International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Developing a Strategic Implementation Manual for Social Entrepreneurship: A Case Study of SRK Education Group International

Richard Paolo B. Deluria[1], Frances Louise T. Deluria[2]

Author Information:
[1-2]*SRK Education Group International, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates*

Correspondence:
richarddeluria@srkeducationgroupinternational.com

Article History:

Date Received: August 1, 2026
Date Revised: October 22, 2026
Date Accepted: October 28, 2026
Date Published: November 03, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0376

Document ID: *2026IJROMS0376*

Recommended Citation:
Deluria, R. P. B. & Deluria, F. L. T. (2026). Developing a Strategic Implementation Manual for Social Entrepreneurship: A Case Study of SRK Education Group International. International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies, 1(10), 77-88. https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0376

Abstract. Educational institutions increasingly pursue social entrepreneurship to combine social impact with organizational sustainability but often lack the systems to institutionalize them across campuses. Existing research, focused largely on definitions and student intentions, offers limited guidance on organization-wide implementation in education. This study developed a Strategic Implementation Manual for Social Entrepreneurship through an exploratory qualitative single-case study of SRK Education Group International. Data were gathered from 15 purposively selected participants, comprising senior administrators, campus leaders, academic personnel, operational managers, and program implementers, through Zoom interviews and questionnaires from January to March 2026. These were supplemented by analysis of institutional documents, benchmarking of comparable national and international educational institutions, and a validation workshop with 24 stakeholders. Responses were analyzed through six-phase thematic analysis, and the resulting themes were triangulated with the documentary, benchmarking, and workshop evidence. Five themes emerged: strong mission-driven commitment coexisting with structural inconsistency; fragmented implementation across campuses; funding instability and the absence of measurable sustainability indicators; leadership-dependent initiatives lacking formal governance; and organizational demand for a formal manual. Benchmarking identified practices addressing each gap, which were adapted into the manual and reviewed during validation. The resulting manual comprises seven components: governance structure and policy; proposal and approval procedures; financial sustainability; implementation standards; monitoring and evaluation; knowledge management and capacity building; and reporting and continuous improvement. The study concludes that the organization's principal challenge is formalization rather than commitment, and that the manual offers a context-specific, theory-informed framework for converting mission-driven activities into coordinated and measurable practice, pending evaluation after implementation.

Keywords: Case Study; Social Entrepreneurship; SRK Education Group International; Strategic Implementation Manual

Introduction

Organizations are increasingly expected to balance financial sustainability with meaningful social impact. Governments, communities, employees, and other stakeholders now expect institutions to move beyond purely profit-oriented approaches and to demonstrate social responsibility while remaining effective. Within this context, social entrepreneurship has emerged as an organizational approach that applies entrepreneurial innovation to the creation of sustainable social value (Dees, 1998; Mair and Martí, 2006). Unlike conventional models that prioritize financial performance alone, social entrepreneurship treats social value creation as the primary objective and economic viability as the condition that allows that value to be sustained (Santos, 2012).

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Over the past two decades, social entrepreneurship has moved from being associated mainly with nonprofit and philanthropic activity toward a broader hybrid organizational model that combines social objectives with financial sustainability (Battilana and Lee, 2014; Doherty, Haugh and Lyon, 2014; Saebi, Foss and Linder, 2019). In the education sector, it allows institutions to extend their mission beyond instruction through community engagement, scholarship provision, and social innovation, while also strengthening stakeholder confidence and institutional sustainability (Bazan *et al.*, 2020; Shahid and Alarifi, 2021).

SRK Education Group International (SRK EGI) is a multi-campus educational organization operating across diverse cultural and geographic settings. SRK Education Group International is the organization's full registered name. Since launching its social enterprise initiative in 2019, SRK EGI has implemented scholarship programs, outreach and feeding programs, care for the sick (including support for cancer patients), disaster relief, and donation drives. These initiatives reflect the organization's commitment to creating educational and societal value alongside its institutional objectives.

Despite these achievements, SRK EGI faces challenges commonly experienced by institutions that attempt to institutionalize social entrepreneurship. The organization does not yet have a comprehensive framework that standardizes governance, planning, execution, monitoring, and evaluation across campuses. Initiatives are often implemented independently, producing inconsistencies in operational practice, documentation, performance measurement, and accountability. Understanding of social entrepreneurship principles also varies across the organization, which limits its ability to balance social impact with financial sustainability in a systematic way.

These conditions point to a gap that is not only practical but also scholarly. Existing research has concentrated on three areas: conceptual definitions and typologies of social entrepreneurship (Zahra *et al.*, 2009; Santos, 2012; Saebi, Foss and Linder, 2019); social entrepreneurship education and the entrepreneurial intentions of students (Bazan *et al.*, 2020; Shahid and Alarifi, 2021); and the governance and impact measurement of stand-alone social enterprises (Nicholls *et al.*, 2012; Ebrahim, Battilana and Mair, 2014). Comparatively little empirical work documents how a multi-campus educational organization converts a mission-driven portfolio of social initiatives into a standardized, organization-wide implementation system, or how stakeholder evidence and external benchmarking can be combined to design such a system. Saebi, Foss and Linder (2019) specifically call for multi-level research that connects individual motivation, organizational structures, and institutional context, which is the level at which this study operates.

Accordingly, the general objective of this study was to develop a Strategic Implementation Manual for Social Entrepreneurship through an in-depth case study of SRK EGI. Specifically, the study aimed to: (1) describe how social entrepreneurship initiatives are currently planned, implemented, and governed across campuses; (2) identify the strategic, operational, and financial challenges that affect their implementation and sustainability; (3) assess the alignment of current practices with relevant theoretical frameworks and with the practices of benchmarked educational institutions; and (4) develop and validate a manual that addresses the identified gaps.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How are social entrepreneurship initiatives currently planned, implemented, and governed across the campuses of SRK EGI?
2. What strategic, operational, and financial challenges affect the implementation and sustainability of these initiatives?
3. How do current practices align with relevant theoretical frameworks and with the practices of benchmarked educational institutions?
4. What components should a Strategic Implementation Manual contain to institutionalize social entrepreneurship across the organization?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study covered the social entrepreneurship initiatives implemented by SRK EGI from 2019 to the period of data collection from January to March 2026, namely scholarship programs, outreach and feeding programs, care for the sick, disaster relief, and donation drives. Participants were internal stakeholders directly involved in planning, implementing, managing, or evaluating these initiatives. Benchmarking was limited to publicly documented practices of selected national and international educational institutions. Several delimitations apply. First, as a qualitative single-case study, the findings are context-specific and support analytical rather than statistical generalization (Yin, 2018). Second, the study did not quantitatively measure the financial returns or social impact of the initiatives. Third, the manual was developed and validated by stakeholders for relevance, clarity, and feasibility, but its effectiveness after implementation was outside the scope of the study and remains to be evaluated.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Literature Review

Social Entrepreneurship and Hybrid Organizing in Education

Definitions of social entrepreneurship remain contested. Early work framed social entrepreneurs as change agents who pursue a social mission with entrepreneurial means (Dees, 1998), while later scholarship described social entrepreneurship as a process of combining resources to catalyze social change and address social needs (Mair and Martí, 2006). Zahra *et al.* (2009) showed that social entrepreneurs differ in motives and in the scale of the problems they address, and Santos (2012) argued that the defining feature is the pursuit of value creation over value capture. Saebi, Foss and Linder (2019) note that this definitional plurality has produced a fragmented field in which concepts are often applied loosely.

A more consistent thread is the view of social enterprises as hybrid organizations that combine social welfare and commercial logics (Battilana and Lee, 2014; Doherty, Haugh and Lyon, 2014). Hybridity creates tensions over goals, resources, and identity, which organizations manage through deliberate structural choices; Pache and Santos (2013), for example, showed how hybrids selectively couple elements of competing logics to maintain legitimacy. However, most of this research examines enterprises that earn market revenue. Educational institutions differ because their social activities are frequently charitable programs funded from operating surplus or donations rather than from trading income. Applying the hybrid lens to education therefore requires care: in this setting, the central tension is less about commercial mission drift and more about how to sustain and coordinate social programs that sit outside the core budget and governance system. This distinction informs the present study.

Theoretical Lenses and Their Limitations

Several theories explain different aspects of social entrepreneurship, but each operates at a particular level and leaves gaps when used alone. Social innovation theory emphasizes the generation and diffusion of novel solutions to social problems; Phillips *et al.* (2015) found that the literature gives considerable attention to the creation of innovations but less to the systems that allow them to be replicated and scaled. Sustainability theory and the Triple Bottom Line call for organizations to account for social, environmental, and economic performance (Elkington, 1997), yet Bansal and Song (2017) caution that sustainability concepts are often used imprecisely and are difficult to operationalize. Measurement approaches such as Social Return on Investment provide structured indicators (Nicholls *et al.*, 2012), and the principle that objectives should be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-bound offers a practical standard for indicator design (Doran, 1981), but neither specifies who should collect data or how results should feed decisions. The shared value perspective links social and economic value at the strategic level (Porter and Kramer, 2011), while stakeholder theory highlights the need to balance the interests of the groups an organization serves (Freeman, 1984).

At the individual level, entrepreneurial intention theory, grounded in the theory of planned behavior, explains how attitudes, perceived norms, and perceived behavioral control shape willingness to act (Ajzen, 1991); Mair and Noboa (2006) adapted this logic to the formation of social venture intentions, and Bazan *et al.* (2020) showed that the university environment and support system influence these precursors among students. Intention, however, does not guarantee coordinated organizational action. Institutional theory addresses that gap by distinguishing regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive pillars that make practices durable (Scott, 2014) and by explaining how organizations adopt similar structures under coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). Organizational learning theory adds that practices become institutional when experience is captured and used to adjust routines (Argyris and Schön, 1996).

Taken together, these lenses suggest a synthesis that guides this study. Normative commitment and individual intention explain why social initiatives emerge; regulative structures such as policies, committees, and procedures explain whether they persist; measurement systems explain whether they can be evaluated and resourced; and learning routines explain whether successful practices spread. The study therefore uses institutional theory as the integrating framework and draws on the other lenses to interpret specific findings and to design the corresponding components of the manual.

Governance, Measurement, and Implementation Challenges

Research on social enterprise governance identifies accountability and mission drift as central risks, particularly where oversight structures are weak or where performance is not measured against social objectives (Ebrahim, Battilana and Mair, 2014). Doherty, Haugh and Lyon (2014) similarly note that hybrids face recurring difficulties in mobilizing financial resources and in managing the expectations of multiple stakeholders. In higher education, studies have concentrated on the support environment for student social entrepreneurship and on the design of social entrepreneurship education (Bazan *et al.*, 2020; Shahid and Alarifi, 2021). Studies of educational settings add that social entrepreneurship initiatives often depend on scarce resources and unpredictable funding (Akoh and Lekhanya, 2022), and that integrating social

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

entrepreneurship requires a cultural shift within organizations toward creativity, hands-on learning, and community cooperation (Mets, Holbrook and Läänelaid, 2021). These studies show that institutional support matters, but they treat the institution mainly as a context for learners rather than as an organization that must itself plan, govern, fund, and evaluate social initiatives.

Benchmarking Practices in Educational Institutions

Studies of educational institutions describe several ways of translating social entrepreneurship into organizational practice. Institutions in North America and Europe commonly embed social entrepreneurship in their strategic goals through dedicated centres for innovation and social impact, which serve as incubators for student-led projects and link academic research with community engagement (Bazan *et al.*, 2020). Malaysian higher education institutions have fostered social entrepreneurship through incubators, collaborations with non-governmental organizations, and interdisciplinary initiatives between business and social science departments (Naseri *et al.*, 2024). In the Middle East and North Africa, effective programs incorporate local customs, religious values, and community needs through close stakeholder engagement, and manuals and guidelines that specify operating standards and reporting procedures support accountability and transparency (Alajlani and Yesufu, 2022). Other studies emphasize formal support structures such as partnerships, training facilities, and policy frameworks that integrate social entrepreneurship into organizational governance (Janelidze, 2019); the integration of social entrepreneurship with corporate social responsibility frameworks to connect social mission with financial sustainability (Alotaibi *et al.*, 2024); and experiential and service-learning approaches that engage teachers and students directly with real social problems (Wahid *et al.*, 2023).

These practices offer useful reference points, but they come mainly from universities with dedicated resources and largely student-centred aims. Naseri *et al.* (2024) caution that global models must be critically assessed for contextual fit and adapted to stakeholder expectations, cultural norms, and available resources rather than replicated. For a multi-campus private education group operating across cultural and economic settings, the relevant question is therefore which structural elements can be transferred and how they should be adapted. The present study addresses this question by using these documented practices as benchmarks for the design of the manual.

Methodology

Research Design

The study employed an exploratory qualitative single-case study design within a constructivist and interpretivist paradigm (Creswell, 2014; Creswell and Poth, 2018; Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2019). A case study is appropriate for examining a contemporary phenomenon in its real-world context when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (Yin, 2018). Because the study aimed to produce a practical output, the design was organized into four sequential phases: (1) a diagnostic phase using interviews and document analysis; (2) a benchmarking phase; (3) a manual development phase; and (4) a validation phase involving a stakeholder workshop.

Research Locale

The study was conducted within SRK EGI, a private educational organization operating multiple campuses and educational programs across different geographic locations. The organization was selected because of its documented commitment to social entrepreneurship since 2019 and because its multi-campus structure makes the problem of standardization particularly visible.

Research Participants

A total of 15 participants took part in the study, drawn from four business units of the organization. The stakeholder categories represented and their roles in the initiatives are presented in Table 1 in the Results and Discussions section. Participants were assigned codes (for example, SA1 for the first senior administrator) to protect their identities.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a researcher-developed semi-structured interview guide consisting of eight open-ended questions in four parts: (1) participant profile; (2) experiences and involvement in SRK EGI's social entrepreneurship initiatives; (3) challenges and effectiveness of the initiatives; and (4) recommendations for a Strategic Implementation Manual. The questions were derived from the research questions and the reviewed literature and were reviewed and validated by two experts before administration. Follow-up questions were used during interviews to elicit concrete examples (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009).

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

The eight questions, with the research question each addresses, were as follows: (1) What is your role or relationship with SRK EGI, and how long have you been connected with the organization? (Participant profile); (2) SRK EGI has implemented scholarship programs, outreach and feeding programs, care for the sick, disaster relief, and donation drives. Which of these have you been involved in or observed, and in what way? (RQ1); (3) Based on your experience, what challenges has SRK EGI faced in implementing or sustaining these initiatives (e.g., funding, coordination, communication, participation, consistency)? (RQ2); (4) Which initiative do you think was most effective, and what made it work well? (RQ1, RQ3); (5) Which initiative was most difficult to sustain or implement, and why? (RQ2); (6) How do these initiatives reflect SRK EGI's mission, values, and commitment to social responsibility? (RQ3); (7) What improvements are needed to make the initiatives more structured, sustainable, and institutionally supported rather than one-time efforts? (RQ2, RQ4); and (8) If SRK EGI were to develop a Strategic Implementation Manual for Social Entrepreneurship, what key guidance or components should it include? (RQ4).

Data Gathering Procedure

Interviews and questionnaires, after institutional authorization and informed consent were obtained, data were collected between January and March 2026 through Zoom interviews and questionnaires based on the interview guide. Each participant's interview was completed within one to two days, depending on the participant's availability. Responses were compiled and de-identified before analysis. Document analysis, institutional documents, including policies, strategic plans, reports, and operational records, were reviewed for evidence on governance arrangements, procedures, funding, documentation practices, and evaluation (Bowen, 2009). The documents were used to corroborate or qualify the accounts of participants. Benchmarking drew on the practices of educational institutions documented in the review of related literature: centres for innovation and social impact in North American and European institutions (Bazan *et al.*, 2020); incubators, partnerships with non-governmental organizations, and interdisciplinary initiatives in Malaysian higher education institutions (Naseri *et al.*, 2024); culturally adapted, stakeholder-driven programs and formal operating and reporting guidelines in the Middle East and North Africa (Alajlani and Yesufu, 2022); formal institutional support structures (Janelidze, 2019); integration with corporate social responsibility frameworks (Alotaibi *et al.*, 2024); and experiential learning approaches (Wahid *et al.*, 2023). Governance and impact measurement guidance for hybrid organizations was also considered (Nicholls *et al.*, 2012; Ebrahim, Battilana and Mair, 2014). These documented practices were compared with those of SRK EGI across five dimensions: governance, implementation, financial sustainability, monitoring and evaluation, and knowledge sharing. Manual development and validation workshop, the themes from the diagnostic phase and the gaps identified through benchmarking were translated into draft manual components. The draft was then reviewed in a validation workshop held on 20 April 2026 with 24 stakeholders. Participants assessed each component for relevance, clarity, and feasibility, and their recommendations were incorporated into the final version.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: How are social entrepreneurship initiatives currently planned, implemented, and governed across the campuses of SRK EGI?

Profile of Participants

Fifteen participants from four business units of the organization took part in the study. They represented five stakeholder categories, from senior administrators responsible for strategic direction to program implementers who deliver the initiatives directly (Table 1). This range of roles allowed the findings to reflect strategic, managerial, and operational perspectives.

Table 1. Profile of participants

Stakeholder category	Code	Role in social entrepreneurship initiatives
1. Senior administrators	SA	Strategic direction, approval, and resource allocation
2. Campus leaders	CL	Campus-level planning and supervision of initiatives
3. Academic personnel	AP	Mobilization of students and faculty; program delivery
4. Operational managers	OM	Logistics, finance, procurement, and documentation
5. Program implementers	PI	Direct implementation of outreach, relief, and scholarship activities
Total		**15 participants from four business units**

Research Question 2: What strategic, operational, and financial challenges affect the implementation and sustainability of these initiatives?

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Overview of Themes

The analysis produced five themes that together explain the current state of social entrepreneurship implementation within SRK EGI. Table 2 shows how the research questions and interview items were connected to the codes, subthemes, and themes, and which data sources supported each theme.

Table 2. Thematic map linking research questions, interview items, codes, subthemes, themes, and data sources

	RQ	Interview items	Sample codes	Subthemes	Theme	Data sources
1.	RQ1, RQ3	2, 4, 6	Initiatives as part of identity; pride in outreach; values-based participation; no written policy; campus-specific procedures	Cultural embeddedness; absence of standard structures	Strong mission-driven commitment coexisting with structural inconsistency	Interviews, documents
2.	RQ1, RQ2	2, 3, 5	Different planning steps per campus; inconsistent reports; good practices not shared; duplicated effort	Procedural variation; weak knowledge transfer	Fragmented implementation across campuses	Interviews, documents, benchmarking
3.	RQ2	3, 5, 7	Reliance on donations and voluntary contributions; no dedicated budget line; no impact indicators; outputs counted, outcomes not tracked	Unstable funding; absence of measurement	Funding instability and the absence of measurable sustainability indicators	Interviews, documents, benchmarking
4.	RQ2, RQ3	3, 6, 7	Initiatives driven by leaders; continuity risk when leaders change; unclear roles; no committee	Leader dependence; governance gap	Leadership-driven initiatives lacking formal governance structures	Interviews, documents
5.	RQ4	7, 8	Requests for operating procedures, templates, committee, indicators, and annual reporting	Readiness for formalization; preferred components	Organizational demand for a Strategic Implementation Manual	Interviews, validation workshop

Each theme is presented with supporting evidence from interviews, documents, and benchmarking, followed by its discussion in relation to the literature. Taken as a whole, the findings show that social entrepreneurship is deeply embedded in the organization's mission and culture, but its implementation remains largely informal, which produces operational inconsistency and limits strategic integration.

Theme 1: Strong Mission-Driven Commitment Coexisting with Structural Inconsistency

Participants across all categories described social entrepreneurship as an integral part of the organization's mission and values. Scholarship programs, outreach and feeding programs, disaster response, and care for the sick were regarded as authentic expressions of the organization's commitment to social responsibility and as essential to its identity.

Despite this commitment, participants acknowledged the absence of standardized structures for planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating initiatives. One participant expressed this contrast directly:

"We believe that helping students and communities is part of our mission, but we need a clearer system to make sure these initiatives are implemented consistently." (Participant)

The evidence suggests that shared values have not, by themselves, been sufficient to ensure consistent execution across the organization.

Discussion. In institutional terms, the organization has achieved strong normative and cultural-cognitive legitimacy for social entrepreneurship, but the regulative pillar remains weak (Scott, 2014). This pattern also differs from the concern in hybrid governance research that organizations drift toward commercial goals (Ebrahim, Battilana and Mair, 2014). SRK EGI faces the opposite problem: its social mission is secure, but it lacks the structures needed to sustain and coordinate it. This finding supports the argument made in the literature review that, in educational settings, the central hybrid tension concerns coordination and sustainability rather than commercial mission drift.

Theme 2: Fragmented Implementation Across Campuses

Although all campuses share the same mission, participants reported differences in planning processes, implementation procedures, documentation practices, and evaluation methods. Successful practices developed at one campus were rarely documented or transferred to others, which reduced efficiency and limited replication.

"Each campus tries to contribute, but the activities and reporting are not always coordinated across the organization." (Participant)

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

These differences affected coordination, documentation, and the sharing of successful initiatives. Benchmarked institutions illustrate alternatives, such as centralized units for social innovation that coordinate activities and resources (Bazan *et al.*, 2020) and interdisciplinary collaboration across departments (Naseri *et al.*, 2024). Cross-campus coordination and standardized reporting were therefore examined as a distinct dimension in the benchmarking comparison, and the resulting provisions in the manual (common procedures, minimum documentation, and campus coordinators) were reviewed in the validation workshop.

Discussion. This finding supports social innovation theory's observation that innovations are more often created than systematically diffused (Phillips *et al.*, 2015). Without routines for capturing and sharing experience, organizational learning remains at the level of individual campuses (Argyris and Schön, 1996). Common procedures and a shared record of initiatives are therefore included in the manual as mechanisms for moving from local innovation to institutional practice. Drawing on the practices of comparable institutions in this way reflects the mimetic process described by DiMaggio and Powell (1983).

Theme 3: Funding Instability and the Absence of Measurable Sustainability Indicators

Financial sustainability emerged as a principal concern. Participants reported that many initiatives depended on available resources, voluntary contributions, or the initiative of leaders rather than on dedicated institutional funding. Few formal systems existed to assess financial sustainability or social impact using standard indicators, which made it difficult for leaders to compare initiatives, allocate resources, and plan on the basis of evidence.

"We can carry out community activities, but sustaining them requires a clearer budget and a way to measure their long-term impact." (Participant)

Participants linked these concerns to the continuity of initiatives rather than to an unwillingness to invest in them. The benchmarking evidence suggests one route to broader funding: integrating social entrepreneurship with corporate social responsibility frameworks and partnerships with governments, businesses, and nonprofit organizations can widen the resource base (Alotaibi *et al.*, 2024). Financial planning and outcome measurement were accordingly examined as benchmarking dimensions and translated into the financial sustainability and monitoring and evaluation components of the manual.

Discussion. These findings are consistent with the Triple Bottom Line argument that organizations must account for economic as well as social performance (Elkington, 1997) and with the observation that sustainability concepts are difficult to operationalize without defined measures (Bansal and Song, 2017). They also echo the observation that social entrepreneurship initiatives frequently rely on scarce and unpredictable funding (Akoh and Lekhanya, 2022). The concern expressed by participants related mainly to the absence of measurement and dedicated funding mechanisms rather than to unwillingness to invest in social programs. Measurement frameworks such as Social Return on Investment (Nicholls *et al.*, 2012) are useful references, but the findings indicate that SRK EGI first requires a simpler set of specific, measurable, and time-bound indicators (Doran, 1981) that campuses can collect consistently.

Theme 4: Leadership-Driven Initiatives Lacking Formal Governance Structures

Participants consistently attributed the success of many initiatives to the commitment and vision of organizational leaders, and leadership support was regarded as a major facilitator of implementation and community engagement. At the same time, participants were concerned that heavy dependence on individual leaders could compromise continuity, because there were no formal committees, clearly defined roles, or standard operating procedures to sustain initiatives when leadership or priorities changed.

"Some initiatives move forward because a particular leader supports them, but we need a process that will continue even when leadership changes." (Participant)

Discussion. Entrepreneurial intention theory explains the strong willingness of leaders and staff to initiate social activities (Ajzen, 1991; Mair and Noboa, 2006). The findings show, however, that intention does not consistently translate into coordinated organizational action without supporting structures. The governance committee, defined roles, and handover procedures in the manual respond directly to this risk, consistent with Janelidze's (2019) argument that formal support structures keep social entrepreneurship within organizational governance rather than as a side project. The finding also extends work on the support environment for social entrepreneurship in universities (Bazan *et al.*, 2020) by showing that the same principle applies to staff and leaders: institutional structures are needed to convert motivation into durable practice. In institutional theory terms, governance is the mechanism that moves practice from the normative to the regulative pillar (Scott, 2014).

Theme 5: Organizational Demand for a Strategic Implementation Manual

Across all stakeholder groups, participants supported the development of a formal Strategic Implementation Manual. They recommended that it include governance structures, implementation

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

procedures, financial management guidelines, monitoring and evaluation systems, sustainability indicators, reporting requirements, and clearly defined responsibilities. During the validation workshop, participants endorsed the establishment of a central Social Entrepreneurship Committee supported by campus coordinators and recommended annual institutional reporting aligned with organizational strategy.

"A manual would help clarify who is responsible, what steps should be followed, and how we should report and evaluate our initiatives." (Participant)

Discussion. The consistency of these recommendations indicates readiness for formalization. Stakeholder theory suggests that frameworks designed with the participation of affected groups are more likely to be accepted (Freeman, 1984), and the validation workshop, attended by 24 stakeholders, provided this participation. These expectations shaped the governance, implementation procedures, monitoring and evaluation, financial oversight, and continuous improvement components of the manual. Participants' expectations also align with the observation that manuals and guidelines promote accountability and transparency by specifying operating standards and reporting procedures (Alajlani and Yesufu, 2022). The preference for a central committee with campus coordinators reflects the selective coupling strategy observed in hybrid organizations, in which some elements are standardized while others remain flexible (Pache and Santos, 2013).

Divergent and Contradictory Evidence

Participants did not question the legitimacy or importance of the initiatives. The main tension in the evidence lay instead between campus autonomy and standardization. Local discretion had allowed campuses to respond quickly to community needs, including disaster relief, and was a source of the innovation discussed under Theme 2; yet the same discretion produced the inconsistency that participants wished to reduce. The manual resolves this tension by standardizing governance, reporting, and minimum documentation while leaving the design of individual initiatives to campuses.

Integration of Findings and Development of the Manual

The four data sources were integrated in sequence. Interviews identified the themes; document analysis corroborated or qualified them; benchmarking identified practices that addressed each gap; and the validation workshop tested the resulting components for relevance and feasibility. Table 3 shows how each theme and benchmark practice informed a specific component of the manual.

Research Question 3: How do current practices align with relevant theoretical frameworks and with the practices of benchmarked educational institutions?

Table 3. Link between themes, benchmark practices, and components of the Strategic Implementation Manual

Theme	Benchmark practice (source)	Manual component	Key contents
1. Mission-driven commitment with structural inconsistency	Strategic embedding through dedicated centres for social impact (Bazan et al., 2020); formal support structures (Janelidze, 2019)	1. Governance structure and policy	Social entrepreneurship policy; central committee; campus coordinators; terms of reference
2. Fragmented implementation	Incubators, NGO partnerships, and interdisciplinary initiatives (Naseri et al., 2024); contextual adaptation (Alajlani and Yesufu, 2022)	2. Proposal and approval procedures; 4. Implementation standards	Annual planning cycle; proposal template; approval levels; minimum documentation; completion report
3. Funding instability; no indicators	Integration with CSR frameworks and partnerships (Alotaibi et al., 2024); impact measurement (Nicholls et al., 2012)	3. Financial sustainability; 5. Monitoring and evaluation	Budget allocation rules; fund sources; cost tracking; indicator framework; baseline and targets
4. Leader-dependent initiatives	Formal governance structures (Janelidze, 2019); experiential learning and capacity building (Wahid et al., 2023)	1. Governance structure and policy; 6. Knowledge management and capacity building	Role descriptions; succession and handover; orientation and training; shared repository
5. Demand for a manual	Manuals specifying operating standards and reporting (Alajlani and Yesufu, 2022); validation workshop recommendations	7. Reporting and continuous improvement	Quarterly campus reports; annual institutional report; periodic review of the manual

Positioning of the Manual Relative to Existing Approaches

The manual also differs from the approaches identified in the literature review. Whereas existing frameworks address definitions, hybrid governance, student-centred education, or impact measurement in isolation, the manual integrates these concerns into a single operational framework for a multi-campus educational organization. Table 4 summarizes these differences.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Table 4. Comparison of existing approaches and the proposed Strategic Implementation Manual

Approach	Primary focus	Level of analysis	Limitation for multi-campus implementation	How the proposed manual differs
Conceptual and typological frameworks (Zahra et al., 2009; Santos, 2012)	Defining social entrepreneurship and its forms	Concept / venture	Do not specify structures, roles, or procedures	Translates concepts into governance roles and operating procedures
Hybrid governance studies (Ebrahim, Battilana and Mair, 2014; Pache and Santos, 2013)	Mission drift, accountability, logic tensions	Organization (enterprise)	Based mainly on revenue-earning enterprises; not campus-level	Applies governance principles to charitable and enterprise programs across campuses
Social entrepreneurship education (Bazan et al., 2020; Shahid and Alarifi, 2021)	Curricula, student intentions, support environment	Individual / program	Treats institution as context for learners	Treats institution as implementer responsible for planning, funding, and evaluation
Impact measurement guides (Nicholls et al., 2012)	Valuing social outcomes	Program	Measurement without implementation structure	Embeds indicators within governance, reporting, and review cycles
Proposed Strategic Implementation Manual (this study)	Institutionalizing social entrepreneurship	Organization (multi-campus)	—	Integrates seven components; developed from case evidence and benchmarking; validated by stakeholders

Research Question 4: What components should a Strategic Implementation Manual contain to institutionalize social entrepreneurship across the organization?

Proposed Implementation Plan

To translate the manual into practice, a phased implementation plan was developed from the findings and the validation workshop recommendations. Table 5 sets out the implementation priorities, key actions, responsible units, monitoring indicators, reporting mechanisms, and proposed timeline.

Table 5. Proposed implementation plan for the Strategic Implementation Manual

Priority	Key actions	Responsible person or unit	Monitoring indicators	Reporting mechanism	Timeline
1. Establish governance	Adopt social entrepreneurship policy; constitute central committee; appoint campus coordinators; approve terms of reference	Executive leadership; Social Entrepreneurship Committee	Policy approved; committee constituted; coordinators appointed in all campuses	Committee minutes to executive leadership	Months 1–3
2. Standardize procedures	Introduce annual planning cycle, proposal and approval templates, minimum documentation and completion report	Committee; campus coordinators	Percentage of campuses with approved annual plans; percentage of initiatives with completion reports	Quarterly campus reports	Months 3–6
3. Secure financial sustainability	Create dedicated budget line or fund; define allowable fund sources; track costs per initiative	Finance office; Committee	Funds allocated versus utilized; share of initiatives with dedicated funding	Semi-annual financial report	Months 4–9
4. Monitor and evaluate	Adopt indicator framework; set baselines and targets; collect outcome data	Campus coordinators; quality assurance or planning office	Beneficiaries reached; outcome indicators met; continuity of initiatives after leadership change	Indicator summary in quarterly reports	Months 6–12
5. Build capacity and share knowledge	Orientation and training; shared repository of practices; cross-campus sharing sessions	Human resources; Committee	Staff trained; practices documented and replicated across campuses	Annual knowledge-sharing forum	Months 6–18
6. Report and review	Publish annual social entrepreneurship report; review and update manual	Committee; executive leadership	Report published on schedule; revisions adopted	Annual institutional report	Months 12–24 and annually

Managerial and Strategic Implications

The findings indicate that the primary challenge for SRK EGI is organizational formalization rather than commitment. The manual is designed to strengthen consistency while preserving the mission-driven

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

culture that participants valued. Because it was validated by stakeholders but has not yet been implemented, its contribution at this stage is a structured and evidence-based design; claims about its effectiveness must await evaluation after implementation.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to accepted principles of research ethics at all stages. The study was conducted as part of a Master of Business Administration research project at the University of Gloucestershire and received ethical approval from the University. It was carried out with the authorization of the organization's management, and organizational documents were accessed with appropriate authorization. Participation was voluntary. Participants were informed of the purpose of the research and the intended use of the information collected, and informed consent was obtained from all participants before data collection. The authors' affiliation with the organization is acknowledged. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained through the use of participant codes and the removal of personally identifiable information from responses and reports. Benchmarking used only published information. All research data were securely stored and used exclusively for academic purposes.

Conclusion

This study developed a Strategic Implementation Manual for Social Entrepreneurship for SRK EGI by examining its current practices, identifying implementation challenges, comparing them with benchmarked institutions, and translating the evidence into a validated management framework. The conclusions are organized according to the research questions. With respect to RQ1, social entrepreneurship initiatives at SRK EGI are planned and implemented largely at campus level and are governed informally. They are strongly anchored in the organization's mission and are regarded by stakeholders as part of its identity, but they are not supported by a common policy, procedures, or governance body. With respect to RQ2, the principal challenges are fragmented implementation across campuses, unstable funding, the absence of measurable sustainability indicators, and dependence on individual leaders. These challenges arise from a lack of formal systems rather than from a lack of commitment. With respect to RQ3, current practices align well with the normative dimension of institutional theory and with the value-creation emphasis of social entrepreneurship, but they are weak in the regulative, measurement, and learning dimensions identified by institutional, sustainability, and organizational learning theories. Benchmarking against practices documented in North American, European, Malaysian, and Middle Eastern and North African institutions helped identify the governance, implementation, financial, monitoring, and knowledge-sharing provisions that the manual adopts, adapted to the organization's context. With respect to RQ4, stakeholders identified and validated seven components for the manual: governance structure and policy; proposal and approval procedures; financial sustainability; implementation standards; monitoring and evaluation; knowledge management and capacity building; and reporting and continuous improvement. The study contributes to the literature by examining social entrepreneurship at the level of organizational implementation within a multi-campus educational organization and by showing how institutional theory, supported by other lenses, can be used to diagnose implementation gaps and design corresponding structures. In practice, it provides SRK EGI with a structured, stakeholder-validated roadmap for institutionalizing its social initiatives.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, SRK EGI is advised to implement the manual in phases, beginning with governance and ending with institutional reporting and review. The implementation plan in Table 5 sets out the priorities, responsible units, monitoring indicators, reporting mechanisms, and proposed timeline for this purpose. For future research, the following are recommended: (1) evaluate the manual after implementation, using pre- and post-implementation comparisons of the indicators in Table 5; (2) develop and test quantitative measures of social impact, including approaches such as Social Return on Investment; (3) include beneficiaries, partner organizations, and students to obtain an external view of the initiatives; (4) conduct comparative multiple-case studies with other multi-campus educational organizations to test the transferability of the manual; and (5) conduct longitudinal research on whether formalization preserves or weakens the mission-driven culture identified in this study.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Akoh, E. I., & Lekhanya, L. M. (2022). Social entrepreneurship as a tool for sustainable development in South Africa: A literature review. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship, 26*(S5), 1–15.

Alajlani, S., & Yesufu, L. O. (2022). Social entrepreneurship, innovation and education for sustainability in the Middle East and North Africa region: A literature review. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship, 26*(S5), 1–11.

Alotaibi, D. M., Youssef, Y. A. E.-d., Aboulhaded, F. A., Hassan, A. O., Al-Rubaian, H. M. S., & Elfeky, M. M. A. (2024). Social responsibility of educational institutions in supporting the entrepreneurship sector in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture*, 132–156. https://doi.org/10.70082/esiculture.vi.1031

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method and practice*. Addison-Wesley.

Bansal, P., & Song, H.-C. (2017). Similar but not the same: Differentiating corporate sustainability from corporate responsibility. *Academy of Management Annals, 11*(1), 105–149. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0095

Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing: Insights from the study of social enterprises. *Academy of Management Annals, 8*(1), 397–441. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2014.893615

Bazan, C., Gaultois, H., Shaikh, A., Gillespie, K., Frederick, S., Amjad, A., Yap, S., Finn, C., Rayner, J., & Belal, N. (2020). A systematic literature review of the influence of the university's environment and support system on the precursors of social entrepreneurial intention of students. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 9*, Article 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-020-0116-9

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11*(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dees, J. G. (1998). *The meaning of social entrepreneurship*. Stanford University Graduate School of Business.
DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Doherty, B., Haugh, H., & Lyon, F. (2014). Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 16*(4), 417–436. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12028

Doran, G. T. (1981). There's a S.M.A.R.T. way to write management's goals and objectives. *Management Review, 70*(11), 35–36.

Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J., & Mair, J. (2014). The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 34*, 81–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2014.09.001

Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Capstone Publishing.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.

Guest, G., Namey, E., & Chen, M. (2020). A simple method to assess and report thematic saturation in qualitative research. *PLOS ONE, 15*(5), Article e0232076. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0232076

Janelidze, N. (2019). Supporting institutions of social entrepreneurship. In *Challenges of globalization in economics and business* (pp. 515–519).

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.

Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business, 41*(1), 36–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002

Mair, J., & Noboa, E. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: How intentions to create a social venture are formed. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, & K. Hockerts (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship* (pp. 121–135). Palgrave Macmillan.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 77-88, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Malterud, K., Siersma, V. D., & Guassora, A. D. (2016). Sample size in qualitative interview studies: Guided by information power. *Qualitative Health Research, 26*(13), 1753–1760. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315617444

Mets, T., Holbrook, J., & Läänelaid, S. (2021). Entrepreneurship education challenges for green transformation. *Administrative Sciences, 11*(1), Article 15. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci11010015

Naseri, R. N., Mohamad, M. S., Murtadho, A., Saifullah, M., & Nurfatoni. (2024). The role of higher education in developing social entrepreneurship in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 14*(2). https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v14-i2/20820

Nicholls, J., Lawlor, E., Neitzert, E., & Goodspeed, T. (2012). *A guide to social return on investment*. The SROI Network.

Pache, A.-C., & Santos, F. (2013). Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(4), 972–1001. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0405

Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N., & James, P. (2015). Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review. *Group & Organization Management, 40*(3), 428–461. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601114560063

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review, 89*(1–2), 62–77.

Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., & Linder, S. (2019). Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises. *Journal of Management, 45*(1), 70–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318793196

Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics, 111*(3), 335–351. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1413-4

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Shahid, S., & Alarifi, G. (2021). Social entrepreneurship education: A conceptual framework and review. *The International Journal of Management Education, 19*(3), Article 100533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100533

Wahid, H. A., Rahman, R. A., Mustaffa, W. S. W., Ahmad, N. L., Ramdan, M. R., & Muslimat, A. M. (2023). Best social entrepreneurship teaching and learning strategies for promoting students' social entrepreneurial minds: A scoping review. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 22*(3), 21–35. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.3.2

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing, 24*(5), 519–532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.