3): 181-198

Van Dijk, T.A. (2009). *Society in Discourse. How context controls text and talk*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Vesala, H. T. & Vesala, K. M. (2010). Entrepreneurs and producers: Identities of Finnish farmers in 2001 and 2006. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26, 21-30.

Vesala K. M. (2012). *Agency. CEAF-Course Spring 2012*. Department of Social Research. University of Helsinki.

Vesala K. M. (2012). *Entrepreneurship. CEAF-Course Spring 2012*. Department of Social Research. University of Helsinki.

Online Resources

American Medical Association (2013). <https://www.ama-assn.org/features/obesity>.

Research Study on the Social Enterprise Sector in Hong Kong: To Capture the Existing Landscape of Social Enterprises in Hong Kong (2014). Center for Entrepreneurship, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. <https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/en/info-pub/publications.html>.

Dey, P. (2012). "Below or Beyond 'Social Entrepreneurship'? Hegemonic Discourse and Transgressive Possibilities in Swiss Nonprofit Organisations" Available online: http://www.organizzazione.unina.it/cms7/proceedings/proceedings_stream_34/Dey.pdf.

European Commission (2018). Employment, Social Inclusion, and Social Protection Policy. International Cooperation and Development. https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sectors/policy-1_en.

Li, S. & Wong, T. (2007). Social Enterprise Policies of the United Kingdom, Spain and Hong Kong. (RP03/07-08) Available from: <http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/sec/library/0708rp03-e.pdf>.

Office of the Third Sector (2006), Social Enterprise Action Plan: Scaling New Heights, London: Office of the Third Sector, Cabinet Office, UK Government. <https://www.thirdsector.co.uk/social-enterprise>.

Teach for Hong Kong: <http://www.tfhk.org/mission-and-values/>

Social Welfare Department, Hong Kong SAR Government: https://www.swd.gov.hk/en/index/site_pubsvc/page_socsecu/sub_comprehens/.

Hong Kong Social Enterprise Resources

Community Investment and Inclusion Fund (CIIF), Hong Kong SAR Government: <https://www.ciif.gov.hk/en/about-ciif/fund-objectives.html>.

Enhancing Employment of People with Disabilities through Small Enterprise Project (3E's Project), Hong Kong SAR Government: <https://www.mcor.swd.gov.hk/en/project/overview.htm>.

Enhancing Self Enhancing Self-Reliance Through District Partnership Programme (ESR Programme), Hong Kong SAR Government: https://www.esr.gov.hk/en/about_esr.html#overview.

Social Enterprise Definitions, Hong Kong SAR Government: <https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/en/introduction/whatis.html>.

Social Enterprise Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR Government: <https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/en/info-pub/speeches.html>.

Social Enterprise Publications, Hong Kong SAR Government: <https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/en/info-pub/publications.html>.

Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship Development Fund (SIE Fund), Hong Kong SAR Government: <https://www.sie.gov.hk/en/who-we-are/sie-fund.page>.

APPENDICES

1. LCQ3 , Social Enterprise, (2007-10): https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/file_manager/pdf/speeches/Speeches_20071031.pdf.
2. LCQ19 , Social Enterprises, (2008-04): https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/file_manager/pdf/speeches/Speeches_20080423.pdf.
3. LCQ14 , Development of Social Enterprises, (2010-05): https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/file_manager/pdf/pr/Press%20Releases%20and%20Papers_20100505.pdf.
4. LCQ4, Promoting the development of social enterprises, (2010-10): https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/file_manager/pdf/pr/Press%20Releases%20and%20Papers_20100505.pdf.
5. LCQ17, The Enhancing Self-Reliance Through District Partnership Programme, (2011-03): https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/file_manager/pdf/speeches/Speeches_20110309.pdf.
6. LCQ 18, Enhancing Self-Reliance Through District Partnership Programme, (2014-04): https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/file_manager/pdf/pr/Press_Releases_and_Papers_20140416_e.pdf.
7. LCQ15, Assistance provided for social enterprises, (2014-12): https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/file_manager/pdf/pr/LCQ15_eng.pdf.
8. CS Speech, Speech by CS at Social Enterprise Summit 2017 concluding session, (2017-11): https://www.social-enterprises.gov.hk/file_manager/pdf/pr/CS_speech_2017.pdf.