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ABSTRACT

Title: How to create social entrepreneurship in the rural highlands of Guatemala - The importance of context and cross sector collaboration

Authors: Ida Larsson and Camilla Stahl

Supervisor: Malin Tillmar

Keywords: social entrepreneurship, context, cross sector collaboration

Background: The importance of creating social and economic value through social entrepreneurship has gained recognition in recent decades. However, the concept has mostly been studied within the Western world, contributing to a skewed perspective of social entrepreneurship, as it also occurs within other contexts. Moreover, the lone actor has been emphasized as the drive for social change. Still, it is argued that it is through several actors within cross sector collaborations that great social impact can be reached.

Purpose of the study: The purpose of this Master Thesis is to explore and broaden the understanding of the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship within a developing country. Moreover, the aim of this Master Thesis is to contribute with insights in how cross sector actors are collaborating in order to enable social entrepreneurship.

Methodological framework: In order to carry out this Master Thesis a qualitative research approach was chosen. A single case study in the western highlands of Guatemala was carried out. The empirical data was gathered through observations and 18 semi structured interviews.

Conclusion: The conducted study acknowledges six contexts: the business, the social, the spatial, the formal institutional, informal institutional and the international influence, which are both enabling and constraining social entrepreneurship. Furthermore, the study reveals four factors of how organizations across sectors and nations are collaborating in order to enable social entrepreneurship: forging initial agreement, building leadership, continuous communication and generation and utilization of resources. The study also reveals the connection of context, cross sector collaboration and social entrepreneurship.
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1. Introduction

*In this chapter the background will firstly be introduced to enhance the understanding of the research. Furthermore, the problem statement will be given. This will be followed by the scope of study, the purpose and the research questions. Moreover, the definitions of key terms and the research disposition will be presented.*

The world of today is facing several social problems such as poverty, malnutrition and gender inequality, just to mention a few. This is the result of the insufficient welfare provided by the different nations. Each nation represents a welfare state, and the responsibility of providing welfare is divided between its three sectors; the state, the market and the civil society sector (Esping-Andersen, 1990). The state sector is supposed to provide the nation with public services, such as health care (Waddell & Brown, 1997). The market sector is focused on profit maximization whereas the civil society sector aim to meet social needs (Erakovich & Anderson, 2013). However, there has been a retreat from the government of providing public goods (Nicholls, 2006). This is mainly because of new political ideologies that promote market-driven models of welfare and focus on citizen self-sufficiency (Nicholls, 2006). As a consequence this has led to an imbalance between social demand and supply, with social needs not being met (Nicholls, 2006).

As a response to these unmet needs and the failure of the welfare state in providing sufficient social services, the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship has arisen. Social entrepreneurship can be described as organizations creating models to support basic human needs, which the existing institutions and markets have failed to satisfy (Seelos & Mair, 2005). In order to meet these basic human needs social entrepreneurship is often occurring across all three societal sectors; market, state and civil society (Berglund, Johannisson & Schwartz, 2012) with the primary goal to create social value (Seelos & Mair, 2005). This is due to the fact that social problems such as poverty require more resources than one single sector can provide alone (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006). Collaborating across borders can be a huge challenge forcing the social ventures to deal with the competing interests and logics of the different stakeholders such as donors, contractors and beneficiaries (Mulgan, 2006; Tillmar, 2012). Nevertheless, it is often the collaborative force of the different
stakeholders that enable to solve the social challenges and not one single organization alone (Montgomery, Dacin P.A. & Dacin M.T., 2012).

Moreover, where social entrepreneurship is found in a society depends on the context. This is due to the differences found between nations and their respective welfare state. In each welfare state an institutional structure is formed to create and allocate its resources under influence from factors such as tradition and ideology (Tillmar, 2012; Wijkström, 2012). Therefore the responsibility for meeting the social needs differ between nations, and as an inevitable consequence, where social entrepreneurship is found (Tillmar, 2012). For example in Latin America, social ventures are mostly found within the civil society sector, rather than in the market or state sector (Berglund et al., 2012; Davis, Etchart, Jara & Milder, 2003).

This study on social entrepreneurship has its starting point in the developing country of Guatemala. This is considered a relevant choice because the state sector has failed to address substantial social problems of the country. This is highlighted by the estimated poverty rate for 2015, with 50% of the population living in poverty (UN, 2015). These rates are even higher for the indigenous people (UN, 2015). The severe poverty makes Guatemala the poorest country in Latin America (IHS, 2014). Moreover, 74% of children under five suffer from malnutrition (S. Chacón, 2015-03-05). This is due to factors such as an unstable and violent history and differences between the indigenous Maya people and the Spanish speaking Ladino people. Further, Guatemala has a nonfunctioning economic and political system with high levels of corruption and a big informal sector without tax payments (CIEN, 2014). This makes the situation even more difficult to resolve. As a consequence actors across all three sectors have taken upon them to address these social problems.

1.1 Problem statement

The concept of social entrepreneurship has most often been studied within a Western context, which may lead to a poor representation of the concept as it is present within different settings (Grenier, 2006). Social entrepreneurs often aim to change the context itself when addressing social problems, as the problems are often deeply embedded in contextual factors (Austin et al., 2006). The methods to drive change are also based on the Western society as modern, capitalist, industrialized and secular (Gregersen, 2010). This implies that it is not highlighted how another context, such as a developing country, affect social entrepreneurship (Khan et al., 2007). Furthermore,
there is an absence of guidelines on how to collaborate between the different sectors with divergent interests, in order to enable social entrepreneurship. Recent literature has pointed out the need to see social entrepreneurship as enabled by a collaborative force, within and between sectors, and not as a single actor (Montgomery et al., 2012). Consequently, further research within the influencing areas of context and cross sector collaboration is needed in order to give a more holistic perspective of the concept of social entrepreneurship.

1.2 Scope of study
There are several projects and cross sector collaborations working in Guatemala addressing the social problems it faces. However this case study will focus on the specific context of the Pro-Poor Rural Value Chains Program (RVCP) in the Association of Rabinal Vargas (ARV). This is a joint action by organizations found in the civil society, the market and the state sector that promote rural development, competitiveness, poverty reduction and environmental sustainability. RVCP supports in total 100 different small farmer associations in Guatemala, and ARV is one of them (AGEXPORT a, 2015). ARV is situated in the western highlands of Guatemala where the indigenous Maya people live and produce vegetables. The study will focus on the context of ARV and how it affects the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. Further, the focus will be on how the cross sector actors within RVCP in ARV collaborate to enable social entrepreneurship.

1.3 Purpose and research questions
The aim of the study is to examine the concept of social entrepreneurship carried out in a developing country. It will explore how the studied area in Guatemala affects the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. The study will also look into how organizations within the three sectors, market, state and civil society collaborate in order to enable social entrepreneurship. This will be conducted through a case examining in the specific context of RVCP in ARV, in Guatemala. The research questions selected for this study are the following:

1. How can the context in a developing country affect the social entrepreneurship within the studied area RVCP in ARV?
2. How do organizations within the civil society, the market and the state sector collaborate to enable the social entrepreneurship within the studied area RVCP in ARV?
1.4 Definitions of key terms

**Context**: “in management research contexts refers to circumstances, conditions, situations, or environments that are external to the respective phenomenon and enable or constrain it” (Welter, 2011, p. 167)

**Cross sector collaboration**: “the linking or sharing of information, resources, activities, and capabilities by organizations in two or more sectors to achieve jointly an outcome that could not be achieved by organizations in one sector separately” (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006, p. 44)

**Social entrepreneurship**: “a practice that integrates economic and social value creation” (Mair & Marti, 2006, p. 36)
1.5 Research disposition

In the figure below the disposition of the research is presented.

Figure 1. Disposition of research
2. Methodology framework

This chapter will present the methodology framework in order to enhance the understanding of how the research was conducted. Firstly, the research process will be introduced, followed by the research approach and design selected for this study. Secondly, the sampling of the informants and interviewees will be introduced. Thirdly, the collection of data will be described. Fourthly, the data analysis will be presented, followed by the quality of the research.

2.1 Research process

To provide an overview of how the research was conducted, the process is visualized in Figure 2 below. Moreover, each step will be briefly presented. The research process began with a literature review to identify possible areas that previous research was lacking. The research questions were from here designed to fill the scientific gap. The relevant theories were later chosen. The empirical data was collected through a minor field study conducted in Guatemala with the duration of 8 weeks. In total 18 semi-structured interviews with interviewees from different organizations within RVCP in ARV were carried out and observations were made. Thereafter the data was analyzed and the research questions were further specified and modified. The next step included the empirical writing and revision of the theoretical framework. Hereinafter the analysis was carried out connecting empirical data with the theoretical framework, and thereby answering the research questions. Lastly the findings of this study were summarized in the conclusion.
2.2 Research approach

As stated above the research process began by conducting a literature review on social entrepreneurship in order to gain a better understanding of the concept as a whole. This approach of understanding and being able to interpret texts is also the point of departure in the hermeneutic approach (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008; Bryman & Bell, 2011). By interpreting the collected literature on social entrepreneurship it became clear that the concept had previously been studied within a Western context. The literature review enhanced the understanding of the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship as a whole, through the collection of several different research articles and studies. This can be described as a part of the hermeneutic circle where “the part can only be understood from the whole and the whole only from the parts” (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008, p. 193). Before departure to Guatemala and the data collection through the field study, there was a pre-understanding that the national context could affect social entrepreneurship. However, through the conducted research the objective reality allowed a deeper understanding of the concept, where the local context of the studied village was seen to have distinct features affecting social entrepreneurship. This could be viewed as another part of the hermeneutic approach which connects the pre-understanding and the understanding (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008).

The collection of literature such as books and published papers has been made through the databases provided by Linköping University; Scopus and UniSearch but also Google Scholar. Firstly, the concept of social entrepreneurship was scanned to identify the area of research needed. The scanning process started out by using the keywords social entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship and social value creation. As a result the research questions were subsequently designed to fill the identified scientific gap. Hereinafter, to ensure a high relevance of searched literature the keywords took its departure from the initial research questions. For example a search in Scopus with the keywords social entrepreneurship + context led to 18 hits. The relevance of the search could further be secured in Scopus were the most cited articles were chosen. As for in the previous example an article by Jack and Anderson (2002), which was cited 258 times was chosen. Moreover, the relevance of the literature used in this study is based on the number of hits in the search results and publication date. In the case of no hits the keywords were separated in order to expand the area of research. Keywords used to conduct the literature were the following; social entrepreneurship, social value
creation, context affecting entrepreneurship, cross sector collaboration, welfare state and collective social entrepreneurship.

2.3 Research design
The research design chosen for this study is a qualitative single case study, which explains in what form the study has been conducted. In order to carry out this study I. Goedhart was contacted. She works as a central coordinator at an international development organization in the Netherlands, International Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries (Hivos). Consequently, she enabled the contact with R. Van Meer at Hivos. He works as a local project manager for RVCP in Guatemala. Furthermore he helped to establish contacts with people from the Guatemalan Exporters Association (AGEXPORT) which is the leader of RVCP. This enabled the single case study of RVCP in ARV to be conducted.

Single case study
This study has been conducted through a qualitative single case study of RVCP in ARV, based on semi-structured interviews and observations in the village of ARV. A qualitative approach was preferable as the aim of the Master Thesis was to develop a deeper understanding of the concept of social entrepreneurship from the perspective of interviewees and informants. This is in accordance with Bryman and Bell (2011), who state that a qualitative approach enables a detailed and thorough examination of the studied area. The data collection was made through observations within the village of ARV and 18 semi-structured interviews with people from different organizations connected to RVCP in ARV. This was to obtain several perspectives and thereby enhance the objectivity of the research. The observations were made as a complement to the interviews to secure the validity. Moreover, a case study was preferable as the research questions were designed with how. Furthermore, it was chosen as the events of the study could not be influenced much by the researchers. Another aspect which made the choice of a case study favorable was that RVCP in ARV is an event in real-time. These three aspects make a case study preferable according to Yin (2003).

After the conducted interviews and observations, the empirical data was analyzed and connected to the pre-formulated framework based on existing theories of social entrepreneurship, cross sector collaboration and context. During the analysis of the empirical data from RVCP in ARV, the theoretical framework was further developed. For example theory discussing the context of traditional entrepreneurship was
included, as the contextual factors in this previous research were shown to be relevant in the local context of RVCP in ARV. This even though it was social entrepreneurship that was examined during the case study. The revised theoretical framework was used when further analyzing the empirical data. This approach can be understood as abductive, which is a combination of the inductive and deductive approach. Deductive implies that conclusions about the specific case are drawn with departure from selected theory, whereas in the inductive approach the theory is formulated based on the specific case (Patel & Davidson, 2003). This approach was preferable as it served the holistic understanding of social entrepreneurship within the area of research. This openness is one of the advantages of the abductive approach, according to Patel and Davidson (2003).

2.4 Sampling of informants and interviewees

As observations and semi-structured interviews were combined in this study, both informants and interviewees were selected.

Selection of informants

The informants for the observations included in this study were different people involved in RVCP in ARV. The group of informants consisted of people in the village, including farmers, a family, management and a volunteer working in ARV. For example visiting the family of one of the farmers in the area of ARV enabled a more in-depth understanding of the daily life of a Maya family. The majority of the informants were selected by the main leader of RVCP, AGEXPORT. This can be recognized as a restriction placed on the researchers, as the sampling can be biased (Bryman & Bell, 2011). During the two days of observations of RVCP in ARV it was necessary to gather the observational information from whatever source available at the time. Because of this and as the informants were not randomly selected, this can be seen as a type of non-probability sampling; convenience sampling. This is a sample that is simply available to the researchers by virtue of its accessibility (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Moreover, during the ongoing observations informal conversations with the volunteer working in ARV occurred. This is a type of conversational interviewing, which Dalton (1959, p.280) refers to as an important foundation for data collection during observations. Moreover, the volunteer became a key informant providing much in-depth information. According to Bryman and Bell (2011) key informants can be of
great help to the observers and provide continuous support during field work, but can also constitute a risk because researchers often become dependent on this person. Moreover, when visiting the farmers the same type of conversational interviewing was used as with the volunteer. This as the Maya people is known to be reserved and somewhat suspicious towards strangers. This informality was expected to increase the understanding and the accessibility to the informants’ everyday life within the studied project. All of these partial dialogues can according to Dalton (1959, p. 280) be summarized as one single statement.

Selection of the interviewees
Before the arrival to Guatemala a schedule for the interviews was received, put together by AGEXPORT. However, the selection of interviewees was based on requests regarding people and places relevant to the formulated research questions. This can be seen as a purposive sampling, which is a type of non-probability sampling (Bryman & Bell, 2011). To obtain different perspectives interviewees from different organizations, hierarchy levels and gender were selected. The interviewees were thus requested to be different in terms of key characteristics, which is argued by Bryman and Bell (2011) to enable a good deal of variety in the sample.

Firstly, interviews with AGEXPORT were made to enhance the understanding of RVCP. Thereafter, an interview with the Hivos program officer for RVCP, R. Van Meer, was conducted. Subsequently, the observations and interviews with ARV and relevant actors of RVCP in ARV were made. These included the board of directors of ARV, member farmers of ARV, the family of one member farmer, buyers and the Community Councils of Urban and Rural Development (COCODE). Moreover, the opportunity to interview the main funder of RVCP, The United States Agency for International Development (USAID), occurred. This type of selection of the interviewees can be seen as a snowball sampling, as the interviewees at AGEXPORT have for example chosen the interviewees in ARV, COCODE and USAID. The snowball sampling method was chosen to get access to the organizations and the project, and to establish contact with people possessing rich internal knowledge. This type of knowledge generated is one of the advantages with snowball sampling according to Bryman and Bell (2011). Snowball sampling can moreover be seen as a form of non-probability convenience sample (Bryman & Bell, 2011), as it includes interviewees available.
2.5 Collection of empirical data

The empirical data mainly constituted of primary data, including observations and interviews, which will be described below. In relation to the observations four aspects will be discussed below; why observations, gaining access, using an overt role for ethical reasons and roles for observers. This will be followed by a description of the semi-structured interviews. The secondary data partly consisted of material about RVCP provided by AGEXPORT and Hivos. This information included project reports and project presentations. Additionally, secondary data was collected in form of country reports and newspaper articles.

Observations

The observations were made during two days in the beginning of March 2015. The observational method, including taking field notes, was chosen as the aim during the data collection was to become immersed in the project participants’ and organizational representatives’ realities, to gain understanding of the situation and of the day-to-day operations of the studied organizations. According to Bryman and Bell (2011) this is possible through the research involvement in the daily running of an organization, and engaging in field work in the studied organizations.

Gaining access

Gaining access to the studied area was not a major problem during this research, as explained in the sampling. However, the informants in ARV mainly consisting of Maya people were perceived to be reserved, which led to what Bell (1969) refers to as a closed social setting. Therefore to gain access it was necessary to socialize with the people in the studied area. Moreover, during all the interviews in the village one representative of the management of ARV was present. These factors could be a possible obstacle to gain full access to rich and trustworthy information.

Using an overt role for ethical reasons

When the observations were made the researchers and research purpose were clearly and openly exposed. This can be described as an overt role (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The overt role was chosen as it partly avoids ethical problems. This as it provides the informants with the opportunity to agree or disagree to participate, based on information supplied to them. Bryman and Bell (2011) argue that this decreases the risk of violating the participants’ privacy. This ethical perspective was the main reason why this role was chosen, because the study partly focuses on sensitive aspects that
could imply consequences for the participants given the current local political climate. However, Bryman and Bell (2011) argue that an overt role could lead to problems in gaining access, as informants might adjust their behavior because the researchers are present.

**Roles for observers**

During the field study it was intended to adopt the roles of *complete observers* with the aim to obtain a as objective and unbiased perspective as possible. This implies pure discrete observations without interaction with people (Gold, 1958). However, the intended role devolved into *observers-as-participants* (Gold, 1958) as representatives in the studied organizations encouraged interaction with people involved in RVCP to enable better understanding of the societal setting and the organizational tasks. The field study was mainly conducted through interviews and observations within the project, however the participation in the daily work was very limited which corresponds to what Gold (1958) refers to as observers-as-participants.

**Interviews**

As stated above, 18 semi-structured interviews with 15 people were conducted. To deepen the understanding of RVCP in ARV two interviews with the project manager of RVCP at AGEXPORT, S.Chacón and the volunteer in ARV, A. Weiss were conducted. Two interviews with M. Rabinal Vargas were conducted as he is active within two organizations, as president of the board of directors in ARV and secretary of COCODE. The semi-structured form was considered more appropriate than unstructured, as the research focus was fairly clear. Additionally, it was desirable to study more specific issues regarding social entrepreneurship in the particular context of RVCP in ARV. A set of flexible open-ended questions was prepared, which is a type of interview guide. These are attached in Appendix 1. Bryman and Bell (2011) argue that this choice is preferable when relatively specific themes should be covered and follow-up questions are desirable. Occasionally it was desirable to obtain a different perspective on a phrase or word central to the study, therefore the *flip-flop technique* was used to turn the concept “inside out” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). This technique refers to using an opposite of the concept to understand its properties, for example during the study an interviewee asked about malnutrition could later on during the interview being asked about his or her perspective of “good nutritious food”.
Three of the semi-structured interviews were audio-recorded. These include S. Chacón (2015-03-05), L. Román (2015-03-05) one of the project managers of RVCP at AGEXPORT and the program officer of RVCP from Hivos, R. Van Meer (2015-03-06), whereas notes were taken during the other interviews. The decision not to record all of the interviews was due to the importance of informality when interviewing the indigenous people, which were recommended by R. Van Meer. Therefore during the data collection when notes were taken, one was responsible for taking notes and the other for interviewing, which is a method recommended by Larsen (2009). To introduce the research in the beginning of the more formal interviews a power point presentation was used, see Appendix 2. In the other more informal settings it was expressed in words. During the interviews with ARV, COCODE, and the two buying companies Siesa and Legumex an interpreter, English to Spanish, was used to avoid the language barrier. The interpreter, A. Weiss, was also a volunteer from the Peace Corps. To follow up on some questions there was a mail correspondence with A. Weiss and S. Chacón. A summary of the 15 interviewees and informants can be found in Appendix 3.

2.6 Data analysis

The empirical data from this case study consisted of primary data such as field notes, interview notes, recorded interviews and secondary data such as project reports, country reports and project presentations. Thus, a big amount of information was obtained. In the first step of the data analysis the recorded interviews were transcribed. Thereafter, relevant themes were labeled into different colors. Corbin and Strauss (2008) define coding as the process of raising raw data to a conceptual level. It further implies to review transcripts, interview notes and field notes and giving labels to parts that appear to be theoretical or empirical significant (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The themes, which the codes were categorized into, were chosen after having considered the empirical findings. This in combination with the content of the theoretical framework. The main themes that were settled were context, cross sector collaboration and social entrepreneurship, where the last theme referred to the seven main objectives set for RVCP by AGEXPORT. Each theme and its sub-themes were assigned a specific color scale. These themes and their respective color scale were applied to all the relevant empirical information during a thorough processing. For example the theme cross sector collaboration was marked with different blue colors regarding aspects which were perceived as relevant for the study. After the data had been sorted into these three themes and its sub-themes, the empirical material was
examined to find significant patterns. These patterns of relevance were compared to existing research and theories, followed by a revising and addition of theories included in the study. This type of process including coding, themes and identification of patterns can be viewed as a *content analysis*, which Larsen (2009) describes as one of the most common ways to analyze qualitative data. This method was chosen to identify patterns, connections and common features or differences in the empirical data used for this study.

## 2.7 Quality of research

### Subjectiveness

The objectiveness of this Master Thesis can be questioned regarding some aspects. One is the observations made in the roles of participants-as-observers, which constituted of close interaction with the informants. The personal relationships which evolved during the field study could have led to a more subjective perspective of the concepts studied. This might have affected the modification of theories done after the data collection process. Bryman and Bell (2011) state that personal relationships can have an influence of the area studied, without the researchers paying any systematic thoughts into it. Moreover, due to the language barrier the significant role of the interpreter could also have led to a more subjective view of the study. This as the direction of the Master Thesis was partly based on information given by the interpreter.

### Reliability

In this qualitative study there are several aspects relevant to highlight in relation to the reliability. Because semi-structured interviews and observations were conducted, there was much room for interpretations and subjective observations which might in turn have affected the reliability. Moreover the interpretation during interviews might have led to linguistic and interpretational differences between the information given and the information received. During the interviews there was additionally a severe risk that the interviewees were affected by the situation. For example, during all the interviews with member farmers of ARV, one or two representatives from the management of ARV were present, which most likely influenced the answers given from the farmers. Signaling this was the fact that the interviewees were very reserved and barely had anything negative to say regarding RVCP. All of the given examples above imply that the grade of trustworthiness of the study can be questioned, in accordance with what Larsen (2009) refers to as the reliability.
Another risk is that the interviewees were affected by the interviewers or the method itself, the so called interview effect (Larsen, 2009). It is possible that this led to the interviewees saying what they thought the interviewers wanted to hear, trying to make a good impression or answering what they believed is commonly accepted. Another potential risk is that the management representatives wanted to make their organization or department appear in a favorable way. Moreover, Larsen (2009) argues that there is a risk that interviewees in a group interview are not honest as they might not dare to share the truth. The author further argues that one disadvantage with qualitative interviews is that people tend to be less honest when being interviewed face to face compared to for example filling out a questionnaire anonymously. Another aspect that makes the reliability questionable is the fact that the majority of the interviewees in ARV were selected by AGEXPORT. Moreover the interviewees in ARV constituted of representatives of the board of directors, thus a part of the management in ARV.

Regarding the secondary data of country reports and newspaper articles, there is a risk of the information being biased as media has the power to present news and information in whatever way suitable for them. However the sources used were the United Nations, Sveriges Ambassad and Dagens Nyheter, which can be recognized as relatively trustworthy sources.

**Generalization**

This Master Thesis has been carried out as a single case study in a village in the highlands of Guatemala. The studied area even has its own societal setting, laws and regulations. As the case study is restricted to a specific context this can according to Bryman and Bell (2011) challenge the generalizability to other settings. Furthermore the majority of the farmers interviewed consisted of members of the board of directors in ARV. This could have led to a biased perspective which according to Larsen (2009) makes the study difficult to generalize. Moreover, the Master Thesis was based on a non-probability sampling which makes the research findings difficult to generalize according to Larsen (2009). For this reason, the representative from AGEXPORT who made the selection was requested to choose interviewees and informants from a wide range of individuals relevant to the research questions. This is a preferable procedure if the aim is, as in this study, to capture multiple different ranges of activities and perspectives (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Therefore informants from different
organizational levels, gender and age within RVCP in ARV were chosen. Even though it is difficult to generalize the results when using a non-probability sampling, it was used as it serves the gathering of rich information about a specific area, which was the aim of the study.

**Transparency**
In order to enhance the transparency in this study it was aimed to explain the processes such as the sampling and the analysis in detail. Thereby the aim was to raise the understanding of what actually was done during the study and how the conclusions were reached, which (Bryman & Bell, 2011) argue can be one of the difficulties with qualitative research. However, there is continuous risk for lack of transparency. This as the researchers normally become over-embedded in their study and thereby become blind to flaws at home.
3. Theoretical framework

_In this chapter the theoretical framework will be presented. Firstly the concept of social entrepreneurship will be given, followed by theories of how context affects traditional and social entrepreneurship. Lastly theories of how organizations across sectors collaborate in order to create social value will be presented._

3.1 Social entrepreneurship

In the following section the theoretical concept of social entrepreneurship will be introduced. The following aspects will be presented below; introducing the welfare state, the emergence and definition of social entrepreneurship and lastly social entrepreneurship in the three different sectors.

3.1.1 Introducing the welfare state

In order to understand the concept of social entrepreneurship and where it is found it is important to first recognize the concept of the welfare state and its three different sectors; the market, the state and the civil society sector. The three sectors of a welfare state are presented in Figure 3. Every country represents its own welfare state and subsequently also the composition of the three different sectors (Esping-Andersen, 1990). The welfare state is responsible for ensuring minimum income levels, limit insecurity and insure that everyone has access to the best social services available (Briggs, 2000). The way a welfare state decides how to organize its economy, dividing the responsibilities of welfare between the sectors in a country, varies depending on the political history (Esping-Andersen, 1990).

However, the three sectors have different characteristics and there are some tasks that belong to each of the sectors. The state sector includes all the authorities and local administrations that maintain and performs the assignments of the state and municipality (Wijkström, 2012). It is responsible for distributing public goods and services such as health care, education and to generate and sustain public order (Waddell & Brown, 1997). The market sector constitutes of all the organizations within trade and commerce that can be seen as profit-driven organizations, focusing on creating economic value (Wijkström, 2012). Civil society includes all non-profit organizations and non-governmental organizations (Wijkström, 2012). These organizations focus on meeting social needs and creating social value (Erakovich & Anderson, 2013). However, Wijkström (2012) suggests a fourth sector called the
household sector, which includes all households within a society. The household sector has seen to play an important role in Latin American countries, where the people have to rely on the family in order to make a living (Martinez Franzoni, 2008). This because the state sector in these countries has shown to be unable to provide sufficient work opportunities for the people (Martinez Franzoni, 2008).

Wijkström (2012) further states that these four sectors have their own distinct logic, which lies as a foundation to the organizational ideal types within the different sectors. Similarly Erakovich and Anderson (2013) argue that the distinct mission, economic considerations and societal focus of each sector create the values of the three sectors included in the welfare state. This in turn decides the resource allocation. These distinct sector differences can be seen in the following Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Civil Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Create wealth</td>
<td>Implement policy</td>
<td>Serve clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>Political/citizens</td>
<td>Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Market/self-interest</td>
<td>Public interest</td>
<td>Client interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Sector differences
Source: Adapted from Erakovich and Anderson (2013)*

3.1.2 The emergence and definition of social entrepreneurship
As the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship is relatively new there are a range of existing definitions of social entrepreneurship in the literature. In this study, social entrepreneurship is based on the concept discussed by Mair and Marti (2006) who refers to social entrepreneurship as “a practice that integrates economic and social value creation” (p. 36). Furthermore, it will be based on that the focus is on creating social value, while the creation of economic value is viewed as a necessity to ensure financial self-sufficiency and sustainability of the social initiative (Seelos & Mair, 2005).
Social entrepreneurship has emerged as a response to the environmental and social value creation demand - and supply developments (Nicholls, 2006; Mair, Robinson and Hockerts 2006). There is an imbalance between the environmental and social demand – and supply-side, according to Nicholls (2006). He further states that there has been a retreat of public support from the government, mainly because of new political ideologies that promote market-driven models of welfare and focus on citizen self-sufficiency. As a result the author argues that the supply side of resources offered for public goods has remained static or been reduced. Nicholls (2006) argues that one reason behind the increased demand for social value creation is the constantly growing economic gap between the poorest and the richest.

The growing number of social problems, such as unemployment and poverty, is partly due to social change and international competition, which the welfare state of today is not built to tackle (Leadbeater, 1997). This is because the welfare state was built for stable families, full male employment and low female employment, which no longer is the common norm (Leadbeater, 1997). Moreover the welfare systems around the world are reducing their entitlements of welfare in an attempt to reduce costs. Dees (1998) further states that the state and civil society sectors are failing in meeting the needs of today. He states that this is partly because of the institutions within the civil society sector are “inefficient, ineffective and unresponsive” (Dees, 1998, p. 1).

It is because of the inequality, between supply and demand of social value creation, that social entrepreneurship has occurred according to Nicholls (2006). He proposes that social entrepreneurs create solutions to community problems and provide sustainable social value in a new form by combining business, charity and social movement models. Additionally, Leadbeater (1997) explains that the only way to overcome the growing number of social issues and maintain quality of welfare is through new innovative techniques in delivering welfare. He further argues that social entrepreneurs are one of the driving forces for delivering these new ideas of welfare services, which have seen to be more cost efficient than what the welfare state can offer.

In more recent research it has been stressed to separate the concepts of the social entrepreneur and social entrepreneurship. For example, Mair and Marti (2006) argue that the term social entrepreneur tend to focus on the individual or organization
founding the social initiative. However, they refer to social entrepreneurship as a process or behavior to create social and economic value.

3.1.3 Social entrepreneurship in the three different sectors
The source of social innovation and therefore also social entrepreneurship emerge in the conjunction of the three sectors; market, state and civil society (Leadbeater, 1997), see Figure 3. These sectors of the welfare state can be viewed as correlated from the start, however actions by social entrepreneurs often contribute to further intertwining (Tillmar, 2012). Social problems such as healthcare and poverty are too complex to be addressed by one single actor, as social problems are embedded in different sectors (Waddell & Brown, 1997; Kania & Kramier, 2011). This can be referred to as sector failure, which occurs when a sector has failed to meet social needs (Bryson et al., 2006). To overcome these failures Gray (1996) states that creative solutions exceeding the barriers of one sector are needed. By collaborating with other organizations within and across sectors, a greater social impact can be achieved than by the value creation of one single actor (Austin et al., 2006). The collaborative approach is needed, as many social issues require more resources than one organization can generate (Austin et al., 2006). Similarly, Tillmar (2012) argues that a positive result of sectoral intertwining is the commitment of people from different organizations and sectors, which can imply access to resources from a variety of sources through networks. This could however also be a disadvantage, with regard to the efforts and resources required to attract funds from different sources and coordinate activities (Tillmar, 2012).

The collaborative approach is needed as resolving social issues often involves many different actors (Montgomery et al., 2012). However, there are some challenges for organizations working together across boundaries, such as concerns about sharing sensitive knowledge or the organizational self-interest (Austin et al., 2006). In order to jointly work together across borders it is therefore important that the organizations understand the differences between the sectors (Erakovich and Anderson, 2013) seen in the previous presented Table 1.
However, social entrepreneurship is an international phenomenon occurring in different sectors depending on the country, for example in the United Kingdom social entrepreneurship is found within the intersection of all three sectors (Nicholls, 2006). On the other hand, social entrepreneurship in Latin America is most commonly found within the civil society sector and occasionally also within the market sector (Nicholls, 2006) see Figure 3. The civil society sector is often recognized as where social entrepreneurs are mostly found (Leadbeater, 1997). Social entrepreneurship occurs in different sectors due to that the national context consists of several aspects, such as the regulatory structure, politics and sociocultural factors (Austin et al., 2006). Therefore, in order for social entrepreneurs to create social value, Austin et al. (2006) argue that social entrepreneurs must find alignment both internally and externally. This can be highly challenging, as the nature of the context is dynamic, constantly changing the conditions for the social ventures.

Figure 3. The three sectors of a welfare state

Source: Adapted from Waddell and Brown (1997); Leadbeater (1997); Nicholls (2006)
3.2 Context affecting social entrepreneurship

As argued in the previous section, the context is significantly influencing social entrepreneurship. Because contextual factors influencing traditional entrepreneurship have also shown to affect social entrepreneurship, theory on traditional entrepreneurship has also been included, as stated in the methodology section. In the following section relevant theories have been selected to answer the first research question. Firstly a definition of context and its influence on social entrepreneurship will be presented. In the second part, four contextual dimension affecting entrepreneurship will be presented; business, social, spatial and institutional.

3.2.1 Definition of context and its influence on social entrepreneurship

Within management research, context refers to situations, conditions, circumstances or environments that are external to the selected phenomenon, in this case entrepreneurship (Welter, 2011). Context can moreover be defined as those elements that will influence success or failure and are outside the control of the entrepreneur (Austin et al., 2006). Newth and Woods (2014) argue that the context moreover provides forces of resistance that can both constrain and enable social entrepreneurship. They identify these forces as: the organizational, market, informal institutional and formal institutional resistance.

Recent research stresses the importance of the context where social entrepreneurship happens, as the understanding of entrepreneurial activities is dependent on contextual factors (Austin et al., 2006; Mair & Marti, 2006; Newth & Woods, 2014). Similarly Jack and Anderson (2002) stress the importance of embeddedness in the context. This refers to the extent, depth and nature of an individual’s or organization’s ties into the environment. For entrepreneurs this context embeddedness enables the entrepreneur to be supported by the local environment, and recognize what is required and available in the area (Jack & Anderson, 2002). Austin et al. (2006) similarly argue that it is of great importance for the social entrepreneur to monitor the context for potential opportunities and threats. Moreover, the social entrepreneurs are enabled to capitalize on opportunities and mobilize resources to reach the greatest social impact (Austin et al., 2006).

Austin et al. (2006) moreover argue that an adverse context often makes the social entrepreneur try to change the context itself, as the social problem generally is deeply embedded in its context. Welter (2011) similarly argues that traditional entrepreneurship is not only affected by context, but the entrepreneur can also affect
the context. However, social entrepreneurs can at times be so driven by their mission that they carry on ahead without paying much attention to the context, unconscious of their impact (Austin et al., 2006).

3.2.2 Four contexts affecting entrepreneurship
Social entrepreneurship was earlier discussed in the context of influence from the national level. This national context was described as countries with different welfare regimes affecting where social entrepreneurship is positioned in the market, state or civil society sector. However, previous research also points out four contextual dimensions that can affect traditional entrepreneurship both on a national and local level; business, social, spatial and institutional (Welter, 2011), see Table 2. Welter (2011) states that these four dimensions constitute the where context, describing where entrepreneurship occurs. The author stresses the variety of the contexts, their influence on entrepreneurship and linkages between them.

The four contextual dimensions business, social, spatial and institutional that affect entrepreneurship will be presented below. These contextual dimensions will hereinafter be referred to as contexts. Even though they will be presented separately, it is often hard to distinct the contexts from each other, as parts of them intertwine (Welter, 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Context</th>
<th>Including</th>
<th>Examples of variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Industry, market</td>
<td>Stage of life-cycle in industries and market, number of competitors,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Networks: household and family</td>
<td>Structure of networks, composition of household/family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>Geographical environment (countries, communities, districts)</td>
<td>Characteristics of physical location, infrastructure, characteristics of local communities and regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (formal and informal)</td>
<td>Political and economic system, culture and society</td>
<td>Regulations, policies and laws, societal attitudes and norms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The where contexts affecting entrepreneurship
Source: Adapted from Welter (2011)
The business context

The business context in which entrepreneurs carry out their activities includes many different aspects, for example the lifecycle in industry and number of competitors (Welter, 2011). Thus, entrepreneurs have to take into account several factors in the market dynamics, such as economics of the venture, substitutes, entry barriers, suppliers and customers (Austin et al., 2006). Likewise, Newth and Woods (2014) argue that the market resistance is a contextual force influencing social entrepreneurship, by having requirements that make the products attractive on the market relative to competitors. This market resistance includes competition, customer resistance and beneficiary resistance. Being embedded in the business context will enable the entrepreneur to understand the market and its demands, the labor market and also recognize local business opportunities (Jack & Anderson, 2002). Moreover, Austin et al. (2006) argue that the macroeconomy is a contextual factor influencing social entrepreneurship in terms of business. The macroeconomy affects for example employment levels and philanthropy activities affecting the amount of money given to social ventures.

Agricultural production is one of the most important economic activities for developing countries, and has moreover been viewed as a male dominated industry (Nyakaana, 1992). Low participation of women in traditional male-dominated industries is often due to structural factors in the societal economic context that keep women from gaining resources, access to markets or experience (Brush, de Bruin & Welter, 2014).

The social context

The second context is the social context, which can be described as the structure where entrepreneurs create social ties to the local environment and carry out their entrepreneurial activities (Jack & Anderson, 2002). The social context has also been discussed in the literature with regards to social entrepreneurship, where the demographics and the sociocultural factors have seen to influence social entrepreneurship (Austin et al., 2006). Welter (2011) states that the social context includes local factors such as social networks, households and family, all affecting entrepreneurship. These factors further contain variables such as structure of networks, the composition of households and roles within the family. These aspects will be presented below.
Social networks

A social network is defined by Haythornthwaite (1999) as a set of actors and the relations holding them together. The author further states that central to the social network is the exchange of resources, such as information, goods, services, social support or financial support. Moreover Welter (2011) states that social networks can offer access to resources in form of clients and potential employees. The author argues that it a social network contains intangible aspects such as support, encouragement and emotional understanding that friends and family can provide. Social ties is an important factor to overcome challenges that new or small businesses might experience (Davidsson & Honig, 2003). Moreover, these social networks can be seen as a mechanism for entrepreneurs to become embedded in their local context, which can contribute to entrepreneurial success (Jack & Anderson, 2002).

Household and family

The composition of the household or family, and the roles within them, are features influencing the nature of entrepreneurship (Welter, 2011). The family and relatives can for example have an impact on the emerge of opportunities, access to resources and the decision to set up a new venture (Aldrich & Cliff, 2003). Social context can moreover be related to gender issues and work-life balance. Jennings and McDougald (2007) state that women’s businesses usually are smaller than men’s in terms of income level, revenue and employment. They argue that the performance difference can be explained by female business owners experiencing a more extensive work-family conflict than their male colleagues. Likewise, Brush et al. (2014) also argue that household and family have a great impact on women’s entrepreneurship. They state that a change in household roles and social norms would increase the probability of women’s entrepreneurial venture creation. Welter (2011) argues that the household and family perspective in the social context is of great relevance, as it influences enterprise development, entry to entrepreneurship and opportunity recognition.

The spatial context

The third context is the spatial context, which refers to the physical place in the geographical environment where entrepreneurship occurs (Welter, 2011). The spatial context includes variables such as characteristics of the physical location and features of the local community (Welter, 2011). In the literature on social entrepreneurship Newth and Woods (2014) discuss one spatial contextual factor referred to as
organizational resistance. This implies the forces constraining social innovation within the organization, mainly culture and governance. The cultural inertia comes from established norms and routines, and governance will either enable or constrain innovation mainly based on the board of directors’ attitude towards risk (Newth & Woods, 2014).

Welter (2011) states that there are different types of local entrepreneurship that are of specific interest, such as community and heritage entrepreneurship. Community entrepreneurship goes beyond the individual and sees entrepreneurship as a collective happening in the local environment. Heritage entrepreneurship implies that communities are safeguarding their heritage. Welter (2011) further argues that the above mentioned types of entrepreneurship emphasize nonprofit goals, social commitment and benefits for the whole community as drivers for entrepreneurship. In this perspective, entrepreneurship is the leverage for social change and for businesses in the community, which enables social and economic development in impoverished communities (Johnstone & Lionais, 2004).

Place, gender and entrepreneurship are highly intertwined according to Berg (1997). Hanson (2009) argues that women often draw on strong local and social ties more than men. The author states that women show a high grade of place embeddedness, and they are frequently located geographically close to their relatives. Mirchandani (1999) additionally stresses the gender effect of industry that often go along with the spatial and social contexts for women entrepreneurs as they prefer, or are forced to prefer, industries where they can work from home. The author further states that home-based ventures often have difficulties in attaining legitimacy with both creditors and clients, as their growth potential is restricted and they are often seen as leisure activities.

As stated previously, Jack and Anderson (2002) argue that it is of great importance for entrepreneurs to be embedded in the local environment, referring to the physical place. On the other hand, the authors further state that over-embeddedness can stiffen economic actions when social aspects overtake economic necessities. Welter (2011) similarly argues that spatial and social closeness can lead to over-embeddedness. The author states that strong social ties can be used as control mechanisms, and that these links can result in closed local networks. This has been seen as a problem for communities aiming for social change (Welter, 2011).
The institutional context
The institutional context includes both formal and informal institutions, according to Welter (2011). The author further argues that it sets enabling and constraining boundaries for actions, thus affecting the extent and nature of entrepreneurship. As enabling forces, institutions can reduce uncertainty, costs and risks of individual actions. As constraining forces, institutions can influence the returns from entrepreneurship and possibly add to transaction costs for entering and developing a business (Brush et al., 2014). Institutions thus have a significant impact on whether an individual recognizes entrepreneurship as desirable and practicable (Shapero & Sokol, 1982). In the following section the formal institutional context will be presented, followed by the informal institutional context.

The formal institutional context
Formal institutions refer to political and economic rules and influences, which generate or limit opportunities for entrepreneurs, for example regulations and laws for market entry (Welter, 2011). This type generally has more direct impact on entrepreneurship (Welter, 2011). Likewise Brush et al. (2014) imply that hard institutional features include policies and regulations influencing entrepreneurship in expected ways, as laws and regulations are designed to have specific outcomes. Similarly Austin et al. (2006) argue that the political influence has a big impact on social entrepreneurship. Newth and Woods (2014) have moreover defined one contextual factor influencing social entrepreneurship as formal institutional resistance, which includes access to resources and regulations.

The informal institutional context
Informal institutions constitute of culture, behavior and tradition in a society, deciding the societal attitudes and norms (Welter, 2011). This context affects opportunity acknowledgment, opportunity exploitation and resource access for entrepreneurs (Welter, 2011). Likewise Newth and Woods (2014) argue that the informal institutional resistance is a force influencing social entrepreneurship, which defines what is socially accepted. The authors mean that this aspect decides if the social innovation of the social entrepreneurship gains legitimacy in the specific area or not. The legitimacy can be linked to cultural, spiritual or indigenous aspects.

Likewise Brush et al. (2014) argue that soft institutional features include norms and culture indirectly affecting entrepreneurship. This is because norms and culture define
acceptable roles for persons in a society or in a group, such as in a community. As the gender role encourages women to enable work-family synergies, it significantly affects women’s entrepreneurship (Brush et al., 2014). Moreover, women often experience a lack of access to resources relative to men (Powell & Eddleston, 2013). The authors moreover state that because the soft institutional factors are more intangible and less obvious, these factors are more difficult to change (Brush et al., 2014).

3.3 How cross sector collaboration enable social entrepreneurship

As noted in the theoretical framework on social entrepreneurship greater social impact can be achieved through collaboration between and across sectors (Austin et al., 2006). In order to answer the second research question relevant theories regarding cross sector collaboration will be presented. Firstly, the need of a collaborative approach in social entrepreneurship will be introduced. This is followed by how cross sector collaboration cooperate in order to create social value.

3.3.1 The need of a collaborative approach in social entrepreneurship

As noted in the introduction, previous research within social entrepreneurship has emphasized the social entrepreneur alone rather than the important role of external actors (Montgomery et al., 2012). Kania and Kramer (2011) suggest that the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship is even an underlying factor for the increasing recognition of the single actor as fundamental to social change. This even though there is little evidence that one single organization can solve many social problems. Therefore a collective approach is suggested in social entrepreneurship, as the work of solving social problems involves a collective action among different stakeholders (Montgomery et al., 2012). The collective action includes the importance of acquiring and utilizing resources from different actors through a variation of activities, to generate a shared vision and in turn drive change. This is enabled by the cross sector collaboration among the state, market and civil society, and is found in the intersection of the different sectors (Waddell & Brown, 1997) seen in Figure 3.

However, the importance of cross sector collaboration in order to solve social problems has been noted in previous literature by several authors (Waddell & Brown, 1997; Briggs, 2003; Bryson et al., 2006; Kania & Kramer, 2011). Bryson et al. (2006) define cross sector collaboration as “the linking or sharing of information, resources,
activities, and capabilities by organizations in two or more sectors to achieve jointly an outcome that could not be achieved by organizations in one sector separately” (p. 44). This definition corresponds to several concepts in literature such as inter-sectoral partnerships (Waddell & Brown, 1997), cross-sector partnerships (Briggs, 2003), collective impact (Kania and Kramier, 2011), sectoral intertwining (Tillmar, 2012) and cross-sector-social partnerships (Vurro, Dacin & Perrini, 2010). The collaborative approach is needed in order to address social issues such as economic development and health care. This is due to the fact that these social problems are dependent on different factors and actors based in different sectors and are therefore too complex to be solved alone (Waddell & Brown, 1997; Kania & Kramier, 2011). Moreover, cross sector collaboration often develops in turbulent environments (Gray, 1996) as the organizations recognize the need of becoming more resource independent, decrease costs and reach sustainability (Bryson et al., 2006). The cross sector collaboration is also affected by constraining and driving forces of competitive and institutional elements, according to Bryson et al. (2006). The authors thus imply that it is important that the cross sector collaboration has a strong relationship with political institutions.

3.3.2 Factors for a successful cross sector collaboration

In the literature on cross sector collaborative efforts in solving social problems, there have been several factors noted in order for the cross sector collaboration to be successful. These will be presented below.

Forging initial agreement

Forging initial agreements refers to when the actors must agree on the purpose, responsibilities, roles and work of the collaboration (Bryson et al., 2006). Moreover, the authors state that these aspects should be based on competencies of the stakeholders. Likewise, Kania and Kramier (2011) suggest a common agenda, which is needed in order for a collective impact to be successful. The authors further argue that the common agenda should assure that all actors share a common vision of change, common understanding of the problem and how to solve it. The common understanding of the problem between the actors has shown to be vital for successfully creating social entrepreneurship (Montgomery et al., 2012). To enable that the efforts of the actors within cross sector collaboration remain aligned Kania and Kramier (2011) suggest a shared measurement system across all actors.
Building leadership
Bryson et al. (2006) suggest that the actors have to build leadership within the cross sector collaboration. The authors state that the cross sector collaboration is in need of both informal and formal leaders in different management levels, who will secure that the goals are being achieved. Moreover, they stress the importance of managing conflict within cross sector collaboration, which occurs due to differences in power between actors. The authors further argue that all actors involved in cross sector collaboration must feel that their interests are being seen and by equalizing the power, the balance can be restored.

Continuous communication
Kania and Kramier (2011) argue that continuous communication is essential to develop trust, guarantee mutual objectives and motivation, which are enabled through regular meetings and open communication. The importance of building trust in order to create social entrepreneurship is further underpinned by Montgomery et al. (2012). Likewise, Bryson et al. (2006) state that in order to enable cross sectoral understanding that holds cross sector collaboration together, the actors have to build trust through continuous information and knowledge sharing.

Generation and utilization of resources
As previously mentioned, social entrepreneurship and likewise cross sector collaborations often occur in the intersection of the three sectors. This is partly because of the need for another organization's resources. These resources should according to Kania and Kramier (2011) be differentiated yet mutually reinforcing in order to create social value. Thus, one of the main strengths of sectoral intertwining is the opportunity to obtain resources from a variety of sources (Tillmar, 2012). Resources that are seen as important for social entrepreneurs are, besides financial capital through funding, also social and human capital (Leadbeater, 1997; Austin et al., 2006). Social capital is referred to as social networks and relationships, whereas human capital is the specific knowledge and skills of people within the organization (Leadbeater, 1997), such as employees and collaborating partners (Austin et al., 2006). It is however not always clear how the resources are being generated and utilized between and within sectors. Montgomery et al. (2012) and Tillmar (2012) have provided two approaches on how resources are generated and utilized in social entrepreneurship, which will be described below.
The generation of resources occurring across sectors can be described through the notion of *sectoral intertwining* by Tillmar (2012) and *cross-sector pooling* or *trading* by Montgomery et al. (2012), seen in the right hand side in Figure 4.
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*Source: Adapted from Montgomery et al. (2012) and Tillmar (2012)*

As for sectoral intertwining, Tillmar (2012) has identified two types of processes. She states that the first type, *individual intertwining*, occurs when the same person is active within multiple sectors and link their activities and resources from the different sectors to each other. Tillmar (2012) states that individual intertwining is more common in the rural context than in the urban. She states that this can be explained by society being dependent on fewer people, and because “everyone knows everyone”. The second process implying sectoral intertwining is defined by Tillmar (2012) as *organizational intertwining*. The author describes this as when different kinds of organizations -in the form of customers, funders and other stakeholders- from different sectors are interlinked in terms of activities or resources.

Both organizational intertwining and individual intertwining can occur within *cross-sector pooling of resources* and *cross-sector trading of resources*, which are two of the four collaboration types suggested by Montgomery et al. (2012), see Figure 4. The authors have seen to extend the perspective proposed by Tillmar (2012) by adding the dimension of resource flows, which can be either *pooled* or *traded*. Pooled implies sharing of the same resources, whereas trading is the sharing of different resources.
contributing to something unique to the social entrepreneurship. Cross-sector pooling of resources allows actors from different sectors to share similar knowledge and resources to gain a competitive advantage (Montgomery et al., 2012). Montgomery et al. (2012) explain the cross-sector trading of resources as were actors across the sectors come together to exchange their unique resources and expertise to solve a social issue. It is further argued that the social entrepreneurship can occur within the same sector seen on the left hand side in Figure 4. As for the same sector pooling of resources Montgomery et al. (2012) describe it as where actors within the same sector share similar skills and resources, and thereby increase efficiency and cut costs. Finally the authors suggest the same-sector trading of resources were actors within a specific sector can exchange unique resources or knowledge to one another, which allows them to combine their strengths and skills. However, it is important to note that all the suggested types of collaboration by Montgomery et al. (2012) and the processes described by Tillmar (2012) can occur simultaneously.

**3.4 Summary of theoretical framework**

In this chapter theories of social entrepreneurship, context and cross sector collaboration have been presented. This theoretical selection was chosen because the context has shown to significantly affect social entrepreneurship, and it is argued that it is of great importance for the social entrepreneur to acknowledge the context (Austin et al., 2006). Further context includes enabling or constraining forces affecting the formation of cross sector collaboration (Bryson et al., 2006). The cross sector collaboration has been seen to be a driving force to create social value (Montgomery et al., 2012).
4. Empirical findings

The Association of Rabinal Vargas (ARV) is a cooperative of farmers working with small scaled production of vegetables. ARV is situated in a small village in the rural areas of Tecpán, in the western highlands of Guatemala. The village consists of about one hundred small white and colorful houses built of stone with tin roofs, situated along a bumpy dust road, passing through the village. The village is well developed compared to others in the area, with the majority of the households having access to electricity, mobile phones and tap water in their houses. However many do not have access to irrigation systems in the fields to water their crops. There are a few small stores along the dust road, some families have small scaled bakeries connected to their homes and many households have chickens and dogs in the yard. However, there is no bigger market close to the village. The people in the village origin from the indigenous Maya people and are in general very short. The women are wearing traditional Maya clothes of handmade skirts and blouses in colorful patterns, whereas men wear modern western clothes. The adults are reserved and somewhat shy, but very polite. There are some children working by helping their parents carrying loads of wood. However, some of them are laughing and playing around the primary school, looking curiously but cautiously and pointing at the white strangers visiting the village.

-Observations (2015-03-09, 2015-03-10)

In the following chapter the empirical findings will be presented. These findings were gathered through 18 interviews with different people connected to RVCP in ARV. The findings are also based on observations during the field study in the village of ARV. The empirical findings additionally include project reports and presentations of RVCP, country reports and articles from newspapers. In the first part, RVCP in ARV will be introduced and the actors briefly presented. In the second part the context of ARV will be described to enhance the understanding of the study area. In the third part there will be a discussion on how the different organizations are collaborating within RVCP in ARV.
4.1 Introducing RVCP in ARV

The Pro-Poor Rural Value Chains Program (RVCP) is a joint action by several organizations within the market, the state and the civil society sector in order meet social needs such as poverty and malnutrition. RVCP supports 100 small farmer associations in Guatemala, and ARV is one of them (AGEXPORT a, 2015). The organizations within RVCP in ARV, will be briefly presented below. For detailed descriptions see Appendix 4.

In Figure 5 RVCP in ARV is introduced, including all the actors from initial funders to final buyers. The funders USAID and Hivos are funding the whole RVCP where ARV is included. The funding goes directly to AGEXPORT, who is the main leader of RVCP. Thereafter the funding flows in two directions, one is to the supporting organizations Vital Voices and INCAP, who is supporting ARV directly. The other is when funding flows directly to ARV, through several actions by AGEXPORT, however not in monetary terms. The secretary of COCODE, who is also the president of board of directors in ARV, M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-09) explained that COCODE is the authority in the community where ARV is situated. COCODE approved RVCP to be carried out in ARV. ARV is the performer of the project receiving the support from AGEXPORT, Vital Voices and INCAP. ARV also handles the production of vegetables, and thereafter sells the crops mainly to Siesa. Siesa is one of the exporting buyers working with ARV (AGEXPORT c, 2015).

Figure 5. RVCP in ARV
4.2 Context of RVCP in ARV

The context of RVCP in ARV will be presented in this section, to enhance the understanding of the studied area. This will be done by describing the different contexts included in the overall setting of RVCP in ARV. The empirical findings will be structured after the four contexts suggested by Welter (2011); the business, the social, the spatial and the institutional context. Within the existing theory the later context has two aspects; formal and informal. However, when presenting the empirical findings and later the analysis, the institutional context has been divided into two independent contexts. This division was made as they were seen to influence the studied area of RVCP in ARV differently.

4.2.1 The business context

The business context includes many factors. However, there were three main themes that appeared to especially influence RVCP in ARV. These themes will be presented below as; certification and other demands from buyers, women participation and handicraft.

Certifications and other demands from buyers

It was found that ARV is working with the certifications Global GAP and TESCO Nurture Scheme, to meet the domestic and international market demands. These certifications include different aspects of how to carry out good agricultural practices and currently 48 out of 152 producing members in ARV are certified under these standards (AGEXPORT c). However, ARV can still sell all crops to the higher certification price. The operation manager in ARV E. Tucubal (2015-03-10) explained that ARV is working towards getting all its farmers certified. The high certification requirements were explained by the agronomist at Siesa, E. Guarchaj (2015-03-09) who said that in order for Siesa to meet the demand from their global customers they have to require high certification standards from their suppliers. He further implied that Siesa only buys what the market wants:

“We only buy sugar snaps and snow peas. Why would we buy corn and beans from the Association of Rabinal Vargas, if the global market wants sugar snaps and snow peas from us?” -E. Guarchaj (2015-03-09)

Legumex is another company that buys vegetables from ARV, but is not involved in RVCP in ARV. However, S. Ambrocio (2015-03-10) from Legumex similarly stated
that customers of today require information about which chemicals are used for food production. He implied that Legumex stresses the importance of approved pesticides usage, and finances 75% of the fertilizers used for the crops in ARV. He further stated that:

“I take samples before the Association of Rabinal Vargas harvest their crops in order to see if any weird pesticides have been used. If that is the case, Legumex will not buy anything from the association” - S. Ambrocio (2015-03-10)

**Women participation in the field**
The program officer of RVCP from Hivos R. Van Meer (2015-03-06) described the traditional agricultural industry as dominated by men, with a low rate of women’s participation. He implied that it complicates the situation for women to participate in business, especially in the rural areas. This is underpinned by one of RVCP project managers at AGEXPORT, S. Chacón, who explained that there traditionally has been a macho culture within the agricultural industry. She also stated that all women in RVCP want to work as farmers in the field, and explained that RVCP aim to increase the women’s participation:

“In the agricultural sector there are women but not that many. We are trying to change that, to be equal in the work 50/50” - S. Chacón (2015-03-05)

Currently, 28 out of the 152 producing members of ARV are women (AGEXPORT c, 2015) where one of the main objectives of RVCP in ARV is to equalize the women’s participation (AGEXPORT a, 2015). Two of the farmers in ARV, J. Jose Rabinal and A. Tucubal Rabinal (2015-03-09) implied that it is more common for women in the village of ARV to stay at home weaving rather than working in the field. Observations in the field also indicate that this was the case, as few women were seen working with farming. However, the volunteer that lives and works in the village where ARV is situated, A. Weiss (2015-03-09) said that she knew women who had worked within farming. But, this only occurs when the workload is high. She explained that the women that participate in the field work are normally the wives of the male farmers. It was also stated that these women do not receive any payment for their work. She further reflected on the low rate of women’s participation:
“Board of directors say that ARV has 28 female producers, but during my three months here I have just seen a few working in the field” - A. Weiss (2015-03-09)

A female farmer in ARV, A. Chavalan (2015-03-10), explained that she had access to her own land, as she inherited some from her father. Observations imply that this is very rare compared to the other women in the village. However, she only takes part in two steps of the production, the seeding and harvesting. The process that includes the usage of agrochemicals is too hard for her to do herself and therefore she hires members of the association to do it. A. Chavalan (2015-03-09) additionally stated that it was hard for her to participate in trainings set up through RVCP, as she had to stay home and take care of her small children. This was also one reason for why she preferred to work from home. Another reason is because she could not afford the irrigation system needed for farming during dry season, expressed as:

“...during dry season I weave handicraft at home. I prefer to stay at home so I can be in the shadow and taking care of the children. It is hard working in the sun in the field.” - A. Chavalan (2015-03-10)

Picture 1. Woman weaving traditional clothes
Handicraft
Observations indicate that many women in the village weave beautiful clothes and textiles in their homes rather than working in the field. S. Chacón (2015-03-05) explained that RVCP is not only about producing vegetables, but also includes handicraft. She argued that this component is of great importance as it shows the traditional and cultural products of Guatemala. It can therefore be seen as an alternative to working within the agricultural industry. The area expert of RVCP from AGEXPORT who was responsible for the activities carried out in ARV, however explained that:

“There are efforts within handicraft in RVCP, but not in the Association of Rabinal Vargas…. AGEXPORT cannot invest in this type of small scale production, it is not enough quantity to be efficient.” -I. Fabiola Rojas (2015-03-13)

4.2.2 The social context
The empirical findings indicate that there are several aspects of the social context influencing RVCP in ARV. They have been categorized into two main themes portrayed below; social networks and household and children.

Social networks
Siesa has worked with ARV since 2006 (M. Rabinal Vargas, 2015-03-10). The agronomist from Siesa E. Guarchaj (2015-03-09) stated that for ARV to achieve the high certification standards, more operational support was needed. E. Guarchaj (2015-03-09) further expressed that he knew that AGEXPORT could provide this type of support through RVCP. He had a personal social network including actors from both ARV and AGEXPORT, which he linked together and as a result RVCP was implemented in ARV. It is also through the contacts of buyers such as Siesa that ARV reaches the international market.

Household and children
During a visit to the family of the operations manager E. Tucubal, his wife S. Garcia (2015-03-10) described her daily routines. She wakes up at 5.30, makes breakfast, prepares the children for school and then sends them off. When the children are away she cleans the house, washes clothes and weaves. Then she prepares lunch as the children return from school and helps them with their homework (S. Garcia, 2015-03-10). Observations indicate that the wife S. Garcia does all the housekeeping, but also
weaves clothes and looks after the family's’ small scaled bakery. This while her husband works within production, and earns the majority of the total family income. A. Weiss described the common family situation as:

“Normally women take care of the household and the families have many children. For example there are 18 children in this family” - A. Weiss (2015-03-10)

Also according to observations there were many people present in the house, both adults and children. A. Weiss (2015-03-09) explained that this is because E. Tucubal and his wife have 18 children, whereof some still live in the house with their own. Thus, there were three generations living together. She described this family situation as common within the households in the village. With regards to the many children in the house she implied that the parents send their children to school when they want to and if they want to. She explained that sometimes parents need the children to help out at home with everyday tasks, such as housework or taking care of their younger siblings. Observations also implied that there was no other option than having the children at home, as no daycares or the like exist in the area of ARV.

4.2.3 The spatial context
While gathering empirical information with regards to the physical place where ARV is situated, two main themes appeared as particularly relevant. These two are presented below as; the association form and the rural area.

The association form
According to the agronomist in ARV, F. Tuyuc (2015-03-09), operating in the form of an association implies several benefits for the members of ARV and indirectly their families. He argued that ARV as an association can more effectively spread the knowledge from trainings provided by RVCP in agricultural practices. He further explained that farmers can borrow agricultural assistance such as seeds, fertilizers and chemicals from ARV. ARV also handles accounting and taxes for the farmers. Being an association according to F. Tuyuc (2015-03-09) also facilitates for the member farmers to become certified and recertified. He explained that as a group of farmers they can increase the quantity of the crops and thereby get economies of scale in the daily operations. He stated that this joint quantity in turn implies that the farmers can bargain for fixed prices from buyers. Besides these advantages, being an organized
group is a basic requirement for being a part of RVCP, as explained by S. Chacón at AGEXPORT:

"It has to be an association. The products of individual farmers do not have the competitiveness as an association has" –S. Chacón (2015-03-05)

The rural area
In the area where ARV is situated, there is a high level of unemployment and 73% of the people live in poverty, which is defined as one family living on less than 2,5 USD per day (AGEXPORT, b). Observations imply that this was also the case for ARV in particular where the standard of living was seen to be simple. For example the farmers in the village used to do their personal business in the field before RVCP provided them with latrines, as a part of reaching the certification standards. Moreover it was seen that wages were generally low in the area. Additionally, there is a significant migration of young men to the United States, in order to find jobs and increase family income (A. Weiss, 2015-05-22). A. Weiss (2015-05-22) explained that about one third of all families have a member who is currently working or has worked in the United States. She stated that:

"Undocumented migration to the US is the number one reason members withdraw from the Association of Rabinal Vargas" –A. Weiss (2015-05-22)

Because ARV is situated in a small village in the rural areas of the Guatemalan highlands, A. Weiss (2015-03-10) stated that this isolates ARV in some aspects. She explained that it is far to the nearest market, which results in a long way to travel for the women to get groceries or to sell handicraft. However, observations found that people grow much of the food locally in the village. A. Weiss (2015-03-10) further stated that the local population does not have easy access to the Internet. She also said that they only have one primary school in the village. The accountant of ARV, A. Guarcas (2015-03-10), explained that all other education is hard to reach as it is situated about 30 minutes away by car and even longer by foot for those not having access to a car. He therefore implied that the population normally only finish primary school. He expressed that:

"It is not possible to learn English in the area, we have to go at least 30 minutes by car to find an English course. And it is very, very expensive. This is a big problem
since we in ARV can not communicate with foreign visitors and buyers that maybe want to buy from us” - A. Guarcas (2015-03-10)

Observations imply that because of the rural isolation and the size of the village, there was an atmosphere of “everyone knows everyone”. Moreover, almost everybody in the village was somehow family related (A. Weiss, 2015-05-22). These close social bonds were also highlighted within the board of directors. Three of the five directors are brothers living in the same family and the other two are also family related and live next door to the three brothers (A. Weiss, 2015-05-22).

4.2.4 The formal institutional context
The formal institutional context refers to formal regulatory forces. The two themes of this context that have shown to influence ARV the most will be presented below: the governmental influence: COCODE and political and economic aspects.

The governmental influence: COCODE
The secretary of COCODE, M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-09) explained that COCODE, as the authority of the community where ARV is situated, has the decision-making power in the area. He explained that therefore it was COCODE who approved RVCP to be implemented in ARV. He expressed that:

“We are the authority of the community, and have the power to approve or reject all projects carried out in the community” - M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-09)

According to the volunteer A. Weiss (2015-03-09) COCODE has set up its own legal system with laws and regulations for the community members. She further explained that trials do not exist and that the decision-making power operates behind closed doors and consists of men exclusively. This organ among other things determines penalties for felonious of village and one example is being condemned to lashes (A. Weiss, 2015-03-09).

Political and economic aspects
The political system is unstable in Guatemala with parties often lacking in ideology (Sveriges Ambassad, 2014). It is common that the representatives of the sovereign party changes to another party during their mandate period to gain individual economic benefits (Sveriges Ambassad, 2014). There is additionally a high grade of ongoing corruption in Guatemala (Sveriges Ambassad, 2014). Just recently the people
of Guatemala demonstrated against the president Otto Pérez as bribes had been paid to avoid import duties (DN, 2015-05-17). The demonstrations were in 10 different cities in Guatemala and were organized through social media (DN, 2015-05-17), which has seen to be a trend among young people in Guatemala to spread information and communicate about societal problems (R. Van Meer, 2015-03-06). Another issue is the nepotism found in Guatemala, referring to that people in power positions often favor their relatives in terms of for example employment, financial means and favors (R. Van Meer, 2015-03-06). Another problem Guatemala faces is poverty; with an estimated poverty rate for 2015, 50 % of the population is living below the poverty line, which is set by UN to $1.25 a day per person (UN, 2015). This makes Guatemala the poorest country in Latin America (IHS, 2014). Due to the extreme skewed resource allocation the poverty rates for the indigenous population are even higher - with 73 % living under the poverty line (IHS, 2014). This skewed resource allocation is underpinned by R. Van Meer (2015-03-06), when stating that the population of Guatemala consists of a big group of poor people and a very small group of extremely wealthy people.

Another issue is the big informal economy, including all jobs which are neither monitored by the government nor taxed. From 2002 until 2014 the people employed in the informal sector corresponded to an average of over 70 % (CIEN, 2014). Due to this high informal sector without tax-payments, 4, 1 million people are not paying taxes to the government of Guatemala (CIEN, 2014). A part of this informal sector is the stable income source through remittances from the United States (Youngblood-Coleman, 2014). Besides the non-tax payments Guatemala has one of the lowest tax rates in the world. This exacerbates the already complicated situation for the Guatemalan government, which must ensure basic services and rights to the population with its highly limited resources (Sveriges Ambassad, 2014).

With regards to ARV the president of the board of directors, M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-10) described that the village of ARV has not been provided with the basic services of irrigation and good infrastructure in terms of roads. This is a result of lack of financial means available from the Guatemalan government’s side. He discussed the bad road conditions by stating:
“The roads need to be fixed. It would make the transport of the products easier and the crops would not be damaged as much. When they are damaged ARV loses sales and thereby money.” - M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-09)

4.2.5 The informal institutional context
The informal institutional context consists of rules originating from culture, social attitudes and norms in a society. The aspects that were recognized as most prevalent in the area of ARV are outlined below: work culture, macho culture and traditional diet.

Work culture
Traditionally it is common that the farmers within the agricultural industry originate from the indigenous Maya people (R. Van Meer, 2015-03-06). Observations likewise imply that the majority of the local population, and thus farmers in ARV, originate from the Maya people. Many of the member farmers in ARV were observed while conducting heavy job tasks, such as carrying heavy loads of wood on their heads and working long periods in the field under the burning sun. This was also expressed by one of the farmers:

“It is hard working in the sun in the field” - A. Chavalan (2015-03-10)

A. Weiss (2015-03-09) further explained that the workdays are usually very long, and stated that a normal workday in the field can be around 12 hours. The farmers also get up very early in the morning to start working in the field (A. Tucubal Rabinal; J. José Rabinal, 2015-03-09), as described by one of the farmers:

“I wake up early, around 5.30, and go work in the field. Then I work all day in the field.” - A. Tucubal Rabinal (2015-03-09)

Macho culture
R. Van Meer (2015-03-06) explained that Guatemala is a very traditional country in many aspects where the macho culture is substantial and where the indigenous population has a strong historical legacy. Likewise S. Chacón (2015-03-05) argued that over time there had been problems related to the traditional common belief that only men could work and provide income for the family. She explained that many people had experienced this prevalent macho culture.
As for the area where ARV was situated, A. Weiss (2015-03-10) implied that domestic violence is common, but occurs behind closed doors and is practically taboo to talk about. This was shown during the field study observations when a woman in the village described her husband as the best husband in the world because he provided for the family and did not hit her. She stated that men normally have the decision making power in the family:

“The man is often the head of the family, so he makes the decisions….decisions regarding different things, like the man chose his wife and they get married very young, when they are like 15-18 years old ….the man also decides if they are using contraception or not.”-A. Weiss (2015-03-10)

**Traditional diet**

With the extensive agricultural industry in Guatemala a lot of nutritious food such as different types of vegetables is produced. Yet this type of production or increased income does not automatically lead to better nutrition and health for the Guatemalan people (R. Van Meer, 2015-03-06). For example 74% of the children in Guatemala under the age of five suffer from malnutrition (S. Chacón, 2015-03-05). The problem of malnutrition originates from eating habits deeply rooted in the culture consisting of corn, rice, beans and tortillas and very little vegetables (R. Van Meer, 2015-03-06).

*Picture 2. White, yellow and purple corn*
The link between income, traditional diet and malnutrition was also shown in the case of ARV. A. Weiss (2015-03-10) explained that the people in the village have a very traditional diet. She stated that even though they grow vegetables such as sugar snaps and snow peas people do not eat it because of their food culture. Furthermore she explained that sometimes there are big amounts of crops, which are not saleable because they for example look odd. These crops are then thrown away instead of eaten. This was further discussed during a visit to a family in the village. S. Garcia (2015-03-10) expressed that “our income has increased so we can feed the children better food”. But when asked about what they eat she answered “rice, beans, tortillas and corn”, which has been stated to be a part of the traditional diet leading to malnutrition (R. Van Meer, 2015-03-06).

4.3 How the cross sector organizations are collaborating within RVCP in ARV

The different organizations within RVCP in ARV were briefly introduced in the Figure 5, in this part of the empirics the roles of these organizations will be presented. Firstly, by describing the role of AGEXPORT, the main leader of the project. Secondly, the roles of the funders Hivos and USAID will be presented, followed by the role of ARV. Thirdly, the roles of the supporting organizations, Vital Voices and INCAP will be introduced. Fourthly, the role of Guatemalan government and COCODE will be presented, followed by the role of Siesa. For a more detailed description of the organizations, see Appendix 4.

4.3.1 The role of AGEXPORT

AGEXPORT
Role: main leader
Sector: market sector

The interview with AGEXPORT, the main leader and initiator of RVCP, was held at the head office in Guatemala City. The interview provided a deeper understanding of RVCP as a whole, which will be highlighted below.
In the interview with AGEXPORT, S. Chacón (2015-03-05) explained that the project was set up to address the social problems which are common on the western highlands of Guatemala. She explained these problems as:

“The members of a family is between 6-8, it is the average. They live of 2,5 dollars per day per family..... sometimes the only thing that they can do to survive is to go to another country ....74% of the children under 5 years suffer from malnutrition.”

-S.Chacón (2015-03-05)

She further described that through RVCP, actors want to change this situation by creating job opportunities for the indigenous people, who are living in these areas. These job opportunities are created through RVCP by supporting small farmers associations of vegetables and handicraft. The support from AGEXPORT was partly described by S. Chacón (2015-03-05) as: “...we support them with access to markets, access to technology and innovation”.

Moreover, she explained that the support from RVCP comes in several ways and through several partners. This in order to enable the seven main objectives of RVCP which are; employment, income generation, technical assistance to small producers, access to finance, environmental sustainability, gender equality and food and nutrition security (S. Chacón, 2015-03-05). This is further described by L. Ramón (2015-03-05):

“When we have all the resources of this intervention for 2-3 years, we can improve the income of the people, we generate employment in the area where there is no work. It is an increase of food nutrition and security, poverty reduction, competitiveness and environmental sustainability. These are the results that are our goals.”

-L. Ramón (2015-03-05)

The resources within RVCP are acquired through several sources. S. Chacón (2015-03-05) said that all the partners included in the project are working with their specific goal and role. The roles of the funding partners were described as “USAID is the main funder and Hivos is the co-funder of the project”(S. Chacón, 2015-03-05). As USAID is the main funder of the project, S. Chacón stressed the importance of reaching their overall goal – to reduce poverty and malnutrition.
4.3.2 The role of funders

The interview with the program officer of RVCP from Hivos, R. Van Meer, was scheduled the day after the meeting with AGEXPORT. The meeting with R. Van Meer was held at the head office at AGEXPORT where his office is located. He explained that this enables him to keep a daily contact with AGEXPORT and makes it easier to follow up on the project.

R. Van Meer described Hivos role within RVCP as both funder and strategic advisor. He further explained that Hivos had set up three objectives for the project: business strengthening, women empowerment and eco-enterprises. These are the outcomes that Hivos strive for at the end of the project. When asked about these goals in relation to the overall goal of USAID he described it as: “let’s say they are sub products of the same main product” (R. Van Meer, 2015-03-06).

During the field study in Guatemala it was scheduled to visit AGRITRADE, the largest agricultural business fair in Latin America set up by AGEXPORT. This visit would help gain a deeper understanding of the Guatemalan agriculture sector. Conveniently, an interview with an USAID representative could be held at the fair.

In the interview with the USAID representative it was described that it was the first time that USAID, the state owned development agency, was working with a domestic partner such as AGEXPORT. The hope of USAID is that this approach will be more
sustainable as the chances are higher that the small farmer associations, such as ARV, can act more independently after the involvement of USAID. When asked why USAID chose to fund RVCP with 23 million US dollar the USAID representative (2015-03-13) said:

“We chose the RVCP because we saw that the goals were aligned and that the practical actions from AGEXPORT and its partners would lead to the main objective of USAID: to reduce poverty and malnutrition”

Moreover, the USAID representative highlighted that in order to secure the goals of USAID a close dialogue must be kept with AGEXPORT: “We have one contact person and meet regularly, every second week, and our representative does visits in the field” (USAID representative, 2015-03-13). Furthermore, when asked if USAID has goals for RVCP which they are evaluating, the representative from USAID explained:

“Yes we have evaluation yearly and in the end of the project. We have indicators on different levels, national, regional, target community and down to project level results. We measure if the theory works, if the actions from USAID and its partners actually lead to reduction of malnutrition and poverty”

4.3.3 The role of ARV

The field study on the small farmer association ARV, included in RVCP, took place during two days in the beginning of March 2015. This time of the year Guatemala experiences its dry season and therefore the production in ARV was low. Moreover, RVCP was implemented in ARV in 2014, nine months prior to the field study.
In the interview with the president of the board of directors in ARV, M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-10) he explained how the whole process had started by stating “Siesa recommended the Association of Rabinal Vargas to AGEXPORT and the RVCP”. Siesa who had been buying snow peas and sugar snaps from ARV connected them to the project as they wanted ARV to have more certified farmers. However, as described above, before the implementation of the project in ARV could start COCODE had to approve it. M. Rabinal Vargas, who is also secretary of COCODE, explained the reason behind why COCODE had permitted RVCP to be carried out in ARV: “RVCP was approved because of the economic reasons for the Association of Rabinal Vargas” (M. Rabinal Vargas, 2015-03-09).

The support from RVCP started with AGEXPORT hiring the agronomist F. Tuyuc and putting him in a leading position within ARV (A.Weiss, 2015-03-10). A. Weiss, the volunteer that works in ARV explained that the main responsibility of F. Tuyuc is to provide the farmers in ARV with technical assistance. This in order to enhance good agricultural practices. The support from F.Tuyuc became visible during the field study when visiting the farmers and one of them expressed: “I get training from Don Enildo and Florencio who visit me and tells me what to use in the production which makes the production quantity increase” (A. Tucubal Rabinal, 2015-03-09). Additionally, A.Weiss (2015-03-10) explained that AGEXPORT hired A. Guarcas as an accountant to handle the finances and salaries to the members of ARV.

M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-10) said that the support from RVCP is enabled by regular visits to ARV from the organizations AGEXPORT, INCAP, Vital Voices and Siesa. The support from the different organizations of RVCP is helping ARV work towards the main goal of ARV: “to increase export, increase family income level and thereby improve the life quality of our members and their families” (F. Tuyuc, 2015-03-10). F. Tuyuc means that the increase in export and family income will lead to food and nutrition security, as the families will then be able to buy better food. F. Tuyuc further explained how RVCP has supported ARV:

- Marketing, promotion and in commercial aspects: strengthening the relationships with buyers and giving them access to export markets, generating income increase
- Technical assistance to improve the quality and quantity of production such as fences to protect the crops, latrines for better hygiene, waste containers and separate mixing areas.
- As a part of technical assistance, trainings for the farmers in good agricultural practices, environmental topics, safe agrochemical usage, good hygiene, food security and nutrition
- Supporting gender equality, with a focus on of women’s participation in the field
- Planting plans set together with the buyers to enhance the knowledge of when to produce and what, in order to meet the market demand
- New building in 2014 including store room, dining room, office and meeting room

4.3.4 The role of Vital Voices and INCAP

The information regarding the cross sector collaboration of the supporting organization within RVCP in ARV is based on interviews with AGEXPORT and the volunteer working in the village of ARV. In the interview with S. Chacón at AGEXPORT regarding the work of the supporting organizations she said:

“The supporting organizations represent a very important part of the RVCP, since the project would not be possible to carry out without them” - S. Chacón (2015-03-05)

These supporting organizations include INCAP that is promoting food and nutrition security and Vital Voices which is promoting women’s participation in the field (I. Fabiola Rojas, 2015-03-13). The work of INCAP in ARV was explained by the area expert manager of RVCP, I. Fabiola Rojas (2015-03-13), as: “INCAP is promoting food security and nutrition in the village, by arranging trainings and visiting the members of ARV house by house”. However, the collaboration with Vital Voices had been perceived as difficult, which was described by A. Weiss as:
“Vital Voices has talked to the board of directors, trying to organize a meeting with female members. They asked the board of directors to collect a list of 30 names of women that they could work with, which they however have not succeeded in doing. The board of directors also do not show up to meetings from time to time.”

- A. Weiss (2015-03-09)

However, in the later mail correspondence with A. Weiss (2015-04-15) she mentioned that Vital Voices has succeeded in holding two gender awareness workshops with the board of directors and their wives. The organization has also started holding monthly entrepreneurship workshops with a group of farmers' wives (A. Weiss, 2015-04-15). She described that the support from INCAP started in December 2014. This through their maternal and infant nutrition project where INCAP visited the families of farmers with pregnant wives or children under the age of two. Since then INCAP visits the families and provides classes every second week (A. Weiss, 2015-04-15).

4.3.5 The role of the Guatemalan government and COCODE

The empirical information of the collaboration between the Guatemalan government and RVCP is based on the interviews with AGEXPORT, Hivos, USAID, ARV and COICODE.

As previous stated COICODE approved RVCP to be carried out in ARV. However, the collaboration between the Guatemalan government and RVCP has shown to be infrequent and lacking accountability in areas of infrastructure (S. Chacón, 2015-03-05; Representative USAID, 2015-03-13; M. Rabinal Vargas, 2015-03-09). When the question regarding the role of the government in RVCP was brought up in the interview with S. Chacón she first became silent. After a deep sigh she said: “there is not much cooperation but we try” (2015-03-05). R. Van Meer (2015-03-06) explained the relation to the government as:
“Especially this year I think will be very complicated because it is election year and all the funding that is in theory available on paper for the ministry will be used to campaign”

In the interview with the president of the board of directors in ARV, M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-10) explained that there is a lack of irrigation in the area. He explained that they had applied for funding from the Guatemalan government of an amount corresponding to 1,045,000 USD (Oanda, 2015-04-13):

“We applied for an irrigation project from the government PDR - Programa de Desarrollo Economico Rural- but it was too expensive since it would cost 8 million Quetzals so we did not get it.” –M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-10)

4.3.6 The role of Siesa

During the field study within the village of ARV, it was scheduled to meet with the exporting organization Siesa that buys crops from ARV.

When interviewing the agronomist E. Guarchaj from Siesa (2015-03-09), he described that they had been buying vegetables from ARV for about nine or ten years. He said that they are very pleased with the collaboration with ARV as they fulfilled all the criteria of a partner. He mentioned that Siesa only collaborates with organized groups, partly by setting up planting plans together of what to produce and when in order to meet the market demand. Furthermore, he expressed the importance of the suppliers working towards reaching certification standards.

M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-10) said that in 2008 ARV was able to achieve certification standards for some farmers, with the financial support from Siesa. He also explained that ARV needed more operational support in order to increase the number of certified farmers. At this time Siesa collaborated with AGEXPORT. The agronomist at Siesa, E. Guarchaj (2015-03-09) explained that he knew that RVCP
could provide the support needed in ARV in order to reach the standards. As described above he therefore recommended ARV to AGEXPORT and RVCP (E. Guarchaj, 2015-03-09).

Furthermore, E. Guarchaj from Siesa (2015-03-09) described the collaboration with AGEXPORT as: “AGEXPORT and Siesa communicate on all levels, on the field level and among higher management as well.” Additionally, when asked about how he communicated with AGEXPORT and ARV he said: “there is a constant communication. Florencio is here almost every day so we can talk to him, I have contact almost daily. Through email, mobile and visits” (E. Guarchaj, 2015-03-09).

4.4 Summary of empirics

In this section a summary of the empirical findings will be given. Firstly, the different contexts of the studied area which has shown to affect RVCP in ARV will be presented in Table 3. Thereafter, in Table 4, a summary of how the cross sector organizations collaborate within RVCP in ARV is presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of context</th>
<th>The business</th>
<th>The social</th>
<th>The spatial</th>
<th>The formal institutional</th>
<th>The informal institutional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influencing aspect 1</td>
<td>Certifications and other demands from buyers</td>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td>The association form</td>
<td>The governmental influence: COCODE</td>
<td>Work culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing aspect 2</td>
<td>Women participation in the field</td>
<td>Household and children</td>
<td>The rural area</td>
<td>Political and economic aspects</td>
<td>Macho culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing aspect 3</td>
<td>Handicraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional diet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3. Summary of how context affect RVCP in ARV*
How the organizations collaborate across sectors in RVCP in ARV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Influencing employees</th>
<th>Means of communication</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGEXPORT</td>
<td>Market sector</td>
<td>Main leader</td>
<td>Employment, income generation, technical assistance, financing, environmental sustainability, gender equality and food and nutrition security</td>
<td>F. Tuyuc, I. Fabiola Rojas, S. Chacón and L. Ramón</td>
<td>Regularly through visits, mobile and mail</td>
<td>Technical assistance, business strengthening new building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hivos</td>
<td>The Netherlands: civil society sector</td>
<td>Funder and strategic advisor</td>
<td>Business strengthening, women empowerment and Eco-enterprises</td>
<td>R. Van Meer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial and strategic advices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hivos</td>
<td>The Netherlands: civil society sector</td>
<td>Funder and strategic advisor</td>
<td>Business strengthening, women empowerment and Eco-enterprises</td>
<td>R. Van Meer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial and strategic advices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>US: state sector</td>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Reduce poverty and malnutrition</td>
<td>USAID representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARV</td>
<td>Civil society sector</td>
<td>Permitting organization</td>
<td>Economic reason</td>
<td>M. Rabinal Vargas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCAP</td>
<td>Civil society sector</td>
<td>Supporting organization</td>
<td>Food and nutrition security</td>
<td>Representatives from INCAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCODE/ Guatemalan government</td>
<td>State sector</td>
<td>Permitting organization</td>
<td>Economic reason</td>
<td>M. Rabinal Vargas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siesa</td>
<td>Market sector</td>
<td>Linking organization</td>
<td>ARV achieving certification standards</td>
<td>E. Guarchaj</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linking to RVCP and access to international market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Summary of how the cross sector organizations collaborate
5. Analysis

This chapter contains the analysis of the empirical findings of this study in relation to the theoretical framework. Firstly an introducing part discussing the creation of social entrepreneurship within RVCP in ARV will be given. Thereafter an analysis model will be presented, which the following discussion is structured in accordance with. This analysis will thereinafter be summarized and result in a suggested framework.

5.1 Creating social entrepreneurship within RVCP in ARV

The aim of RVCP in ARV is found to be to create both economic and social value. This value is aimed to be created through the seven main objectives of RVCP: employment, income generation, technical assistance, access to finance, environmental sustainability, gender equality and food and nutrition security. Economic value has been recognized as employment, income generation, technical assistance and access to finance. The social value creation includes the objectives environmental sustainability, gender equality and food and nutrition security. Economic and social value creation is combined in the project of RVCP in ARV, which implies that social entrepreneurship is performed. This acknowledgement was done in accordance with the definition of Mair and Marti (2006), who refer to social entrepreneurship as “a practice that integrates economic and social value creation” (p.36). Therefore, social entrepreneurship in this Master Thesis refers to the creation of economic and social value, which aims to be created through the seven main objectives of RVCP in ARV.

To analyze the findings and simultaneously answer the research questions a model for the analysis was developed, see Figure 6. The analysis will be structured according to this model. Firstly, the contexts that have shown to affect the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV will be analyzed. These contexts can be seen in the square on the left hand side and include: the business, the social, the spatial, the formal institutional, the informal institutional and lastly the international influence context. Moreover, these contexts have seen to include forces both enabling and constraining the social entrepreneurship, which will be discussed in relation to each context. Thereafter, as seen in the square on the right hand side, factors of how the organizations collaborate...
across sectors will be examined. These factors include: *forging initial agreement, building leadership, continuous communication and generation and utilization of resources*. They will be discussed by how they enable and constrain the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. Simultaneously, the interconnection between the context and collaboration will be described. Following this, two tables will be presented summarizing the analysis of the two aspects context and cross sector collaboration. Lastly the analysis will result in a suggested framework to clarify how context, cross sector collaboration and social entrepreneurship are connected.

*Figure 6. Analysis model*
5.2 How contextual factors affect the social entrepreneurship

In this section the different contexts that have been seen to affect the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV will be analyzed. These contexts, seen in the figure above, are the following: the business, the social, the spatial, the formal institutional, the informal institutional and lastly the international influence context. The contexts presented are partly categorized after the existing theory presented by Welter (2011). However the suggested institutional context has been divided into formal and informal. The international influence has also been added to the existing theory as it appeared to be a relevant influencing factor during the case study. The six contexts will be analyzed one by one below through their enabling and constraining forces.

5.2.1 The business context

The understanding of the business context and its demands has been a crucial factor for the performance of RVCP in ARV. Many factors in the market dynamics have to be taken into account by the entrepreneur, such as industry, customers and suppliers (Austin et al., 2006; Welter, 2011). Yet the factors of the business context that have shown to influence the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV in a crucial way have been categorized into two themes presented below; the enabling market demand and the constraining male dominated industry.

The market demand

The empirical findings show that the initiation of RVCP in ARV was triggered by the international market demand. This demand led to buyers having certification requirements and criteria which ARV had to fulfill, for example planting plans determining types of crops. The agronomist at the buying company Siesa expressed this as:

“We only buy sugar snaps and snow peas. Why would we buy corn and beans from Rabinal Vargas, if the global market wants sugar snaps and snow peas from us?”

-E. Guarchaj (2015-03-09)

The international market demand thus initiated RVCP in ARV, but has also seen to continuously affect the operations in ARV. The empirical findings highlight that in accordance with Austin et al. (2006) the customer demand is an important contextual factor in the market dynamics. It has shown to be necessary to constantly take this demand into account as a farmers association. For example, the findings show that
customers of today often want to know about chemicals used in food production, which was stressed in the interview with the buying company Legumex. The agronomist at the company explained their zero-tolerance attitude towards unpermitted pesticides as:

“I take samples before Rabinal Vargas harvest their crops in order to see if any weird unpermitted pesticides have been used. If that is the case, Legumex will not buy anything from the association” - S. Ambrocio (2015-03-10)

The empirical example above can be seen as a positive market resisting force (Newth & Woods, 2014) as the market has influenced the production in such way that the products are attractive on the market relative to other propositions. Thus, the international market demand has been seen to both initiate RVCP in ARV and be an ongoing influence on the project. Therefore, the international market demand has contributed to the creation of both economic and social value and is in turn recognized as a force enabling the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

**Male dominated industry**

It has been found that women in ARV are expected to prioritize the household and family above working within farming, which implies that fewer women are available for agricultural production. This even though it is seen as one of the most important economic activities for developing countries (Nyakaana, 1992) such as Guatemala. Additionally it was shown that due to the high birth rates it makes it difficult for women to participate in the farming. Moreover, from a female farmer perspective the production has been described as hard work. It has been recognized that women only work in the field occasionally when the workload is heavy, and then often without payment because they help their husbands. A. Weiss (2015-03-09) reflected over the low participation rate for women as:

“Board of directors say that ARV has 28 female producers, but during my three months here I have just seen a few working in the field”

The empirical findings show that the agricultural industry in the study area of ARV is dominated by males, which Nyakaana (1992) states as common for the agricultural industry in general. It has further been seen that it is harder for women than for men in ARV to gain resources and work experience, mainly because of structural factors in
the context. These structural factors include that women in the village less often own their own land and additionally they are often obligated to alone take care of the children. Brush et al. (2014) argue that low women participation in male dominated industries is often due to these types of structural factors in society. These factors have thus seen to inhibit the possibility for women to enter entrepreneurship, which Welter (2011) similarly argues is due to the expected gender roles in a society.

One of the main objectives of RVCP in ARV is to equalize women’s participation in farming expressed by S. Chacón (2015-03-05) at AGEXPORT: “in the agricultural sector there are women but not that many. We are trying to change that, to be equal in the work 50/50”. However, the farming in ARV has shown to be male dominant with low female participation due to the structural factors described above. Therefore the male dominated industry is recognized as a force constraining women participation in the field. Thus, it constrains the social value creation and thereby the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

5.2.2 The social context
The social context, constituting of factors such as social networks and household roles (Welter, 2011), has shown to have a significant influence on the initiating and the nature of social entrepreneurship occurring in ARV through RVCP. Two forces within the social context have been identified as affecting the social entrepreneurship in a substantial way and will be presented below: the enabling social networks and the constraining traditional household roles.

Social networks
The empirical findings imply that social networks are of great relevance for RVCP in ARV as it has provided access to clients, information and financial support. Welter (2011) argues that these are main advantages of social networks. This can be seen through the initiating phase of RVCP in ARV where the agronomist at Siesa, E. Guarchaj, was shown to have a personal social network including both representatives from AGEXPORT and ARV. Through the social network the linkage was enabled and RVCP was implemented in ARV. Consequently, ARV obtained some of the advantages discussed by Welter (2011), such as access to clients and information through RVCP. These were described by S. Chacón (2015-03-05) as: “…we support them with access to markets, access to technology and innovation”.
Thus, the personal social network of E. Guarchaj at Siesa enabled the linkage that resulted in RVCP being implemented in ARV. This implies that the social network is recognized as a force enabling both social and economic value creation, and thereby enabling the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

**Traditional household roles**

The empirical findings show that it is more common for women in the village of ARV to stay at home to take care of the household rather than working in the field, as stated previously. They were seen to have some home-based work such as weaving or having a small bakery. It was found that women in ARV prefer, or were forced to prefer, work which they could do from home. Mirchandani (1999) argues that this is a common influence of the social context defining acceptable roles. The author further argues that this type of home-based ventures have difficulties in attaining legitimacy as work, as they are often just seen as leisure activities. This perspective was shown in accordance with the situation in ARV. Weaving and managing the bakery were perceived as chores included in the daily household routines rather than a form of business. Additionally, the empirical findings show that families in the area of ARV usually have many children, and it is the women’s responsibility to take care of them. This is reinforced by Austin et al. (2006) who state that this is a sociocultural factor which influences social entrepreneurship. A. Weiss underpinned this family situation during a visit to one of the families in ARV explaining:

“*Normally women take care of the household and the families have many children. For example there are 18 children in this family*” - A. Weiss (2015-03-10)

It has therefore been found that the women in ARV experience a more extensive work-family conflict than the men. The culture that defines these types of acceptable roles for people in a society affects entrepreneurship as it can constrain women to participate in business activities (Brush et al., 2014; Jennings & McDouglad, 2007). It was found that women in the village of ARV receive fewer resources relative to men, in terms of land and the possibility to participate in trainings provided by RVCP. Powell and Eddleston (2013) further emphasize this by stating that it is common while adopting traditional gender roles.

It has been found that there are efforts of RVCP in ARV trying to change the traditional household roles, which Brush et al. (2014) argue would increase the
probability of women’s entrepreneurship. These efforts for change have been observed as RVCP is trying to increase women’s participation in the field. Moreover the RVCP is trying to enhance gender equality through trainings and entrepreneurship workshops with farmers wives, set up by Vital Voices. However, it has been difficult to change these household roles partly because women are obligated to stay at home with the children. This is because there is no other option such as daycare in the village of ARV. Additionally, the norm of women taking care of the household rather than working seems to be strongly anchored in the traditions of the area of ARV. Brush et al. (2014) further argue that this norm is seen as an intangible cultural factor and therefore difficult to change.

The above presented aspects of household roles in the village where ARV is situated have seen to be factors contributing to low women’s participation in farming. As one of the main objectives of RVCP in ARV is to reach gender equality, the household roles can be seen as a force constraining the social value creation. Therefore it also constrains the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

5.2.3 The spatial context
The spatial context is described by Welter (2011) as the physical place in the geographical environment where entrepreneurship occurs. The physical place in this case refers to the village where ARV is situated. Seen to RVCP in ARV where all the actors jointly create social entrepreneurship, it is important that all actors directly involved in the value creation in ARV understand the spatial context. This is argued to be crucial in order to achieve the desired outcome of entrepreneurship (Jack & Anderson, 2002). Within the spatial context of ARV three aspects have been shown to clearly affect the social entrepreneurship and will therefore be presented below; the enabling *ARV working as an association*, the constraining *lack of embeddedness*, the constraining *over-embeddedness* and the constraining *rural isolation*.

**ARV working as an association**
The empirical findings show that the farmers working together in the form of an association have implied several advantages. One crucial advantage is that it enabled ARV to be a part of RVCP from the beginning. S. Chacón (2015-03-05) at AGEXPORT explained that: “*It has to be an association. The products of individual farmers do not have the competitiveness as an association has*”
It has also brought several other advantages. One example is that the technical assistance provided through RVCP can be spread more effectively, facilitating the certification and recertification of farmers. Additionally it has shown that as a farmers association, ARV can negotiate fixed prices from buyers. These aspects have seen to secure income levels for the farmers in ARV. Moreover, this collaborative approach between the farmers in ARV characterizes community entrepreneurship, which Welter (2011) suggests is a type of entrepreneurship that goes beyond the individual. This is in accordance with ARV as working in the form of an association was recognized as a way to generate value for many people. Working as an association has thus shown to be the leverage for business in the area, in terms of securing income and giving access to RVCP. Therefore, this can be recognized as a type of local entrepreneurship, which Johnstone and Lionais (2004) argue enables social and economic development in impoverished communities.

The above mentioned advantages of operating in the form of an association, in combination with the fact that it enabled ARV to be a part of RVCP, has thus seen to enable the creation of economic and social value. This implies that ARV working as an association is recognized as a force enabling the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

**Lack of embeddedness**
The empirical findings indicate that there have been efforts within RVCP in ARV to become embedded in the physical location of ARV, which is of great importance when creating entrepreneurship according to Jack and Anderson (2002). For example AGEXPORT created a local connection by hiring agronomist F. Tuyuc and the accountant A. Guarcas from AGEXPORT to work in RVCP in ARV. Moreover, field visits from all the collaborating organizations are occasionally done in ARV.

However, empirical findings have shown that the social value creation in ARV has been constrained due to lack of embeddedness in some aspects. It was recognized that some actors of RVCP in ARV did not always know what was available and required in the area of ARV. This was underpinned by the discussion regarding gender equality and the example below. S. Chacón (2015-03-13) at AGEXPORT stated that all women in RVCP in ARV want to work as farmers in the field, but a female farmer differently expressed:
This example implies that some actors within RVCP are very keen to address the social needs of ARV, yet carrying on with their social value creation without paying much attention to the context. Austin et al. (2006) argue that this can be the case when social entrepreneurs are very driven by their mission. The empirical example shows that some actors of RVCP do not recognize what is desired in ARV in terms of support, which Jack and Anderson (2002) state implies a lack of embeddedness in the local context. The authors further argue that this is normally constraining the entrepreneurship.

Lack of embeddedness in the context of ARV has thus seen to imply that actors of RVCP occasionally do not have a common understanding of how to address the social problems, such as gender equality. Therefore the lack of embeddedness is recognized as a force constraining the social value creation, and thereby the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

**Over-embeddedness**

Additionally over-embeddedness has shown to be a force constraining the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV in other aspects. There is a spatial and social closeness within ARV, seen from observations to be a result of the size of the village and the way the management controlled ARV. The closeness was mainly highlighted through the close bonds of the board of directors, described as:

“The board of directors has constituted of the same people since the start of ARV”

-I. Fabiola Rojas (2015-03-13)

All directors of the board were additionally shown to be family related, with the majority being brothers and living in the same family. Jack and Anderson (2002) argue that social networks can be a mechanism for entrepreneurs to become embedded in their local context, and thereby enabling entrepreneurial success. However this local closeness of the board of directors was seen to result in a closed local network in ARV, which Welter (2011) argues is an implication for groups aiming for social change. The close social ties and the fact that all directors of the board of ARV are
family related, can imply a risk for corruption and nepotism. This has seen to be a great problem in Guatemala in general (Sveriges Ambassad, 2014).

Additionally, M. Rabinal Vargas is both the president of the board of directors of ARV and the secretary of the community authority COCODE. M. Rabinal Vargas being active within the two organizations was shown to put him in a questionable power position, having much control over ARV. This because he has a strong decision making influence in ARV at the same time as COCODE is the authority in the area of ARV. Welter (2011) argues that this type of social and spatial closeness can lead to over-embeddedness, and thus be a disadvantage when strong social ties are used as control mechanisms. The negative aspect of this power position was shown when the board of directors made the collaboration with the gender equality organization Vital Voices difficult. Newth and Woods (2014) argue that the board of directors’ attitude towards risk can constrain social innovation. However as seen in the example with Vital Voices, it was the board of directors’ attitude towards change that somewhat constrained the social value creation.

In summary, over-embeddedness has shown to result in a questionable power position and a closed local network of the board of directors in ARV. This was found to make the social value creation, in the form of gender equality, through RVCP in ARV more difficult. Thus it has seen to constrain the social value creation, and thereby the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

**Rural isolation**
The empirical findings have shown that the physical location of ARV, within a village in the rural areas of the Guatemalan highlands, has created some challenges for RVCP in ARV. The rural aspect and the isolation that comes with it are typically characteristics for the local community where ARV is situated. These characteristics of the local community are of great importance to acknowledge for the entrepreneurship to be carried out (Welter, 2011). The physical location in the rural area has shown to imply limited access to job opportunities and generally low wages. However this is not only because of the rural isolation. Martinez Franzoni (2008) argues that in Latin American countries, such as Guatemala, the state sector is generally unable to provide sufficient work opportunities. Therefore many men of ARV have migrated abroad in order to find better-paid work and provide for their families. Besides the social impact this has on the family, it leads to a more limited workforce available for ARV. As expressed by the volunteer living in ARV:
“Undocumented migration to the US is the number one reason members withdraw from the Association of Rabinal Vargas”—A. Weiss (2015-05-22)

Additionally the physical location in the rural area has resulted in ARV and its members being isolated in some aspects. These aspects include limited access to the Internet, education, markets and learning English. Jack and Anderson (2002) argue that it is especially important for external entrepreneurs active in rural areas to acknowledge and understand these types of features, to achieve entrepreneurial success. The accountant in ARV explained the lack of education coming from the rural isolation as:

“It is not possible to learn English in the area, we have to go at least 30 minutes by car to find an English course. And it is very, very expensive. This is a big problem since we in ARV cannot communicate with foreign visitors and buyers that maybe want to buy from us”–A. Guarcas (2015-03-10)

As one of the objectives of RVCP in ARV is business management, meaning that farmers are supposed to learn about business and trade as well as communicating with their buyers. However the isolation can be recognized as a force constraining this objective and thus the economic value creation. Additionally the migration leading to men withdrawing from ARV can be seen as constraining social entrepreneurship. This because the human capital of ARV is crucial, as if there are not enough farmers in the area, RVCP simply cannot be carried out. This implies that the migration is a force constraining the social and economic value creation, and thereby the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

5.2.4 The formal institutional context
The formal institutional context including political and economic aspects, has shown to affect RVCP in ARV in several ways. The empirical findings show that the formal institutions have both generated and limited opportunities for the social entrepreneurship carried out in ARV, in accordance with what is argued by Welter (2011). Two forces have seen to clearly affect the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV: the enabling force of COCODE approving the RVCP in ARV and the constraining force of the economic and political climate.
**COCODE approving the RVCP in ARV**

The empirical findings show that as the authority in the community, COCODE approved RVCP to be implemented in ARV. As the secretary of COCODE expressed:

“We are the authority of the community, and have the power to approve or reject all projects carried out in the community” - M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-09)

When COCODE approved RVCP to be carried out in ARV, this led to reduction of uncertainty and risk in ARV, as RVCP aims to secure economic income by generating employment in ARV. When an institution reduces risks in ways like this, it can be recognized as an enabling force for entrepreneurship (Welter, 2011).

Moreover, the individual intertwining of M. Rabinal Vargas, as both the secretary of COCODE and president of ARV, can be acknowledged as he approved the RVCP to be carried out allowing access to resources in ARV. This access to resources is one of the main strengths of individual intertwining according to Tillmar (2012). She further acknowledges that individual intertwining is more common in the rural context, which was seen in the case of ARV where “everyone knows everyone”. However, this closeness of social ties (Welter, 2011) has also seen to affect RVCP in ARV negatively, which is discussed in the previous part of the spatial context.

COCODE approving RVCP to be carried out in ARV thus led to the creation of economic and social value through the project in ARV. The approval from COCODE can therefore be recognized as a force enabling both economic and social value, and thus the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

**The economic and political climate**

The empirical findings show that the overall economic and political climate in Guatemala has led to high national poverty rates and limited resources available for the government to invest in public services. Because of this climate it has shown to be a lack of financial resources provided by the government to RVCP in ARV. As a force of the macroeconomy, Austin et al. (2006) argues that this can constrain social entrepreneurship. The lack of financial resources from the Guatemalan government has shown to result in insufficient irrigation and inferior road conditions in ARV. These are two basic services that have been acknowledged as the responsibility of the government to provide (S. Chacón, 2015-03-05; USAID representative, 2015-03-13).

Newth and Woods (2014) argue that it is the formal institutional force that to a large
extent decides the resources available for social ventures, and thus enabling or constraining the social entrepreneurship. In the case of ARV the Guatemalan government has thus been recognized as constraining the social venture. Empirical findings highlight the fact that if the farmers had access to irrigation during the dry season, ARV could almost double the sales and thus the income generation. Moreover, due to the bad road conditions much of the crops were damaged, as the president of the board of directors in ARV stated:

“The roads need to be fixed. It would make the transport of the products easier and the crops would not be damaged as much. When they are damaged ARV loses sales and thereby money.” - M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-09)

In summary, the economic and political climate has seen to result in lack of basic services, in the form of lack of irrigation and bad road conditions for ARV. This has in turn led to decreased sales and lost potential income. As one of the main objectives of RVCP in ARV is increased income generation, the economic and political climate is recognized as a force constraining the economic value creation. Thereby, it is constraining the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

5.2.5 The informal institutional context
The informal institutional context including societal attitudes, norms, tradition and culture (Welter, 2011) has shown to affect RVCP in ARV in several ways. In general the culture in the area of ARV was shown to be strong traditionally anchored. The forces within the informal institutional context that have seen to affect the social entrepreneurship most clearly are the enabling hardworking people, the constraining macho culture and the constraining food culture.

**Hardworking people**
Observations imply that the local population is generally very hard working and energetic, which was seen to reflect the norm in that specific location. It was expected from the people in the village of ARV to have good work ethics, which can be recognized as norms and values defining what is socially accepted in the area (Newth & Woods, 2014). The values and habits leading to hardworking people were seen to come from the indigenous culture, as it was explained that the Maya people had a long background as farmers within the laborious agricultural industry. This good work ethics and hard work was stated by one of the member farmers of ARV:
“I wake up early, around 5.30, and go work in the field. Then I work all day in the field.” - A. Tucubal Rabinal (2015-03-09)

The hardworking people have seen to imply a high production quantity and willingness to increase income. This indicates that the hardworking people enables the creation of economic value, and is thus recognized as a force enabling the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

**Macho culture**

The empirical findings indicate that there is a distinct macho culture in the village where ARV is situated, with the men having the decision making power. This type of cultural influence can be recognized as a soft institutional feature, which Brush et al. (2014) argue affect the entrepreneurship by defining acceptable roles for persons in the society. These roles can stiffen the social entrepreneurship, as it makes it difficult to break out of norms (Brush et al., 2014). Moreover, it was found that domestic violence is common. This aspect was recognized during the field study when a woman in the village of ARV expressed that her husband was the best husband in the world, as he provided for the family and did not hit her. The decision making power was underpinned when A. Weiss (2015-03-10) discussed the situation:

> “The man is often the head of the family, so he makes the decisions...decisions regarding different things, like the man chose his wife and they get married very young, when they are like 15-18 years old ....the man also decides if they are using contraception or not.” - A. Weiss (2015-03-10)

This type of culture which is strongly rooted in traditions and norms can be defined as a soft institutional factor, which Brush et al. (2014) argue often are intangible and less obvious in a society, and therefore difficult to change. Considering the aspects discussed above, the macho culture has shown to be prevalent and makes it difficult to enhance the gender equality. As this is one of the main objectives of RVCP in ARV in order to create social value, the macho culture is recognized as a force constraining the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

**Food culture**

It was shown that the food culture in the village where ARV is situated was very strong and traditionally anchored. The empirical findings show that the main goal of...
ARV is to increase family income, and thereby automatically increase their life quality regarding many aspects such as food security and nutrition. However it was shown that raised income did not automatically lead to more nutritious food, as the diet remained the same due to culture. Newth and Woods (2014) argue that established norms and routines in an organization can lead to cultural inertia, which affects social entrepreneurship. However, in the case of ARV it was shown that established norms and routines within a societal group also can lead to cultural inertia and problems of malnutrition. This was underpinned in a conversation with S. Garcia (2015-03-10) regarding how their food habits had changed as RVCP in ARV she stated that: “our income has increased so we can feed the children better food.” But when asked about what they eat she answered. “rice, beans, tortillas and corn”. This food has however shown to be a part of the traditional diet and not being nutritious enough, contributing to the social problem of malnutrition. Similar to the macho culture discussed above, the food culture can also be recognized as a cultural influence deeply rooted in traditions. This influence is also rather intangible and less obvious, implying that it is difficult to change (Brush et al., 2014).

The aspects discussed above can be compared to one of the main objectives of RVCP in ARV; to improve food security and nutrition. Thus it is recognized that the food culture in the area of ARV is a force constraining the social value creation, and thereby the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

5.2.6 The international influence context
Besides the contexts suggested by Welter (2011), the empirical findings showed that one additional context had a significant influence on the creation of social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. This context is recognized as the international influence, which will be discussed below.

Firstly, seen to the business context it was due to the international market demand, and its requirements on product quality standards, that RVCP was initiated in ARV. This was enabled by the social context, where Siesa was seen to link ARV to AGEXPORT and the project through a personal social network. It has moreover been seen that Siesa is linking ARV to the international market, by exporting their crops.

Secondly, within the spatial context there was also shown to be an international influence. The option to emigrate abroad was found to be highly appealing in the area
where ARV is situated, as the emigration to the United States is the main reason why farmers withdraw from ARV. Besides the social implications for the family, the workforce available for working as a farmer within RVCP in ARV decreases as a result of the migration. Thus, the migration to the United States is seen to constitute a force constraining the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

Thirdly, seen to the formal institutional context the international influence has seen to affect the social entrepreneurship. The severe economic and political situation in Guatemala is highlighted by factors such as the country being the poorest country in Latin America, corruption and the political system being unstable. Mainly as a consequence of this situation, the Guatemalan government has shown to have a lack of financial resources available to fund RVCP and provide public services. This resulted in other actors shouldering the responsibility; the international partners USAID from the United States and Hivos from the Netherlands. They have shown to enable the whole RVCP through their funding. As a result, the international financial support and thereby international influence is recognized as a force enabling the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

Lastly, seen to the informal institutional context it was seen that the international influence was a major reason that the indigenous people, originally very traditional anchored, actually changed some major habits and norms in order to operate in a way desired by RVCP. For example the farmers in ARV started using approved pesticides and used latrines instead of doing their personal business in the field. This change in behavior was all because of the international market demand having these requirements, which in turn took the form of certification standards. Subsequently, the international influence changing some traditional norms and habits has been recognized as a force enabling the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

The international influence was found to cut cross all the other contexts. Therefore, the international influence is recognized as an important contextual factor both enabling and constraining the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

5.3 How organizations across sectors collaborate to enable social entrepreneurship

In this section of the analysis there will be focus on the cross sector collaboration which can be seen on the right hand side of the proposed analysis model. The
discussion will take its departure from theories regarding aspects of forging initial agreement, building leadership, continuous communication and generation and utilization of resources. All of the aspects mentioned above have shown to be critical for how the cross sector organizations in RVCP in ARV are collaborating in order to enable social entrepreneurship. However, it will also be discussed whether these aspects are constraining the creation of social entrepreneurship. Throughout the analysis the interconnection with the context will be addressed.

5.3.1 Forging initial agreement
The alignment of the different stakeholders’ objectives and their different roles in RVCP in ARV has been stressed in the empirical findings as important in reaching the goals of RVCP, and thereby creating social and economic value. This is described by the USAID representative (2015-03-13) as:

“We chose the RVCP because we saw that the goals were aligned and that the practical actions from AGEXPORT and its partners would lead to the main objective of USAID: to reduce poverty and malnutrition.”

It was further highlighted in the interview with R. Van. Meer (2015-03-06) who explained Hivos’ goals in comparison to the overall USAID goal as: “let’s say they are sub products of the same main product”. Moreover, F. Tuyuc (ARV, 2015-03-09) stated that the goal of ARV is: “to increase export, increase family income level and thereby improve the life quality of our members and their families” which should automatically lead to better food and nutrition security. Subsequently, leading to the overall goal, to reduce poverty and malnutrition. The importance of setting up roles and responsibilities and agreeing on the same vision and purpose in order to create social value is highlighted in the literature (Bryson et al., 2006; Kania and Kramier, 2011). Furthermore, regarding evaluation of RVCP the representative from USAID mentioned:

“Yes we have yearly evaluation and in the end of the project. We have indicators on different levels, national, regional, target community and down to project level results. We measure if the theory works, if the actions from USAID and its partners actually lead to reduction of malnutrition and poverty” -USAID representative (2015-03-13)
The evaluation indicators can be recognized as a shared measurement system, which according to Kania and Kramier (2011) ensures that the efforts remain aligned. By ensuring aligned efforts Kania and Kramier (2011) mean that successful cross sector collaboration can be carried out. Because all of the actors within RVCP in ARV are working towards the same goals; the seven main objectives leading to the USAID goal, this enables the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

However, it can be questioned whether the actors within the cross sector collaboration have a common understanding of the social problems of women participation and nutrition and how to solve them. This common understanding of the problem is a vital ingredient for the cross sector collaboration (Kania & Kramier, 2011) in order to create social entrepreneurship (Montgomery et al., 2012). As in the interview with S. Chacón (2015-03-13) she states that all women want to work in the field. However A. Chavalan (2015-03-10) said the contrary when saying that she rather stayed at home weaving and taking care of her children than being out in the field. The fact that the stakeholders are not sharing the same understanding of the problem can be seen as one aspect in the cross sector collaboration constraining the creation of social entrepreneurship. The actors not sharing the same understanding of the problem can be explained by RVCP’s lack of embeddedness in the local context of ARV, discussed in the analysis of the spatial context.

In summary, the shared common vision within the cross sector collaboration can be recognized as an enabling force for the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. Moreover, the cross sector collaboration is constraining the social entrepreneurship through the lack of common problem solving. This can also be explained by RVCP’s lack of embeddedness in the local context of ARV.

5.3.2 Building leadership
There are several leaders within the project that have been found working towards the seven main objectives, thereby securing the social and economic value creation. Two of the leaders are F. Tuyuc and E. Tucubal who provide the farmers with technical assistance. The farmer A. Tucubal Rabinal (2015-03-09) describes this by:

“I get training from Don Enildo and Florencio who visit me and tells me what to use in the production which makes the production quantity increase.”
The quantity increase implies that the technical assistance provided creates increase in income, thereby creating economic value. The technical assistance also leads to environmental sustainability, as the farmers get trainings in what agrochemicals to use. Therefore, the leaders are also securing the creation of social value. Having leaders in the cross sector collaboration ensuring that the goals are being achieved enables the social value creation (Bryson et al., 2006).

However, as much as RVCP in ARV has leaders in different management levels working towards the goals, it can be questioned whether the board of directors in ARV is enabling all the aspects of RVCP. The cross sector collaboration between ARV and Vital Voices has been found to be difficult:

“Vital Voices has talked to the board of directors, trying to organize a meeting with female members. They asked the board of directors to collect a list of 30 names of women that they could work with, which they however have not succeeded in doing. The board of directors also do not show up to meetings from time to time.”
- A. Weiss (2015-03-09)

The reason behind the constraining leadership of the board of directors in the cross sector collaboration can be explained by the context of the village. Firstly, over-embeddedness of the board of directors has led to a questionable power position. This power position constrains the work of Vital Voices, leading to that the main objective of gender equality is hard to reach. Thereby the social value creation is constrained. In order for a cross sector collaboration to create social value the power balance between actors need to be restored (Bryson et al., 2006). Vital Voices has started holding trainings and workshops which can be recognized as what Bryson et al. (2006) describe as working towards equalizing the power.

Secondly, the board of directors has found to be affected by other contextual factors. These include the business context with the agricultural industry being male dominated. Also included is the social context of the household roles being very traditional, with the women staying at home. Lastly, the informal institutional context including the macho culture were the men have been observed to have the decision making power.
In conclusion, there are some present leaders in the cross sector collaboration working towards the goals of RVCP in ARV, enabling the creation of social entrepreneurship. However, the main objective of gender equality have found to be somewhat constrained by the board of directors. This is due to the over-embeddedness, the male dominated industry, the traditional household roles and the macho culture within the village.

5.3.3 Continuous communication
The empirical findings demonstrate a continuous communication between the stakeholders of RVCP in ARV. E. Guarchaj from Siesa (2015-03-09) explained the collaboration between AGEXPORT and Siesa by:

“AGEXPORT and Siesa communicate on all levels, on the field level and among higher management as well”- E. Guarchaj (2015-03-09)

On a field level he further explained that he communicated with AGEXPORT constantly through email, mobile and visits. This communication between Siesa, ARV and AGEXPORT is enabled by F. Tuyuc, who is employed by AGEXPORT and working in ARV.

In the interview with USAID the representative mentioned that they communicate with AGEXPORT but also pay visits to the associations, such as ARV. R. Van Meer at Hivos explained that he has a daily communication with AGEXPORT, through his office positioned at the head office of AGEXPORT. Furthermore, in the interview with M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-10) he said that the communication with AGEXPORT, INCAP and Siesa was mostly through visits to ARV.

These empirical examples show that a continuous communication within RVCP in ARV is existing, which Kania and Kramier (2011) argue enables the cross sector collaboration to guarantee mutual objectives, motivation, develop trust (Bryson et al., 2006) and also secure cross-sector understanding. These aspects are all seen to enable the social value creation (Bryson et al., 2006; Kania & Kramier, 2011). The continuous communication within RVCP in ARV implies that the cross sector collaboration is building trust, which ensures according to Montgomery et al. (2012) that social entrepreneurship is carried out. Therefore, the continuous communication between the different organizations is enabling the actors to have and work towards
mutual objectives. These are the seven main objectives of RVCP which enables the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

On the other hand side, an aspect which has been noted in the empirical findings is the fact that the communication seems to have one main actor: AGEXPORT who is holding the cross sector collaboration together. Therefore it can be questioned if everyone in the cross sector collaboration has mutual objectives. According to Kania & Kramier (2011) the continuous communication should secure having mutual objectives. ARV state that their goals are aligned with RVCP, as discussed in the part of forging initial agreement. However, it seems that ARV has more focus on the creation of economic value rather than social value. This as it is implied that social value should come as a result of the economic value creation. This economic focus of ARV deviates from the nonprofit focus, which Erkovich and Andersen (2012) suggest is the common focus of civil society organizations. The economic focus of ARV within the project is further expressed as: “RVCP was approved because of the economic reasons for the Association of Rabinal Vargas” (M. Rabinal Vargas 2015-03-09).

The communication between AGEXPORT and the Guatemalan government was described by S. Chacón (2015-03-05) as: “there is not much cooperation but we try”. In order to create social value in cross sector collaborations it is important to work close with political institutions (Bryson et al., 2006). However, in the case of RVCP in ARV the actors have shown to create social and economic value without much communication with the Guatemalan government. RVCP was enabled by the support from USAID and Hivos who have taken it upon them to address some of the social problems that Guatemala faces. The Guatemalan government on the other hand has seen to favor themselves through nepotism and corruption rather than taking interest in the public, which according to Erkovich and Anderson (2013) is the common norm. These factors of nepotism and corruption are included in the formal institutional context described previously. This is found to be a constraining institutional element for the cross-sector collaboration (Bryson et al., 2006). The lack of communication with the Guatemalan government can be described as somewhat constraining for the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV, as it leads to bad road conditions and lack of irrigation. Thereby, constraining the economic value creation, as income generation is lost.
In conclusion, the continuous communication in RVCP in ARV is partly enabling the creation of social entrepreneurship. However, the fact that only one stakeholder is the main communication partner has shown to lead to divergent interests constraining the social entrepreneurship. This as ARV is favoring the economic aspects of RVCP overseeing the social value creation. The lack of communication due to the formal institutional context is partly constraining the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. This is due to the fact that it contributes to lack of basic services in ARV. Subsequently, leading to lost income generation that is one of the main objectives of RVCP.

5.3.4 Generation and utilization of resources

As shown in the empirical findings the generation and utilization of resources within RVCP in ARV has shown to be vital for enabling the social entrepreneurship. This in accordance with Kania and Kramier (2011) who point out that in order to create social value the activities of the actors in cross sector collaboration should be differentiated yet reinforcing. This is underpinned in the interview with L. Ramón (2015-03-05) at AGEXPORT who describes the importance of the required resources as:

“And in the fourth step, when we have all the resources of this intervention for 2-3 years, we can improve the income of the people, we generate employment in the area where there is no work. It is an increase of food nutrition and security, poverty reduction, competitiveness and environmental sustainability. These are the results that are our goals”

The organizations’ unique resources and their importance to RVCP in ARV are further described by S. Chacón (2015-03-05) at AGEXPORT as:

“The supporting organizations represent a very important part of the RVCP, since the project would not be possible to carry out without them”.

These two empirical examples show that the activities and resources are critical in order to carry out RVCP. This in accordance with Austin et al. (2006) who argue that cross sector collaboration is needed as social problems require more resources than one independent organization can mobilize. Moreover, the social problems addressed within RVCP in ARV such as poverty are described by Waddell & Brown (1997) as
too complex to address alone. This as the problems often are embedded in different sectors.

All of the organizations within the different sectors contribute with their own specific resources and activities into RVCP in ARV. This can be seen as the trading of resources between actors. Montgomery et al. (2012) refer to this as the sharing of different resources contributing with something unique to the social entrepreneurship. Furthermore, it has been noted that three different resources; human, social and financial capital are highly important in order to create social entrepreneurship (Austin et al 2012; Leadbeater, 1997). These resources are all seen in RVCP in ARV. In the interview with S. Chacón (2015-03-05) she explains how the financial capital has been acquired: “USAID is the main funder and Hivos is the co-funder of the project”. I Fabiola Rojas (2015-03-13) describes INCAP’s contribution as human capital to the project: “INCAP is promoting food security and nutrition in the village, by arranging trainings and visiting the members of ARV house by house”. Whereas the contribution from Siesa has come in another form explained as “Siesa recommended the Association of Rabinal Vargas to AGEXPORT and the RVCP” (M. Rabinal Vargas, 2015-03-10). Through this empirical example it becomes visible that Siesa has enabled RVCP in ARV through its social network, which Leadbeater (1997) refers to as a form of social capital. Thus, these empirical examples all highlight the importance of the different resources being brought into RVCP in ARV by the different organizations.

The exchange of the actors’ unique financial, social and human resources, across sectors in RVCP in ARV can favorably be explained through organizational intertwining (Tillmar, 2012). Tillmar (2012) refers to organizational intertwining as when different organizations from different sectors are interlinked in terms of activities or resources. Additionally, the actors’ exchange of different types of resources across sectors can be seen as the cross-sector trading of resources proposed by Montgomery et al (2012), see Figure 4. However, it is important to notice that the trading of resources is not only cross sector, but also cross nation. Therefore based on the information from the study, it is suggested that all of the actors are enabling the social entrepreneurship by generating and utilizing their resources to RVCP in ARV through a cross nation/cross sector trading of resources.
However, it was found to be one constraining aspect in the collaboration. This aspect constitute of the insufficient resources provided by the Guatemalan government to RVCP in ARV. These insufficient resources are found to be partly because of the lack of communication with the government. However, there is a close relationship with the government on a local level within RVCP in ARV. The close relationship is represented by M. Rabinal Vargas who is active both within the state sector through COCODE and the civil society sector through ARV. Tillmar (2012) suggests that this type of individual intertwining can lead to positive effects obtaining resources from a variety of sources. As shown in the example below the individual intertwining could have provided ARV with irrigation. However, this could not be reached due to the lack of funding from the government:

“We applied for an irrigation project from the government PDR -Programa de Desarrollo Economico Rural- but it was too expensive since it would cost 8 million Quetzals, so we did not get it.” - M. Rabinal Vargas (2015-03-10)

This lack of resources from the government to RVCP was also noted by R. Van Meer (2015-03-06) when stating: “especially this year I think will be very complicated because it is election year and all the funding that is in theory available on paper for the ministry will be used to campaign”.

The insufficient resources from the Guatemalan government can be understood by the formal institutional context including the constraining force of the economic and political climate. This factor implies that there are limited resources available for the government to invest in public services, as discussed previously. Moreover, the government’s interest in the public is not the common norm in Guatemala. These factors are constraining the economic value creation. This as ARV loses potential income, due to that they are not able to produce during dry season. Therefore, the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV is constrained.

In summary, it can be noted that the cross sector collaboration is enabling the creation of social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. This through a cross-nation/cross sector trading of resources. The resources such as trainings in food and nutrition security and technical assistance, lead to the economic and social value creation. However as stated above the lack of contribution of resources from the Guatemalan government, due to the contextual factors, is constraining the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.
To summarize the discussion of cross sector collaboration, it was found that all the enabling factors of cross sector collaboration did not automatically lead to the creation of social entrepreneurship. This was recognized to be because of the context of ARV, which was often highly constraining for the cross sector collaboration. The contextual factors which were seen to affect the collaboration in a crucial way were the food culture, the traditional household roles, the male dominated industry and the macho culture.

5.4 Summary of factors affecting the social entrepreneurship

In the first part of the analysis, contexts affecting the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV have been identified. Hereinafter the forces within each context have been analyzed and recognized as enabling or constraining the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV, see Table 5. In the second part of the analysis the aspects of how the different organizations across sectors collaborate, in order to enable social entrepreneurship, have been examined. Moreover, aspects in the cross sector collaboration constraining the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV have been acknowledged. These constraining factors have been discussed in relation to the contextual factors, which can be seen in the last row in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of context</th>
<th>The business</th>
<th>The social</th>
<th>The spatial</th>
<th>The formal institutional</th>
<th>The informal institutional</th>
<th>The international influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>The market demand</td>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td>ARV working as an association</td>
<td>COCODE approving the RVCP in ARV</td>
<td>Hardworking people</td>
<td>International market demand USAID &amp; Hivos funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraining</td>
<td>Male dominated industry</td>
<td>Traditional household roles</td>
<td>Lack of embeddedness</td>
<td>Over-embeddedness</td>
<td>Rural isolation</td>
<td>The economic and political climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Summary of analysis contextual factors
5.5 The suggested framework of factors influencing social entrepreneurship

To summarize the findings of this study, a suggested framework was developed, see figure 7. The findings show that contextual factors and the cross sector collaboration affect the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. The contextual factors can be seen in the outer circle in Figure 7. The contexts have been categorized into; the business, the social, the spatial, the formal institutional, the informal institutional and the international influence. Moreover, how the organizations collaborate across the market, state and civil society sectors, has likewise provided aspects enabling and constraining the social entrepreneurship. These factors can be seen in the inner circle in Figure 7. The cross sector collaborative factors include; forging initial agreement, building leadership, continuous communication and lastly generation and utilization of resources. In the intersection of the three different sectors the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV has been visualized, referred to as SE in Figure 7.
To clarify that USAID and Hivos are not a part of the Guatemalan welfare state they have been marked in red. However, as discussed in the analysis, they have both contributed to enable the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. Therefore, it is suggested that the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV is found within the intersection of all three sectors. This in contrast to Nicholls (2006) who suggests that social entrepreneurship within Latin American countries is mostly found in the civil society sector.

Figure 7.

The context and the cross sector collaboration affecting social entrepreneurship
6. Conclusion

In the conclusion the findings of the study in relation to the purpose and the research questions will be presented. Furthermore the contribution of this Master Thesis will be given, followed by practical implications and further research.

The purpose of this Master Thesis was to study how the concept of social entrepreneurship is performed within a developing country. This was aimed to be done by examining how the context in the studied area affects the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. Additionally the intention was to investigate how organizations within the studied case collaborate across the market, state and civil society sectors, in order to enable social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. This was enabled through a case study within RVCP in ARV.

In order to fulfill the purpose two research questions were developed. These will be stated and answered separately in the section below.

Research question 1: How can the context in a developing country affect the social entrepreneurship within the studied area RVCP in ARV?

As for the context affecting the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV, six contexts were recognized as significantly influencing the social entrepreneurship. These are the business context, the social context, the spatial context, the formal institutional context, the informal institutional context and lastly the international influence. Each of these contexts was acknowledged to contain forces both enabling and constraining the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. These forces will be presented below in relation to each context.

In the business context, the market demand was seen to be an enabling force while the male dominated industry was recognized as a constraining force. As for the social context, social networks was shown to be an enabling force whereas traditional household roles was seen as a constraining factor. In the spatial context, ARV working as an association was acknowledged as an enabling force while lack of embeddedness, over-embeddedness and the rural isolation was seen to be constraining forces. In the formal institutional context, COCODE approving RVCP in ARV was recognized as
an enabling force, whereas the economic and political climate was seen as a constraining force. As for the informal institutional context, the hardworking people constituted an enabling force, while the macho culture and the food culture were acknowledged as constraining forces. Lastly, within the proposed context of the international influence, the international market demand and the USAID and Hivos funding were seen as enabling forces. Additionally the option to emigrate was recognized as a constraining force.

Research question 2: How do organizations within the civil society, the market and the state sector collaborate to enable the social entrepreneurship within the studied area RVCP in ARV?

Through the case study of RVCP in ARV, four factors were acknowledged in how the organizations across the different sectors collaborated in order to enable the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. These factors include forging initial agreement, building leadership, continuous communication and generation and utilization of resources. Moreover, it was also recognized that these factors were also constraining the social entrepreneurship aimed to be created through RVCP in ARV. Therefore, these constraining forces were further analyzed in relation to the context. This will be further described below.

As for the forging initial agreement, it was seen that the shared common vision across all actors was an enabling force. However the lack of common problem solving was seen to be a constraining force, which was due to the contextual factor lack of embeddedness. Secondly building leadership was seen to contain leaders as an enabling force. However it was also recognized that the leaders in the board of directors constituted a constraining force in some aspects. This was seen to be due to several contextual factors; over-embeddedness, male dominated industry, traditional household roles and macho culture. Thirdly within continuous communication it was recognized that all actors communicating was partly enabling, as it was only one main communication partner, which was seen to be a constraining force. Moreover it was recognized that the lack of communication with the government was a somewhat constraining force. This was shown to be due to the constraining context of the economic and political climate. Lastly, seen to the generation and utilization of resources the proposed aspect of cross nation/cross sector trading of resources was seen to be an enabling force. The lack of resources from the government was seen to
be a constraining force, which was also due to the constraining economic and political climate.

To summarize, it has been recognized that contextual factors within the studied area have both enabled and constrained the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. Moreover, factors of how the cross sector organizations collaborate to enable social entrepreneurship have been acknowledged. Additionally constraining forces within the cross sector collaboration have been recognized, which have seen to be due to both the cross sector collaboration itself and contextual factors.
7. Contribution

This Master Thesis has contributed with broadening the understanding of the concept of social entrepreneurship through the perspective of a developing country context. Furthermore, the case study in RVCP in ARV showed that the contexts of the studied area were both enabling and constraining the social entrepreneurship. More specifically, it was found that one force constraining the social entrepreneurship crucially were the economic and political climate. This became visible through the lack of interest from the Guatemalan government for the public good, leading to for example insufficient resources provided for RVCP in ARV. Furthermore, the strongly anchored traditional culture was seen to make social change difficult, especially in regard to gender equality and food and nutrition security.

Moreover, this Master Thesis has highlighted the important role of the international influence which was seen to enable the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. This was seen as the international market demand was shown to be the initiating factor for RVCP being implemented in ARV. Additionally, as a result of the insufficient support from the Guatemalan government, the international partners USAID and Hivos shouldered the responsibility of the state sector and funded RVCP. Thus, the international influence was shown to be a force significantly enabling the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV.

Furthermore, this study has provided a deeper understanding of the importance of viewing social entrepreneurship as created by a collaborative force rather than one single actor. This study has highlighted the collaborative force as happening not only across sectors but also across nations. Furthermore, the study has shown more specifically how the cross sector actors collaborate in order to enable social entrepreneurship within a developing country context. However, the study recognized that some aspects of the cross sector collaboration were actually constraining the social entrepreneurship. However this was mainly a result of contextual factors such as the strong traditional culture and the economic and political climate. Therefore, the study has also contributed with insights of how the context is affecting the cross sector collaborations efforts in creating social entrepreneurship.
8. Practical implications

The empirical findings indicated that there are occasionally different opinions within RVCP of how to address some of the social problems, which was shown to origin from RVCP’s lack of embeddedness in the local context or ARV. Jack and Anderson (2002) argue that when embedded in the local environment through for example social networks, the entrepreneurs obtain knowledge of what is required and available in the area. It was shown to be questionable if the actors of RVCP were embedded enough in the context to gain this type of knowledge. It is moreover doubtful if the goals of RVCP in ARV, such as gender equality and food and nutrition security, can be addressed without a common understanding of the social problems and how to solve them.

An example of this lack of common understanding of how to address social problems is the objective of gender equality. Seen to this objective, RVCP in ARV has stressed the increase of women participation in the field as a mean to reach gender equality. Therefore the low rate of female farmers seen in the empirics might be recognized as a setback in relation to gender equality. However, the empirical findings have shown that some female farmers find the fieldwork hard and rather work from home for several reasons. It has been shown that different types of chores conducted from home by women were common, such as weaving beautiful traditional clothes and having a bakery. This implies a sort of heritage entrepreneurship, which is type of entrepreneurship that refers to communities safeguarding their heritage (Welter, 2011). Through the case study heritage entrepreneurship has been recognized as an alternative way of gender equality as the women have the possibility to earn their own income this way. These chores can be seen as a part of the household sector suggested by Wijkström (2012) which has seen to be important within Latin American countries (Martinez Franzoni, 2008). It is therefore recommendable that the actors in RVCP take this into account when creating social entrepreneurship, by supporting these types of chores.

It is recommended that the actors of RVCP should be more embedded in the local context of RVCP in ARV to gain knowledge of what is required and available in the area. This would enable a more common understanding of the social problems and how to address them between all actors. As a result gender equality could for example be enhanced by alternative entrepreneurial activities. Some suggestions of these types
of entrepreneurial activities, to enhance gender equality and simultaneously heritage entrepreneurship, will follow. RVCP is currently including handicraft, but in ARV it was too small scaled for RVCP to support. Therefore another approach is suggested. Firstly, RVCP could support the women in ARV in organizing a weaving cooperative including women from the villages in the area. This would enhance the quantity produced. The quality could be enhanced by trainings in good weaving practices. Additionally, it has seen to be a trend in the Western world, among other places Europe, where the design and patterns similar to those produced in the studied area are very popular. This implies that if the women making handicraft in ARV could obtain more training in business management and a connection to the international market, they could reach out to a great amount of potential customers. This connection could be done through webpages and social media, which have seen to be a trend in Guatemala used to effectively spread information and campaign (R. Van Meer, 2015-03-06). Even though there is not easy access to internet in the area, it is recommendable to have one public computer available for the members of ARV. This will make it possible for them to get access to and share information. Secondly, another way of enhancing the gender equality and also the heritage entrepreneurship could be by giving women support in business management in relation to starting up small local businesses such as bakeries.

Another example of this lack of common understanding of how to address social problems is the objective of food and nutrition security. It has shown that the increase in income has not automatically led to the people of ARV eating more nutritious food, as it was aimed to do. Moreover, the present trainings in food and nutrition is only targeting women with children under two years. Due to the strong traditional food culture among the indigenous people it is recommended to include the entire family in the trainings. This would lead to that also men gained knowledge of what the benefits of nutritious food are. Thus they would know what to grow to provide nutritious food for the entire family. This has a good chance of succeeding as it was found that the farmers of ARV already is producing nutritious vegetables such as snow peas and sugar snaps.
9. Further research

In this Master Thesis the context affecting social entrepreneurship and the cross sector collaboration affecting entrepreneurship have been studied. It has been recognized that the context influence both social entrepreneurship and the cross sector collaboration aiming to enable social entrepreneurship. However, further research is needed to examine how this recursive link between context and cross sector collaboration is influencing one another in relation to social entrepreneurship.

The study further shows that there are contexts specific for developing countries affecting social entrepreneurship significantly. These have been recognized as for example the economic and political climate leading to a lack of basic services for the people, and the strong traditional culture in the rural areas. The economic and political situation in Guatemala was additionally recognized as a reason why international funding was necessary, partly as the national government could not provide funding’s and basic services needed. The purpose of this Master Thesis was however to study how the social entrepreneurship was enabled or constrained seen to context and collaboration, rather than examine the actual outcome and effects of social entrepreneurship. Therefore an interesting area for future academic research would be to examine how these specific contexts in a developing country affect the outcome of social entrepreneurship.

In relation to the international funding, the study has also shown that the cross nation/cross sector collaboration has enabled the social entrepreneurship of RVCP in ARV. An interesting area for future academic research would be to examine how and to what extent this type of cross sector collaboration over the national borders between several actors can enable social entrepreneurship. This is specifically relevant in a developing country with its unstable economic and political climate.
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Appendix 1

Interview guides

Interview guide for interview with AGEXPORT

Sophia Chacón, project manager RVCP, 2015-03-05 and 2015-03-13
Lesly Román, project manager RVCP, 2015-03-05

Introducing the research. Power point.

1. Can you please tell us more about AGEXPORT?
   a. Background?
   b. Organizational structure?
   c. Can you describe what type of organization you are and how it affects you? Private non-profit organization, what does it mean?
   d. Purpose/goal?

2. How would you say that the social problems are addressed in Guatemala?
   a. Which are the roles of government, market and volunteers?
   b. Which do you perceive as the most important?
   c. How does the societal setting affect the Pro-rural-value chains program?

3. How is the Pro-rural-Value chains Program designed?
   a. How is the value chain structured?
   b. What are different steps within the project?
   c. How do you choose your collaboration partners?
      i. Specific criteria?
      ii. What do you expect from the different collaboration partners?
   d. Organizations involved?
   e. How does the project address the social problems?
      i. How do the different organizations contribute to solve the social problems?
      ii. Who does what? What is your role?

4. How do the different organizations collaborate within this project?
   a. How is the collaboration enabled practically? Communication?
   b. Which are your goals with the project? Which do you think are the goals of public, private, Hivos?
   c. How are these goals settled?
      i. Together with other stakeholders?
      ii. How do you prioritize these goals?
      iii. How do you evaluate the program? (Public, Private, Hivos)

5. What do you see as weaknesses and threats and strengths and opportunities of the project?
Interview guide for interview with Alexa Weiss, volunteer from the Peace Corps working in ARV, 2015-03-09 and 2015-03-10

Introducing the research. Power point.

1. How would you say the collaboration between the organizations within RVCP in ARV works?

2. How would you describe the role of Board of Directors in ARV?

3. How is the support from RVCP given to ARV?

4. How does the technical assistance work?

5. How does it work with certifications?

6. How do you perceive the gender equality here in ARV? Woman participation?

7. How are trainings given?

8. How do you think that the context in this area of ARV is affecting the RVCP?

9. How do you think the societal structure effects the RVCP here in ARV, seen to the public, private and civil society such as volunteering organizations?

10. Do you see any further improvements that can be made within the project?
Interview guide for interview with Board of Directors of ARV, 2015-03-10

Mario Rabinal Vargas, president of ARV
Enildo Tucubal, operation manager in ARV

Introducing the research. Power point.

1. What are your mission and goals as ARV?
   a. How are they set?

2. Which organizations do you collaborate with as ARV?
   a. Which role does each organization have?
   b. How do you communicate?

3. How did the collaboration with AGEXPORT start?

4. Why did you decide to be a part of the RVCP program?
   a. What are your expectations on the program?

5. How do you think the collaboration with AGEXPORT and the RVCP has affected ARV?

6. Which buyers did you collaborate with before and after the collaboration with AGEXPORT?

7. Does AGEXPORT have any demands that you have to fulfill to be a part of the program?

8. What do you think of the following factors and how do you work with them:
   -education and support for producers
   -environmental aspects
   -women participation
   -income level
   -employment

9. Do you see any types of challenges for the association?

10. If you could decide, would you change anything within the project? Do you need further support with anything?
Interview guide for interview with Mario Rabinal Vargas, Secretary of COCODE, 2015-03-09

Introducing the research. Power Point.

1. Can you please tell us more about COCODE and what you are doing?

2. What is your role within the RVCP in ARV? How do you support the project?

3. How come you are a part of RVCP?

4. What are your expectations and goals?

5. How do you work to enable this?

6. Which organizations do you collaborate with within the RVCP in ARV?
   a. How?

7. How is COCODE connected to the government?

8. How has the situation in the area changed since the project started?
   a. And in terms of for example Employment, income level, access to food, woman participation, environment

9. What do you perceive as good in the project and what can be improved?
Interview guide for interview with farmers in ARV 2015-03-09 – 2015-03-10

Introduction to the research:

- Who are we? Students from a Swedish university, research for our Master Thesis
- What is the research about? Why is this important? Knowledge about the social entrepreneurship in a developing country
- Why are you selected? We want to see this from your perspective
- Confidentially about the information provided
- Anonymity?
- Participant voluntary
- Provided opportunity for the interviewee to ask questions, gave contact information

Questions:

6. How does a normal day for you look like?

7. How has your normal day changed since you started working within the project?

8. How do you think about the Pro-poor rural value chains program? What does it include?
   a. The different steps within the project?
   b. What do you expect from the project?
      i. What is your goal?
      ii. What kind of support do you expect from the different organizations?
         (government, AGEXPORT, local partner)
      iii. What do they expect from you? Any criteria?
   c. How has the project affected you?
      i. How has your job situation changed with this project?
      ii. How has your income changed with this project?
      iii. How has the access to food changed with this project?
      iv. How have your thoughts about the environment changed?

9. With whom in the project do you communicate with? How? How often?

10. What is good about the project and what do you think can be done better?
Interview guide for interview 2 with Sophia Chacón, project manager of RVCP, 2015-03-13

Introduction to the research in previous interview

Questions

1. Which organizations do you collaborate with within the RVCP in Rabinal Vargas?

2. Is Siesa the same as Asomam?

3. How does the money flow in the value chain?

   3a. Do the farmers take part? Do they get part of the money?

   3b. How does the objective “financing” work?

4. Do the collaborating partners work independently or does AGEXPORT have impact on their work?

5. How is the collaboration working with these supporting organizations?
The interview guide for the interview with Ron Van Meer, Hivos, program officer for RVCP, 2015-03-06

Introducing the research. Power point.

1. What is Hivos’ role within the Pro-poor rural value chains program?

2. How does Hivos choose the projects to fund? Any criteria?

3. Which are Hivos goals within the project?
   a. How are they set?
   b. How are they aligned with the general goals of the project?
   c. Which stakeholders affect the goal setting?
   d. How do you evaluate the project/if the goals are reached?
   e. What are the consequences if they are not reached?

4. What is your role within the project?

5. How would you say that the social problems are addressed in Guatemala?
   a. Which are the roles of government, market (business companies) and volunteering organizations?
   b. Which do you perceive as the most important?
   c. How do you think the social setting affect the Pro-rural-value chains program?

6. How does Hivos collaboration with AGEXPORT look like?
   a. How is the collaboration enabled practically? Contact?
   b. Which do you think are the goals of:
      i. Public
      ii. Private
      iii. AGEXPORT
Interview guide for interview with Irma Fabiola Rojas, area expert manager of RVCP, AGEXPORT 2015-03-13

Introduction to the research
• Who are we? Students from a Swedish university, research for our Master Thesis
• What is the research about? Why is this important? Knowledge about the social entrepreneurship in a developing country
• Why are you selected? We want to see this from your perspective
• Confidentially about the information provided
• Anonymity?
• Participant voluntary
• Provided opportunity for the interviewee to ask questions, gave contact information

Questions:

1. Which organizations do AGEXPORT collaborate with within the RVCP in ARV?

2. How is the collaboration working out?

3. Besides agriculture, are there other ways of doing business through RVCP in ARV?

4. How is the Board of Directors selected?
Interview with Santos Lares Ambrocio, Legumex, 2015-03-10

Introduction to research: Power point

Questions:

1. Can you please tell us more about Legumex and what you are doing?

2. What is your role within the RVCP in Rabinal Vargas?
   a. How do you support the project?
   b. What kind of products?
   c. When did this collaboration start?

3. What do you know about the RVCP and AGEXPORT?

4. Why is Legumex working with ARV? Are there any drawbacks and benefits?

5. How does the collaboration between Legumex and ARV work?

6. What expectations and goals do you have for the collaboration between Legumex and ARV?

7. Do you have any specific criteria that ARV has to fulfill?

8. What is your role within this collaboration ARV?

9. How have you seen changes in the production since AGEXPORT came into the picture?

10. Does Legumex give technical training?

11. How would you like to improve the relationship between Legumex and ARV?

12. How could the production be improved?
Interview guide for interview with Siesa E. Guarchaj 2015-03-09

Introduction to research: Power point

Questions:

1. Which are your goals and missions as an organization?

2. How come you are a part of the RVCP project?

3. Have you experienced any changes since AGEXPORT started working with ARV?

4. What kind of criteria does Siesa have to work with the producers in ARV?

5. Which organizations does Siesa collaborate with?

6. How do you collaborate with AGEXPORT?

7. How do you communicate with AGEXPORT? With ARV?

8. What do you perceive as good in the RVCP and what can be improved?
Interview guide for interview with a representative from USAID, 2015-03-13

Introduction to the research
- Who are we? Students from a Swedish university, research for our Master Thesis
- What is the research about? Why is this important? Knowledge about the social entrepreneurship in a developing country
- Why are you selected? We want to see this from your perspective
- Confidentially about the information provided
- Anonymity?
- Participant voluntary
- Provided opportunity for the interviewee to ask questions, gave contact information

Questions:

7. What is USAID’s role within RVCP?

8. How does USAID choose the projects to fund? Do you have any criteria?

9. Which are USAID’s goals within the project?
   a. How are they set?
   b. How are they aligned with the general goals of the project?
   c. Which stakeholders affect the goal setting?
   d. Have you evaluated the project? How do you evaluate the project?
   e. What are the consequences if they are not reached?

10. How would you say that the social problems are addressed in Guatemala?
    a. Which are the roles of government, business companies and volunteering organizations?
    b. Which do you perceive as the most important?
    c. How do you think the societal setting affect the Pro-rural-value chains program?

11. How does USAID collaboration with AGEXPORT look like?
    a. How is the collaboration enabled practically? Contact?
    b. Which do you think are the goals of:
       i. Public
       ii. Private
       iii. Civil society

12. What do you see as weaknesses and threats and strengths and opportunities of the project?
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Power point introducing the research for the interviewees

Research for Master Thesis
Social entrepreneurship
Lis Larsson and Camilla Stahl

Who are we?
- Swedish students from the University of Linköping
- Master Thesis within Business and economics
- Examine values + social value
- Value of Agrojet

Why are we here?
- The research
  - Theory: social entrepreneurship
  - Empirial information: Preparatory selection program
  - Research focus on different factors affecting social entrepreneurship within R&D

Initial research questions
1. How does the societal structure affect the social entrepreneurship within the project?
2. How are the social challenges addressed within the project by the public society organization, the public, and the private sector?
3. How do the organizations within the different sections collaborate to enable social entrepreneurship?

Practical information
- Master Thesis published through University of Linköping
- Open communication during the research
- Choice of anonymity: organizations and individuals
- Result of the Thesis
- Thank you!

Questions and contact information
- Questions?
- Lis Larsson: lislarson@student.lnu.se Phone: 031-604-18-18
- Camilla Stahl: camilla.stahl@student.lnu.se Phone: 031-604-18-18
Appendix 3
Summary of interviewees and informants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview/Observation</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>AGEXPORT</td>
<td>Sophia Chacón</td>
<td>Project manager RVCP</td>
<td>2015-03-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>AGEXPORT</td>
<td>Lesly Román</td>
<td>Project manager RVCP</td>
<td>2015-03-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>AGEXPORT</td>
<td>Irma Fabiola Rojas</td>
<td>Area expert manager RVCP</td>
<td>2015-03-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>AGEXPORT/ARV</td>
<td>Florencio Tuyuc</td>
<td>Agronomist ARV</td>
<td>2015-03-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ARV</td>
<td>Enildo Tucubal</td>
<td>Operation manager ARV &amp; member board of directors ARV</td>
<td>2015-03-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview/observation</td>
<td>ARV</td>
<td>Juan Jose Rabinal</td>
<td>Farmer &amp; member of board of directors</td>
<td>2015-03-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview/observation</td>
<td>ARV</td>
<td>Antolin Tucubal Rabinal</td>
<td>Farmer &amp; member of board of directors</td>
<td>2015-03-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview/observation</td>
<td>ARV</td>
<td>Angelina Chavalan</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>2015-03-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview/observation</td>
<td>ARV/COCODE</td>
<td>Mario Rabinal Vargas</td>
<td>President of ARV &amp; Secretary of COCODE</td>
<td>2015-03-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview/observation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Santos Garcia</td>
<td>Wife of Enildo Tucubal</td>
<td>2015-03-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Hivos</td>
<td>Ron van Meer</td>
<td>Program officer RVCP</td>
<td>2015-03-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Legumex</td>
<td>Santos Lares Ambrocio</td>
<td>Agronomist Legumex</td>
<td>2015-03-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview/mail correspondences</td>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td>Alexa Weiss</td>
<td>Volunteer in ARV</td>
<td>2015-03-09 2015-03-10 2015-05-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Siesa</td>
<td>Edisson Guarchaj</td>
<td>Agonomist Siesa</td>
<td>2015-03-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Representative USAID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2015-03-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Description of organizations
The general Pro-Poor Rural Value Chains Program (RVCP) currently consists of 100 value chains, whereof one is the Association of Rabinal Vargas (ARV). Firstly the organizations that obtain a role within the general RVCP will be presented, and thereafter the organizations relevant to this case study of ARV.

Description of organizations in the general RVCP

USAID
The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) is lead by the U.S. Government and was founded in 1961 by John.F. Kennedy. Their aim is to end poverty in the world and support resilient, democratic societies. (USAID, 2015) Within the RVCP, USAID is the main funder (Hernández, 2012).

Hivos
The Dutch development agency, Humanist Institute for Cooperation (Hivos), operates within the civil society sector and was founded in 1968. Hivos are to date present with projects in 27 developing countries where they strive to contribute to a sustainable, free and equal world. (Hivos, 2013) Hivos is a co-funder and a strategic partner of the RVCP (Hernández, 2012).

AGEXPORT
The Guatemalan Exporters Association (AGEXPORT) a non-profit private association, within the market sector, and was founded in 1982. The organization has a vision to make Guatemala an exporting country which will increase the development of the country and create new employment opportunities. AGEXPORT are present within the agricultural, manufactured goods and service sector, 85% which are small and medium enterprises (SMEs). Furthermore, they have 20 commissions actively promoting the different sectors, one of them is the handicraft commission supporting the work of handicrafts in Guatemala. AGEXPORT has about 1000 member organizations within these sectors, for example exporting companies that export the products to the international market.( AGEXPORT d, 2014) AGEXPORT is the main leader of the RVCP (Hernández, 2012).
Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama (INCAP)
INCAP was founded in 1949, its a part of the civil society sector, and its mission is to support its member states (Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panamá, Belize, Honduras, Costa Rica and Dominican Republic) to achieve and maintain food and nutrition security of the populations. This is enabled through its functions of training, technical assistance, information and communication, research and mobilization of resources. (INCAP, 2015) INCAP is one of the supporting organizations in the RVCP (Hernández, 2012).

Vital Voices
Vital Voices is a non-governmental organization within the civil society sector, that works within the area of gender equality by promoting women leadership all around the world. The organization founded in 2000 in US are now present in 144 countries. Their mission is to recognize, invest in and empower women all over the globe. (Vital Voices, 2015) Vital Voices is one of the supporting organizations in the RVCP (Hernández, 2012).

Description of organization specifically operating within the RVCP in ARV

The Association of Rabinal Vargas (ARV)
The Association of Rabinal Vargas (ARV) is a civil society organization founded in 2002 and is located in Aldea Zaculeu, in the department of Quiché, Guatemala. The main purpose of ARV is to produce, process, promote and export fruit and vegetables, and its leading products consist of fresh peas and snow peas. Currently it has 152 members, of whom 124 are men and 28 are women. The association is currently exporting to the United States (Rosemont, COSTCO), England (Marks & Spencer, Sainsbury Supermarket, Tesco) and the Netherlands. In order to meet market requirements ARV is working towards the certification standards of Global GAP and Tesco Nurture Scheme within good agricultural practices. At present 48 out of 152 members are certified under these standards. (AGEXPORT c, 2015-03-05).

The Community Councils of Urban and Rural Development (COCODE)
The Community Councils of Urban and Rural Development (COCODE) is a part of The System of Development Councils (SISCODE) in Guatemala. Hereinafter COCODE will refer to the specific Local Development Council in the community of
Zaculeu where ARV is situated. COCODE obtain funding from the municipal of Tecpan, which answers directly to the national government of Guatemala. The function of COCODE is to promote the economic, social and cultural development of the community of Zaculeu where ARV is located. As the authority of the community COCODE additionally has the power to approve or reject all projects carried out in the community. (M. Rabinal Vargas, COCODE, pers. comm., 2015-03-09)

Siesa
Siesa started operating in the 1980s by exporting snow peas to the United States and the United Kingdom, and is today one of the leader agro-exporters and one of the largest exporters of non-traditional crops in Guatemala. The company buys and exports vegetables such as green peas, beans and broccoli. Siesa stresses the importance of establishing partnerships with producers that support them in meeting the requirements demanded by the market. (E. Guarchaj, Siesa, pers. comm., 2015-03-09)