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ABSTRACT

This research project focuses on the role of collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria. The Nigerian government, particularly since the structural adjustment programme of the mid 1980s, has put in place policies and programmes aimed at entrepreneurship development, as a means of employment generation, poverty alleviation and rapid economic development. In fact, it seems as if all the strategies applied in the past to fight poverty have proved ineffective. Collective social entrepreneurship (CSE) is useful for the part it plays in the process of capital accumulation, innovation, employment creation and poverty reduction. Literatures suggest that this concept has not been prominent in Nigeria and has not been adequately investigated. The objectives of this research, therefore, are fourfold. Firstly, to critically review the relevant literature relating to the various entrepreneurship strategies and collective social entrepreneurship, with a particular focus on gaining a deeper understanding of what the dichotomies are in order to develop a conceptual framework. Secondly, to study the current impact of the collaboration of collective social entrepreneurs on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Thirdly, to examine the extent to which CSE strategies can impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria and, lastly, to determine the nature of the collaborations and strategies employed by collective social entrepreneurs to address poverty in Nigeria and, in turn, to suggest the best poverty reduction collaborative strategy for CSE in Nigeria.

This exploratory study is both inductive and deductive in nature and adopts a multi-method research design, using both qualitative and quantitative data. Data was collected through semi-structured in-depth interviews and questionnaires with multiple informants in twenty (20) collective social entrepreneurship firms in Nigeria in order to investigate the impact of CSE on poverty. The study employs a stratified sampling technique. Employers and employees of two subsectors of social entrepreneurship organizations in Nigeria are surveyed using multivariate analysis and descriptive methods (frequencies, percentages, cross tabulations and multiple regression) are used for data analysis. SPSS is used to analyze the quantitative data using a multiple regression analysis to test the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, while NVIVO is employed to analyze the qualitative data. It was noted from findings that the cooperative form of collaboration and multivocality strategy is mostly used by Nigerian CSEs for their poverty alleviation mission.

This research contributes to knowledge within the field of collaborative social entrepreneurship by offering a conceptualization of CSEs and empirical study on an investigation into collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria. Another contribution of this research is that the nature of this research is the first of its kind to be carried out in Nigeria. Previous studies have been done in more developed economies, but none in Nigeria. Lastly, this research has been able to establish that cooperatives, product development and multivocality will act as more of a proxy for poverty alleviation in Nigeria.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Collective Social Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEs</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEV</td>
<td>Social Entrepreneurial Ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWA</td>
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<tr>
<td>MNC</td>
<td>Multinational Corporations</td>
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<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Community Based Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBV</td>
<td>Resources Based View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCs</td>
<td>Less Developed Countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research background and context

This study looks at collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to promote the alleviation of poverty in Nigeria. As revealed in the literature, poverty is one of the biggest problems in the world today (Baba et al., 2014). This is demonstrated by the following statistics: three billion people live on a minimum of US$2 per day (World Bank, 2012; 2014) and half a billion people live on below US$2 per day (World Bank, 2014); 70-90 per cent of people in the developing world are poor and Nigeria is part poor developing countries; poverty is number one of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (World Bank, 2012); and 75 per cent of the world’s poor are women (World Bank, 2014). It seems that all of the strategies applied in the past to fight poverty have proved ineffective, as the strategies and programmes have not been able to alleviate poverty (Abimbola & Nwiro, 2013; Peterson, 2015).

The Nigerian government, since independence has developed programmes aimed at employment creation, rapid economic development and poverty alleviation (Abimbola & Nwiro, 2013, Mohamed et al., 2015). These programmes have failed as a result of a lack of direction and incorrect implementation (Abimbola & Nwiro, 2013), but the world has found a most promising poverty alleviation strategy in the form of CSE. CSE is the coming together of different social entrepreneurs to address social issues from the historical literature, and it can be suggested that CSE strategies are making a positive impact across the countries in which they have been employed (Tan et al., 2015), such as Canada, Hungary and the United Kingdom.

A United Nations report (2014) on Nigeria's Common Country Analysis (CCA) has depicted the nation as one of the poorest and most unequal nations on the planet, with more than 80 million of the population living below the poverty line. According to the report, Nigeria has a population of more than 175 million and is the most crowded country in Africa and the seventh most crowded in the world. It is estimated that the population will be around 200 million by 2019 and more than 400 million by 2050 and it will most likely be one of the five most populated nations on the planet. In Nigeria, 37% of children less than five years of age were stunted in their growth, 18% died and 29% were underweight (Mohamed et al., 2015).
The Nigerian economy has not been growing as expected and it is revealed that government revenues have fallen by as much as 33 per cent, which has further brought about the drop in Gross Domestic Product, by 0.36 per cent, in the initial three months of 2016 (Ezekiel & Edwin, 2016).

CSE arises when social entrepreneurs convene to address social issues (Connell, 1999; Smith & Woods, 2015). It is a major source of economic development (Wilken, 1999; Oly & Iftikhar, 2012) and a means of poverty alleviation (Connel, 1999; Worrell et al., 2013). Wilken (1999) uses the term CSE to describe the source and structure of economic development. Whereas De Sousa & Docuyanan (2016) use the term to describe the pattern of interactions among different organizations. On the other hand, Mueller et al. (2015) use the term CSE to represent the role it plays in the capital accumulation process and innovation. Other authors posited that CSE can lead to life achievements such as business success (Schoonhoven & Romaneli, 2001; De Bruin & Lewis, 2015) and it also shows how working together can help business activities (Felin & Zenger, 2007; Burress & Cook, 2009; Morgan, 2016).

The term collective social entrepreneurship is used when the choices about asset deployment are taken not by an individual, but by a group of individuals (Si et al., 2015). According to Burress and Cook (2009), collective social entrepreneurship is also explained and expressed according to the intention or motive of the entrepreneurship. Burress and Cook (2009) collated 240 articles and examined them, and suggested that collective entrepreneurship is explained and expressed according to the intention or motive of the entrepreneurship. Though Montgomery et al. (2012) suggested strategies such as framing, convening, and multivocality as some of the strategies of CSE, they also argued that the strategy that works for each circumstance is a question that is dependent on the nature of the CSE strategy and how the strategies are implemented. Montgomery et al. (2012) therefore recommended an investigation into how collaborators will leverage on resources and overcome the unique challenges related to collaborations within the same sector and across sectors in order to determine the difference between the two. Social entrepreneurs face significant resource voids (Montgomery et al., 2012; Hjorth & Holt, 2016). Resource constraints are a major challenge to social entrepreneurs. It is incumbent on them to understand that goods and services can be drummed up, and to understand the variety of different businesses, how they
carry out their businesses in different markets, platforms and locations and that some of these businesses are vital and successful.

The poverty rate of Nigeria is at 61% (World Bank, 2014) and its economic growth rate is at 6.7% (Gbandi & Amissah, 2014). Nigeria as a nation has lots of innovative entrepreneurs (Agbalajobi, 2011) but this has not translated into poverty alleviation (Oluseyi et al., 2013).

More so, research shows that entrepreneurial skills and collectivism can reduce poverty and enhance economic growth (Oladeji & Abiola, 1998; Kayode, 2015), yet whilst many studies have been undertaken within a Western context (Morgan, 2016; Hjorth & Holt, 2016) there are no empirical studies on this phenomenon within Nigeria, hence the significance of this study to the field of CSE. Therefore, this study will fill this gap, looking into collective social entrepreneurship collaboration and strategy formulation with a view to alleviating poverty in Nigeria.

Poverty will, no doubt, increase if drastic steps are not taken (Kayode, 2015). While poverty is becoming apparent in the diaspora (United Nations, 2012; World Bank 2014; Bessant et al. 2012). It is therefore important to understand the fact that all humans are mutually dependent and it is necessary to act at local levels to reduce poverty through value creation and collectiveness (Peterson, 1988; Ossai & Nwalado, 2012).

1.2 Aim and objectives of the research

Aim of Research

To investigate CSE as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria.

Research Objectives

1. To critically review the relevant literature relating to collective social entrepreneurship collaboration and strategy, with a view to gaining a deeper understanding of the phenomenon in order to develop a conceptual framework.

2. To study the current impact of CSE collaboration on poverty alleviation in Nigeria.

3. To examine CSE strategies and their impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria.

4. To suggest the best poverty reduction collaborative strategy for CSE’s in Nigeria.
1.3 Research questions
- How do social entrepreneurship organizations formulate their strategies and what is the nature of these strategies?
- What are the impacts of CSE collaborations and strategies on poverty alleviation in Nigeria?

Hypothesis
- H1= Cooperative form of collaboration will not contribute to poverty alleviation in Nigeria through increased income.
- H2= Licensing agreement form of collaboration will not alleviate poverty in Nigeria through employment creation and business opportunities.
- H3= Multivocality form of CSE strategy will not alleviate poverty in Nigeria through skill development.
- H4= Product development form of strategy will not alleviate poverty in Nigeria through education and training.

1.4 Justification for the research

Poverty incidence in Nigeria is on the increase (World Bank, 2014). The term poverty connotes a situation where the majority of the populations are living below the poverty line and they do not earn enough to meet their daily needs (Adesina, 2013). What is more, the available resources cannot meet the needs of the population (Akinmulegun, 2014). Poverty can lead to corruption, hunger, environmental degradation, sickness and death (Adesina et al., 2013). To avoid these situations, poverty alleviation is urgently needed. Poverty alleviation is one of the major priorities of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) - the need to reduce poverty in most developing countries, including Nigeria, has become a great concern to the heads of nations and the international community as a result of the consequences of poverty (Akinmulegun, 2014). The Millennium Development Goals are a set of eight point goals that were set by the leaders of 189 countries in the year 2000 at the United Nations Millennium Summit to improve the lives of the world’s poorest people and reduce poverty. One of the mechanisms of such poverty alleviation is through the collaboration of social enterprises.
Nigeria as a nation is among the poorest countries in the world and many of its population are still living in abject poverty, with more than 50% on a living wage of less than $2 per day (World Bank 2014; Adesina, 2013). The level of economic growth not only affects poverty, but poverty incidence also affects lives and economic growth. Studies have confirmed that economic growth is one of the ways to address the problem of poverty and this can be done through the development of enterprise, entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship, which by their operations generate employment and the redistribution of wealth (Aiyedogbon & Ohwofasa, 2012). The World Bank (2014) has described Nigerian poverty as a paradox, which has also been confirmed by other authors, such as Aiyedogbon & Ohwofasa, 2012; Aigbokhan, 2012. This view asserted that Nigeria is rich but that the people are poor and the level of wealth of the nation does not reflect the lives of the people (Aigbokhan, 2012).

About four decades after Nigeria became independent the country still remains poor, with an annual per capita income of less than $300 (Akinmulegun, 2014). This is below the average of $450 for sub-Saharan Africa (Akinmulegun, 2014). The World Bank (2014) reports that per capita consumption and per capita income are lower than in the early 1970s. PCI dropped from $1,600 in 1980 to $290 in 2002 and there was a further reduction in 2012 to $120. This fall was as a result of unemployment, neglect in agriculture, currency depreciation, corruption and bad leadership (Adesina, 2013).

Studies show that there is a relationship between economic growth and poverty (Aiyedogbon & Ohwofasa, 2012). Therefore, poverty will slow down economic growth and economic growth will improve poverty level through the redistribution of income and the provision of employment (Adesina, 2013). The current economic recession in Nigeria is also caused by the high poverty situation (Aigbokhan, 2012). Unemployment is a major cause of poverty and is considered as a barrier to social progress and transparency (Akinmulegun, 2014). The level of poverty in Nigeria has led to degeneration into armed robbery, kidnapping, terrorism, corruption, insecurity and other vices (Akinmulegun, 2014). There is therefore a need to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria in order to reduce the resultant effects of poverty mentioned above, i.e. terrorism, corruption, kidnapping, armed robbery, bad governance, etc.

Research has been undertaken with regards to various strategies to alleviate poverty in Nigeria, but there has been scarce research that has addressed how CSE can be used as a collaborative strategy to reduce the level of poverty in Nigeria (Abubarkar, 2012). Williams
(2012) studied the evolution of collective strategies among organizations at Stanford United and among research and development consortia and concluded that collectivism is a formidable tool for networking and addressing social issues. Mair et al. (2012) researched collective entrepreneurship and its contribution to sustainable rural development in Greece, but this research was not focused on Nigeria and not on Lagos in particular. With such a huge population there is therefore a need to look at the effect of CSE within the context of Nigeria.

Whilst there has been some research on CSE by Montgomery et al. (2012) titled “Collaboratively Shaping Social Good”, which focuses on the effectiveness and use of collaborations in fighting poverty, not much research has been conducted on the effectiveness of social entrepreneurship and its success in reducing poverty within the context of Nigeria. This research therefore argues that there are different forms of collaborations and strategies that can be used to address poverty, such as alliances, cooperatives, licensing agreements and joint ventures.

Within the Nigerian context, CSE has received very little attention with regards to collaborative strategies that may potentially curb poverty (Faridi et al., 2015). Many authorities have shown concern about the level of poverty in Nigeria and researchers have also looked at poverty from different perspectives, but to date a resolution has not been found (Edet, 2015). In fact, Idris and Yusof (2016), who researched the proliferation of intervention programmes and poverty reduction, concluded that poverty is a major problem in Nigeria and requires a multidimensional approach. Edet (2015) researched poverty alleviation from the perspective of policy implementation and concluded that policies relating to poverty are key in alleviating poverty in Nigeria. Kasali et al. (2015) asserted that, among other factors, micro financing will help to alleviate poverty in Nigeria through entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship. Oyediran et al. (2015) posited that engagement and investment in agricultural cooperatives will alleviate poverty in Nigeria. The position of Oyediran et al. (2015) is in line with this research, as a cooperative is a form of collaboration that is used for poverty alleviation. Idris & Agbim (2015) argued that micro financing will alleviate poverty in Nigeria; this is poverty alleviation from another dimension of financing. Finance is an important factor needed by CSEs in poverty alleviation. Effiom & Francis (2015) opined that multilevel marketing is an important poverty alleviation index. The findings of Effiom & Francis did not touch on collectivism and the importance of collaboration in poverty
alleviation in Nigeria, but this research is investigating CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

More recently, Adiyia et al. (2016) suggested that our attention should be shifted to tourism as a poverty reduction mechanism. An economic evaluation of fiscal and monetary policies will help the Nigerian government in the fight against poverty alleviation (Abula & Adebayo, 2016). Jacob and Onwughalu (2015) criticized the position of Effiom and Francis (2015) and suggested that marketing will not alleviate poverty at any level. From another perspective, Aye et al. (2016) suggested that women’s development is a panacea to poverty alleviation, and that education for women is education for all. Hassan (2015) looked at poverty alleviation from the point of view of GDP. He stated that the government should make a concerted effort to increase GDP in order to reduce the level of poverty in Nigeria. Daniel (2016) claimed that international organizational development will impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Corruption is a major cause of Nigeria’s poverty and curbing corruption will eradicate poverty in Nigeria (Gonzalez, 2016). Organizational development, such as small and medium enterprises, will grow the economy and alleviate poverty (Okon & Edet, 2016). Entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurship and social missions will eradicate poverty in Nigeria (Olusegun, 2013). Interestingly, Maria (2015) said that cooperatives play a major role in economic development and poverty alleviation, whereas Aniebonam (2012) opined that community development will impact positively on the community and help local poverty eradication. Looking at the foregoing literature, none of the literature has focused on the impact of CSE as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty specifically in Nigeria, hence the importance of this research.

CSE could be used as a poverty alleviation measure because it is holistic and integrates so many different aspects of the community, such as economic, social, cultural, environmental and political. It is obvious that social entrepreneurship is an agent of poverty alleviation but the dimension of CSE as a poverty alleviation mechanism has not been adequately researched.

This research is the first of its kind within this sector in Nigeria, as this sector consists of the highest number of social entrepreneurs (Oyelola et al., 2013). Many programmes, schemes and research projects aimed at poverty reduction have been conducted within Nigeria, but the results have not been very positive. What is more, these research projects were not focused
on the present sectors, the Finance and Education sectors. Therefore, the focus has shifted to examining the effect of collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy for poverty reduction.

The study by Pache & Santos (2013), Peterson researched into the role of the private sector in alleviating poverty. The study used data from 58 countries. Regression analysis was conducted on these findings and the scatter plots indicate that there is an indirect correlation between the two. That is, the private sector reduces poverty as hypothesized, and with the added innovation of entrepreneurship, the ideas are more effective in reducing poverty. This suggestion will be studied in this research.

According to the World Bank report of 2012, 189 countries signed the Millennium Declaration for the adoption of millennium Development goals, according to which, the goal is to reduce poverty, i.e. the number of people living on less than 1 dollar per day by 2015. Looking at the foregoing argument, it is therefore pertinent to carry out an investigation of CSE as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria after all other strategies have failed.

1.5 Brief description of research methodology

This study adopts a pragmatic philosophy as the research takes both the positivist position and the interpretive position, based on the philosophical assumptions they underpin in order to answer the research questions. From a pragmatic stance, a mixed method (quantitative and qualitative) is employed within this study. Quantitative primary data will be collected using questionnaires and analyzed quantitatively using a multiple regression analysis in order to identify the relationship between poverty and collective social entrepreneurship. Qualitative primary data will be collected by conducting semi-structured in-depth interviews through the audio-recording of conversations and then transcribing them to written words for qualitative analyses. A case study will be carried out using content analysis to gather information about the organizations internal communications and operations from the internal records. The case study is not to gather data from the employers and employees of the CSE organization for analysis, but to have an insight into the CSE operations and structure. The qualitative method is employed in order to explore deeper into the nature of collective social entrepreneurship through asking questions, and to understand its concept, requirements and model in order to understand its implementation strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria (Effiom & Francis,
The research will be in two stages; firstly a case study will be carried out to understand the nature, relationship and structure of the CSEs, while the second stage will involve quantitative and qualitative enquiries.

However, this study employs both deductive and inductive approach, as the research is aimed at producing an understanding of CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria, and to suggest the best poverty reduction collaborative strategy for CSE in Nigeria. The approach starts by exploring and then by confirming. This method is mainly used in qualitative and quantitative research (Yin, 2003; Taiwo et al., 2016). The survey strategy is adopted for this study as it is associated with the inductive approach (Saunders et al., 2009). It will be used to answer “what” research questions and it also allows the researcher to gather primary data from a sizeable number of target participants (collective organizations) in Lagos State, Nigeria using suitable data collection tools. The study will be carried out within the education and finance sectors, as these areas generate the highest number of social enterprises in Lagos State, Nigeria (Oyelola et al., 2013; Taiwo et al., 2016). This will help to gather adequate data amongst collective social entrepreneurs.

Multiple sources of secondary data are compiled through journals, books, articles and company records for content analysis of the research, as well as the literature review. Primary data will be collected through the administration of questionnaires and the conduction of semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire will be administered both face-to-face and online, depending on what is convenient for the respondents.

The researcher adopts a disproportionate stratified sampling approach towards shortlisting the respondents for the survey. Disproportionate stratified sampling would help to get a true reflection of how the phenomenon under study occurs in its natural form, without trying to influence the outcomes by choosing a biased sample (Lawanson, & Oduwaye, 2016). Questionnaires will be designed and a pilot study will be conducted in order to amend and refine the questionnaire, thereby giving the data collection instrument validity and reliability. About two hundred and twenty (220) questionnaires will be administered to the employees and the CEOs of the collective organizations. The twenty collective organizations are made up of about four different social entrepreneurship organizations, bringing it to a total of eighty (80) individual social organizations.
In order to answer research questions, SPSS software will be used to test and analyze the hypothesis using suitable statistical analytical tools (multiple regression analysis) for quantitative analysis, while qualitative primary data gathered through audio-recording will be transcribed and analyzed qualitatively. Multiple regression will allow the researcher to determine the relative contribution of each of the predictors to the total variance, i.e. how much effect collective social entrepreneurship, strategy, collaboration, income, etc. has on poverty reduction (Obi & Ezeugo, 2016).

Finally, quantitative data analysis is important in order to generate an in-depth analysis on the nature, attitude and orientation of the survey sample (Dongkek & Okoye, 2016). Through the use of quantitative data, more practical and convincing proof is available for conducting research related to the existing problems. A multi-method research design will provide more concrete and comprehensive evidence, which will result in more valid data (Valerie et al., 2012). A multi-method research approach provides advantages that offset the disadvantages of using either qualitative or quantitative research methods in isolation. A multi-method research design will provide more data that can be sourced both quantitatively and qualitatively. The data will also be in-depth, as the nature of the data is quantitative and qualitative; it will help with understanding the mindset, viewpoint and the emotions of the respondents. A multi-method research design will produce a holistic perspective of the organizations under investigation and at the same time help the researcher to grasp the data in a more rigorous and statistical manner (Valerie et al., 2012; Cuestas & Intartaglia, 2016).

In this study, twenty social entrepreneurship organizations representatives from Lagos state, Nigeria were invited to a face-face semi structure in-depth interview. The interview is to give the researcher a broader view of CSE strategies. It produces a spontaneous response and allows for follow-up questions. The purpose of the interview is also to clear up any doubts regarding the new approach and follow up on anything that could come up later (Gbenga et al., 2015).
1.6 Key definitions

1.6.1 Entrepreneurship
The activity that involves the evaluation and exploitation of opportunities and their discovery in order to bring forward new services and goods in the market, and the different ways of handling and organizing the processes, raw materials and the markets with the help of previously unknown efforts is called entrepreneurship (Santos, 2012). The definition of entrepreneurship is so broad that it can also include social entrepreneurship inside it. This is a kind of entrepreneurship that has as its main focus “developing opportunities which promote social changes as well as address social needs” (Mair & Marti, 2006: 15).

1.6.2 Social entrepreneurship
The process in which resources are combined in different ways in order to promote social changes, cater to social needs and establish new organizations is called social entrepreneurship (Meyskens et al, 2008; Agwu et al., 2014). It is a process of the creation of social value. It is the phenomenon in the non-profit sector that involves applying market-based skills and experience in business in order to use innovative strategies to earn income (Mair et al., 2012; Maria, 2015; Dant et al., 2013). According to the common definitions of social entrepreneurship, instead of creating shareholder and personal wealth, it creates personal value (e.g. Zadek & Thake, 1997; Smith & Woods, 2015). This activity includes the creation of new and innovative ideas instead of using existing practices and ideas (Ndubisi & Itfikahar, 2012).

1.6.3 Collective social entrepreneurship
This is also referred to as collectivism. It is the idea of different social entrepreneurs coming together to address social issue(s) (Kania & Kramer 2011; Smith & Woods, 2015). The nature of the social problems are such that it becomes extremely difficult for the individual actors to solve the problems individually, rather a collaboration of different actors is required at different levels across different industries and competencies in order to tackle the complications (Tan et al., 2015). This calls for the utilization of different resources across different sectors. Kania and Kramer (2013) have referred to the concept of “Collective Impact”, which will produce lasting results after the social problems have been tackled and dealt with. The individual impacts may create definitive results, but will not be lasting and
sustainable, whereas the collective impact will not only be sustainable but the interplay between the different actors will ensure it has long lasting effects (Khavul & Bruton, 2013). Lumpkin, (2013) said that the collective impact will require the different protagonists to work together with a common mindset towards a common goal to achieve the social objective, in contrast to their individual work. Newbert et al. (2012) and Lund-Thomsen et al. (2016) posited that the acts of social ventures mainly result in fruitful value creation, whereas the work of an individual subject results in only value capture. But in order to capture values, the help of diverse actors from diverse fields is required (De Sousa & Docuyanan, 2016). Thus the collective social entrepreneurship focuses on the concept of association and partnership rather than on individual work. The social ventures mainly result in the successful tackling of social problems and thereby the study of the collective and their actions are very important in order to determine the different factors and the reasons by which the social objectives could be achieved (Mueller et al., 2015).

1.6.4 Collective social entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation

A lot of studies related to poverty alleviation have been adopted using several distinct theoretical underpinnings. This has helped in finding a workable solution for the subject matter (Beamish & Lupton, 2016). Several inclusions of these theories are the theory of basic needs, the vent for surplus theory, dependency/underdevelopment theories and lastly the individual deficiencies theory (Boone & Ozcan, 2015). The main aim of these theories is to focus on alleviating poverty without looking into the root cause of it. The theory is entirely concentrated on the adoption of collective social entrepreneurship for the alleviation of poverty. This work adopts a collective social entrepreneurship approach towards alleviating poverty. The collective social action is often backed and coordinated by several formal political coalitions, trade associations, research and development consortia, agricultural or producer cooperatives, government agencies, formal industrial alliances, associations of cultural organizations, federations of trade associations, etc. (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012; Amadabadi & Gerdefaramarzi, 2012). Collective social entrepreneurship is a process in which several social entrepreneurs or individuals come together to address social impact. Dacin et al. (2010) and Parangue and Willmott (2016) asserted that collective entrepreneurship can be used to describe the proper structure and source of economic development. This means that a family, an individual, government or a group of unrelated people can form a business venture or social enterprise venture. This categorization was used to determine the economic development of several countries (Cheney, 2015). This form of
development gives a reflection of economic condition, culture and public policy. Graefe (2006) and Long et al. (2015) suggest that collective entrepreneurship is an interaction that exists between several individual firms. The term is in line with the process of collective learning (Semali, 2015). In this context new technical knowledge is acquired amid the global and institutional restructuring. Collective entrepreneurship thus plays a vital role in the adaption of a nation’s institutional capacity (Jolly & Raven, 2015). Contrary to this, Otto & Ukpere (2011), use collective entrepreneurship as a role playing model in the accumulation of capital and innovation. Further, both authors added that ‘entrepreneurial function’ need not be reduced or limited to a single entity or individual, since the entrepreneurial function is best realized through the process of collective entrepreneurship and it involves several other players from state, central and local government bodies. It also includes representatives from international organizations for promoting and regulating the conditions related to competition and competitiveness (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000; De Bruin & Lewis, 2015).

1.6.5 Collaboration
Collaboration is referred to as the exchange of ideas and information, enhancing resources, altering activities and sharing resources with other organizations for mutual benefit and to achieve a common purpose (Himmelman, 2002; Verschoore et al., 2015). In the context of this study, collaboration is referred to as one organization working with other organizations for mutual benefit.

1.6.6 Cooperatives and poverty alleviation
The foremost voluntary business organizations formed for mutual development are the cooperative societies (Melton et al., 2016). These societies are managed by the people through shared capital contribution or profit contribution accrued from their respective businesses. In short, these societies are democratically managed by the members (Kasimir, 2016). Henry (2012) has defined cooperatives as autonomous associations or organizations that are voluntarily managed by people in order to meet the social, economic and cultural needs of a democratically owned and operated enterprise. Cooperative is defined as a member-owned and group based enterprise or business, which aims at the social and economic development of any sector (Othman et al., 2012). Juliá-Igual et al. (2012), considered cooperatives as an association of a person with limited means and voluntarily achievement of its goals through democratically controlled business organizations. The person is also responsible for sharing the profit and loss of his accrued shares and is liable to
take all the benefits associated with the organizations (Jolly & Raven, 2015). Cooperatives act as a catalyst for the growth of the local entrepreneur (Tregear & Cooper, 2016). This is because it helps in mobilizing and operating the capital, and further helps in entrepreneurial development. This is supported by Mair & Marti (2009), since they understand that cooperative societies are owned, controlled and operated through their members on a non-profit or cost basis. Cooperative enterprises help in providing several productive employments and alleviating poverty through the achievement of social integration and collaboration (Mathuva, 2015). They also help in that they are a model for providing values of self-help, democracy, social responsibility, equity, equality and solidarity (Kania & Kramer, 2013; Poledrini, 2015).

1.6.7 Strategy
The future of any business is mapped with the help of strategy, as it suggests which products and services should be sent to which markets and in which ways (Smith et al., 2016). Strategy also helps in deciding the long-term scope and direction of the organization (Johnson et al., 2011; Minja & Mutunga, 2015). It explains how the resources of the organization should be changed with respect to the clients, market and customers in order to meet the expectations of the stakeholders (Jandt, 2015).

1.6.8 Innovation
Innovation is referred to as the successful exploitation of new ideas (Evers & Ewert, 2015). The delivery of better quality services and products and the improvement of the present business models are also determined by innovation (Elmes et al., 2016). This is how innovation can be traditionally defined and it is exclusively related to the business (Alden Rivers et al., 2015).

1.6.9 Joint venture
Joint venture is the venturing of two or more companies for the development of new businesses within the existing organizations with a new way of working, organizational structures and rewards (Saha & Chattopadhyay, 2015), as against the existing working style and culture of an organization (Amadabadi & Gerdefaramarzi, 2012). Similarly, Beamish and Lupton (2016), defined joint venture as an engagement between firms for the expansion of their market participation in a geographical manner, learning new technologies and skills, the
creation of economies of scale, etc. Also, joint ventures help in consolidating and strengthening their existing market positions as well as gaining information process (Beamish & Lupton, 2016). In international operations, a joint venture is referred to as having its headquarters in the country of operation of any one of the venturing companies (Pomponi et al., 2015). Amadabadi & Gerdefaramarzi (2012) considers joint venture as the involvement of any one of the local partners with a foreign partner for the achievement of business objectives. The main motives of joint venture are gaining and sharing knowledge in the market place, acquiring or learning knowledge from the venturing partner, and improving and managing the marketing, administration, operations, finance and human resource departments (Pomponi et al., 2015). Besides all these ideas, cluster analysis suggests that the development of knowledge is an important criterion for joint ventures (Triki & Mayrhofer, 2016). Almost 82 % of the total joint venturing organizations help in generating knowledge and alleviating poverty (Vitalis & Scott, 2015).

1.6.10 Strategic alliance
The agreement between two or more companies for reaching a common goal or objective is referred to as a strategic alliance (Reuer & Devarakonda, 2016). Albers et al. (2015) argue that strategic alliances are one of the various operating options for achieving organizational goals based on the cooperation between the alliance companies (Albers et al., 2015). Yee et al. (2015) posited that for a strategic alliance to impact on economic development and reduce poverty, there must be an agreement between two or more independent organizations. In a strategic alliance, the alliance companies share all kinds of relationships, except for acquisitions, loans, sales based on short-term contracts, and less important activities based on agreements or activities that are not strategic for the partners (Xu et al., 2016), for example, a long-term basis agreement provided for service or outsourcing (Juttim, 2016). The alliance partners willingly provide modifications to their existing business practices for reducing wastage and duplication and for facilitating improved performance (Veltri et al., 2015; Jordan, 2015. A strategic alliance can sometimes be referred to as a “partnership”. It offers the chance for businesses to take mutual benefits from each other and take the opportunity of a sustained competitive advantage (Albers, 2016).

1.6.11 Licensing agreement
A commercial contract between the licensee and the licensor is defined as a licence agreement (Dauletshina, 2015). There are several key elements in the contract, even though
this varies from contract to contract (Bonfanti et al., 2016). The contract is based on the patented technology, registered trademark, a copyright work, industrial design, trade secret or any kind of intangible asset (Littlewood & Holt, 2015). A licensing agreement is also referred to as a reference for providing technical support, assistance and training (the licensing agreement provided by the licensor for the benefit of the licensee) (Chandra, 2016).

Licensing may be general, and this is due to the fact that only having one kind of right or patent will not be sufficient for the licensee party to produce as well as to sell a particular item (the licensee needs to obtain the right to use a corresponding trademark) (Massey et al., 2015). Similarly, the licensing contract also specifies and permits the functional use of Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) (De Sousa & Docuyanan, 2016). The licence agreement gives the right to use the subject matter without distribution of the copyright with respect to the competition ((Duchene et al., 2015)). The geographical market restrictions can be specified with regional, national and international laws (Fox & Sohnesen, 2016). The expiry date is another important aspect of a licensing agreement. Other important elements of a licensing agreement include performance warranty (performance of the licence subject matter under the right conditions as per the licence agreement to give the desired results) and lastly, termination contingencies (this is in the event of any kind of bankruptcy of either of the parties). Biggins and Scott (2015) argued that the licensing agreement is not only applicable to commercial businesses, but also in the social service sector for the purpose of poverty alleviation. Furthermore, Thomas and Wilkinson (2015) added that CSEs can take advantage of licensing agreements to achieve the corporate mission of poverty alleviation. Wu et al. (2015), in relation to the Commercialization of University Invention, posited that licensing agreements are a source of major innovation within learning organizations who want to add value to the economy and the local community through poverty alleviation. Policy framework could affect a successful licensing agreement in any society, therefore the government has a major role to play in the process ((Duchene et al., 2015). The need for transparency from both the licensor and the licensee is important in a licensing agreement if it is to achieve its objectives (Akinwale, 2016).

1.6.12 Multivocality
Multivocality is the approach in which various opinions can be combined and stakeholders can operate in a collaborative manner (Grabow & Walker, 2016). In the context of collaborative entrepreneurship, Green et al. (2016) state that multivocality would imply an
appreciation for diverse comments or perspectives. Similarly, Gordon (2008) and Fox (2015) stated that collaborative development requires that contributing partners have positive regard for individual opinions. It would imply gathering different ideas around the same business problem and agreeing on a common solution after mutual discussion. Jolly and Raven (2015), believes that of all the perspectives and opinions, not all may be practically implementable. However, for the success of any collaborative entrepreneurship initiative, multivocality is an important precondition to follow in dealing with social concern.

Multivocality can be a strategy for community development and poverty alleviation (Montgomery et al., 2012; Cheney et al., 2014; Fowler, 2015). The multivocality concept focuses on combining the numerous voices to speak to the shareholders in a way that is accessible to audiences, and this shows up in several voices in the professional and academic literature in the role of “social embeddedness” in Medici political power (Suthers et al., 2013). Combining multiple voices to speak to a variety of audiences allows collectives to connect with diverse communities in a manner that “appeals to numerous audiences simultaneously” (Khatib & Miri, 2016). Multivocality is both evident in a number of the cases above and vital for the success of social entrepreneurship in many instances (Montgomery et al., 2012; Ocasio & Radoynovska, 2016).

1.6.13 Framing
From the perspective of social sciences, framing refers to the process by which individuals or organizations perceive and communicate about reality (Redman, 2013). It is the social construction of an event or phenomenon, which creates the required impression or perception within others (Cabecinhas & Abadia, 2013). As stated by Bradshaw & Richardson (2009), framing can be regarded as a schema of interpretation that individuals gradually build on so that they start responding to events or situations around them. Even within the social entrepreneurship framework, it is the individual frames that decide the choices that members make (Gallo-Cruz, 2012).

Framing and ideological development involves “the collective interpretation of ideas and the mobilizing of followers towards the achievement of a cause” (Montgomery et al., 2012, p. 383). Montgomery et al. (2012) further added that framing as a concept is a poverty reduction strategy for CSEs. New cooperatives in Canada today show evidence of being framed by strong, community-focused social objectives (Algar-Faria, 2014). Across Nigeria, social care and social services, alternative health care, alternative and organic food, alternative and
renewable energy, community economic development (CED), and offering employment for marginalized communities make up a less significant number of motivators for the creation of new co-ops (Rosenbloom et al., 2016). In other words, the majority of new cooperative projects emerging in Nigeria in recent years are primarily grounded in strong social objectives (outwardly focused to the community), rather than focused mainly on mutualistic needs and aims (inwardly focused on membership needs) (Adelaye et al., 2016).

1.6.14 Convening
As stated by Huang et al. (2016) and Gray and Stites (2013), conveners are individuals who come together for a common purpose to achieve some decided objectives. The role of these conveners would be to act as bridging agents to bring about information sharing in a largely complex environment (Frynas & Stephens, 2015). Similarly, Gordon (2008), states that conveners could be leaders within a social collaboration framework who help to make the right choices and recommendations based on the analysis of multidisciplinary problems. Within a social entrepreneurship framework, such conveners help to evaluate opportunities, clarify group purpose, influence partners and create the right kind of platform to encourage participation amongst others (Montgomery et al., 2012; Rodrigues et al., 2016).

Convening is a strategic practice most likely used when strategic actors or institutional entrepreneurs identify a complex social problem, or other need for change, yet do not possess the knowledge, know-how or skill set to address the problem without the support of others (Dorado, 2006; Peredo & McLean, 2012; Stephens et al., 2015). Unable to succeed unilaterally, these actors, or conveners (Carmona, 2010; Schneider et al., 2016), focus their efforts instead on convincing others to collaborate and to jointly address problems and initiate change (Hahn & Gold, 2014:1321). Legitimacy, social capital and interpersonal trust are, therefore, important resources for conveners (Dorado, 2005; Svendsen and Laberge 2006; McDonald et al., 2015). The act of convening, or bringing parties together for a shared purpose and to solve complex issues, is vital in that it also facilitates and stimulates collaboration (Montgomery et al., 2012; Austin & Seitanidi, 2014). It is defined as a process that allows multiple parties who view a problem from varying perspectives, or view differing aspects of the problem, to constructively explore solutions beyond their own vision and knowledge (Hansen, 2011). In the collaborative shaping of social goods, Montgomery et al. (2012) stated that CSEs can achieve their social mission of poverty reduction and other social projects through a convening strategy.
1.6.15 Poverty alleviation

When a person cannot access the basic needs of humans, i.e. food and water, it is called poverty (Hickel, 2016; Ravallion, 2016). It can be described as a multidimensional condition, as the person loses their dignity and their ability to improve their lives is affected; society is also affected in various ways (Hickel, 2016). Poverty alleviation is amongst the biggest challenges that countries face in current times (Sharpley, 2016). For most countries, the majorities of the citizens earn below the national average and are poor. As described by Clyde & Karnani, 2015), poverty reduction is the process by which countries need to identify their assets, create new avenues for asset utilization and enhance the transferability of benefits from those assets. Countrywide efforts would be required to make these benefits available for the common welfare (McKague et al., 2015). The process of poverty reduction would involve activities related to the removal of socio-economic barriers (Begum et al., 2015). The same has been stressed by Green et al., (2015) and Chen et al. (2015), who stress that poverty reduction would require many interrelated forces to be attacked at the same time. The knowledge and skill building of people, increasing access to educational opportunities, reducing the level of deprivation and an increased public role in decision-making are some of the key steps for alleviating poverty in the first place. Mohammed et al. (2009) and Peterson (2015) suggest that countries need to apply the right mix of people, technology, credit and information to make the best use of available resources to reduce poverty.

Poverty is essentially a multidimensional attribute and does not have a standard definition (Peterson, 2015). It is believed to be a situation of low income leading to low consumption and the inability to satisfy daily needs (Mohamed & Xavier, 2015). Individuals suffering from poverty struggle to provide shelter, education, health facilities and basic security for themselves and their family members (Qi & Tang, 2015). The same concept has been stressed by Kanbur (2015), who believes that poverty is a function of demographic variables, such as education, child mortality, health, etc., and that the lack of the above parameters creates poverty in the first place. Similar definitions have been provided by the Faridi (2015), which sees poverty as a state of the short-term deprivation of basic human needs. Almost all the definitions stress the economic, social and psychological incapacitation that individuals suffering from poverty tend to face (Adiyia et al., 2016). Abubarkar (2012) argued that the alleviation of poverty requires the consideration of such factors as increased income, education and training, employment creation and business opportunities, welfare and standard
of living, skills development, savings and investment.

**1.6.16 Organizing**
In the process of organization, the activities of the enterprise are grouped and categorized and the relationship among the authorities is understood. It also defines and regulates the duties and authorities among relationships, as well as arranges and discovers the tasks to be done, so that people can efficiently work together to complete their objectives (Allen, 2002).

**1.6.17 Structure**
Structure defines the framework in which an organization is built (Jolly et al., 2016). The structure defines: formal tasks that are assigned to departments and individuals; reporting of formal relationships, which also consists of the responsibility for decisions, it defines line of authority, systems and processes that are designed so that the coordination of the employees in all departments can be ensured effectively (Heinze et al., 2016).

**1.6.18 Strategy**
In terms of a business, Kach et al., (2016) suggest that the direction of an organization is defines by its strategy. It set out which product or service to take to the market (Tajvidi & Karami 2015). The scope of an organization and the direction is explained in the strategy and this has to match the resources of the organization (Peterson, 2015).

**1.7 Scope of the research**

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate CSEs as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in the context of Nigeria. Therefore, to achieve the objective of this research, literature that is related to social entrepreneurship is reviewed properly in order to develop a conceptual framework and, at the same time, understand how CSE as a strategy can impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. The theoretical foundations of this study can build on the various theories and models, such as the resource mobilization theory and the resource based view (Lo, 2015; Miemczyk et al., 2016).

The level of the impact of poverty with respect to the Nigerian context is examined with the help of nature and strategies of social entrepreneurship. In this research, a collective lens is used to examine social entrepreneurship and collaborative action and how it can be used to solve social problems. In a situation where a single actor may not be successful, collaboration
can be used on numerous levels to achieve social changes. Collaborative action is needed for bringing about a social change and, most especially, for addressing the menace of poverty. The necessity to collaborate with outside actors and draw on external resources in order to bring about changes can be explained with the help of some of the prior literature across the social movements (Martin et al., 2016; Desai, 2016; Martin et al., 2016), cooperatives (Spear, 2000), institutional change (Yozwiak et al., 2016; Ku et al., 2016; Iwasaki et al., 2015) and cross-sectorial partnerships (Sala et al., 2016; Desai, 2016; Moshtari, 2016). Collective social entrepreneurship is the primary focus of this research, which involves the collaboration of similar as well as diverse actors to apply business principles to solving social problems. By examining social capital, social relationships and the necessary actions that could bring about social change, social entrepreneurship behaviour and theory can be understood in a better way. Collective social entrepreneurship is also useful in building new resources and improving the existing ones, and understanding the effect of the reshaping and emergence of the institutional arrangements that can create social values (Montgomery et al., 2012). I define collective social entrepreneurship as the coming together of similar as well as diverse actors for the purpose of applying business theories and principles to resolve social menace.

Looking at several examples of the collective actions taken within the social entrepreneurial literature has enabled the researcher to understand and comprehend the field in-depth and enabled the researcher to answer several questions, such as what collective social entrepreneurship entails, including the form of collaborations, their strategies and opportunities, as well as the important strategies that ultimately lead to the outcome of social change, which are related to collective social entrepreneurship.

1.8 Limitation of study
As with any research, this research is not without limitations. The following summarizes the limitations for this study:

1. This research used only Lagos State out of the 36 states in Nigeria.
2. Two sectors were used - education and finance. Other sectors could be considered for further research.
3. There are other strategies and forms of collaboration mentioned in the literature that were not considered.
4. The findings of this study relate only to CSE employers and employees in selected sub-sectors in Nigeria. Since it did not cover all sectors, there is a good deal of scope for further research.
5. This study is based on the opinion and perceptions of the respondents. Therefore, the limitations of the opinion surveys have to be recognized because the respondents' opinions might not be the same as their actual practice and actions.

1.9 Key assumptions

Many research projects have been conducted on the role of the private sector in relation to its contribution to poverty reduction strategies. Sharpley (2016) argue on the effect of entrepreneurial activities on national economic growth, while other authors consider the speed of organizational growth in the country. Peterson (2015), investigated how private sectors can reduce poverty. The result of the study reveals that private sectors can alleviate poverty through employment creation and, at the same time, if policies are directed towards entrepreneurship and innovation, this can enhance economic growth and create more income for the poor. Peterson, 2015; Tan et al. (2015) and Forsstrom-Tuominen et al. (2015) argue that collective social entrepreneurship can stimulate economic growth and alleviate poverty. Applying an enterprise based solution to end poverty only focuses on small business development and innovation (Qi et al., 2015). Montgomery et al. (2012) recommended that future research should investigate CSE as a strategy to reduce poverty. With the addition of collective activities by individual private organizations, the economic activities can be boosted to provide income generating facilities for the poor people in countries like Nigeria (Edet, 2015). Therefore, the key assumptions in this research are:

- With the increase in the rate of collective social entrepreneurship, the rate of poverty will reduce (Gbenga et al., 2015; Begum & Abdin, 2015). Boukhatem (2016) studied the Italian textile district of Novara (North East Italy), and the case provides a collective contribution by individual actors who jointly solved a specific set of social and economic problems. According to the findings of Begum & Abdin (2015), the greater the collectivism, the greater the employment opportunities generated. In his study, he added that social entrepreneurs are employers of labour and, as collaboration and collectivism increases, a higher amount of employment will be generated, which therefore impacts on poverty.

- Innovation added to existing strategy always increases the opportunities for generating economic activities (Evers & Ewert 2015; Alden et al., 2015; Peterson, 2009).
Innovation is the engine that drives entrepreneurship, while strategy is important for survival and sustainability. One of the key resources needed by entrepreneurs is human resources, which is labour, and the reward for labour is wages and salaries. Social entrepreneurs increase economic activities through their services and also create employment (Elmes et al., 2015).

- Collective social entrepreneurship involves some aspects of social impact (Montgomery et al., 2012; Smith & Woods, 2015; Tan et al., 2015). CSE is about using entrepreneurial skill to reduce social impact and solve complex social problems, it creates new institutions and dismantles outdated institutional arrangements (Montgomery et al., 2012). The new institution can cause social change and transformation through awareness, training and employment (Montgomery et al., 2012).

1.10 Research setting: Country and industry

Nigeria is a federal constitutional republic in West Africa, bordering Niger in the North, Chad and Cameroon in the East and Benin in the west. It comprises 36 states and the Federal capital territory where the capital, Abuja, is located. The Nigerian population will be approximately 200 million by the year 2019 and about 400 million by 2025 and will therefore become one of the top five most populous nations in the world (Macdonald et al., 2015). The largest cities in Nigeria are Lagos, Kano, Ibadan, Benin city and Port Harcourt. Nigeria has an approximate population of 184 million and is the most populous nation in Africa. The country hosts over 500 different ethnic groups and languages, the official language is English, with a diverse religious background (Nwankwo, 2015).

Nigeria has the world’s 20th largest economy with more than $500 billion in terms of GDP as at 2015 (Ayegba, 2015). Nigeria has been identified as the regional power of the African continent. It has also been identified as an emerging global power in the international arena (Nwankwo, 2015).

Nigeria is a middle income, emerging market and a mixed economy, expanding in manufacturing, finance, services, telecommunications, technology and entertainment (Frank, 2016). Its major sectors are agriculture, energy, mining, transport and services. Entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship have emerged in the different sectors of the
country and these sectors have several subsectors upon which the foundation of this research is built (Ayegba, 2015).

Nigeria is also one of the poorest and most unequal countries in the world, with about 64% of the population living below the poverty line (Ayegba, 2015). Youth unemployment in Nigeria reached 42% in 2016, creating more poverty, crime, hunger and terrorism. Over 10 million children of school age are out of school and have no knowledge and skills. The economy is currently in recession and government revenue had fallen by as much as 33% by the first quarter of 2015 (Ayegba, 2015; Kadiri et al., 2015).

Lagos is one of the most populous cities in Nigeria and is the hub of the Nigerian commercial economy, with a population of about 21 million in 2016 (Ayegba, 2015). Lagos generates a significant portion of the nation’s GDP and it is Nigeria’s economic focal point. Lagos is a major information communication technology centre in West Africa, the biggest ICT market in Africa. It is also the centre of entrepreneurial activities in Nigeria (Kadiri et al., 2015).

The social entrepreneurship subsector has contributed to the Nigerian economy in the areas of technology and industrial development, employment generation, capacity building, increasing standard of living, structural transformation of rural areas and community development (Umoh & Udongwo, 2015).

Some academic scholars (Scott-Parker and Senserrick, 2016; Gale, 2015) have discussed the relevance of selecting a research setting, as it sets a boundary for generalizability that is observed to constitute a range of theories. Having the right research settings will facilitate the approach of the researcher to deal with the requirements of the research, such as documenting a particular phenomenon, examining exposed theories and confidently drawing conclusions about the empirical test (Saunders et al., 2009).

From the reviewed literature, it can be noted that past studies concentrated on America, Asia and western countries (Aremu and Adeyemi, 2011; Natee et al., 2016). Research has also been conducted relating to entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation, but work in the area of CSE conducted within the Nigerian context is limited. According to a study conducted by Peterson (2015), on the role that innovation plays in alleviating poverty, the private sector has a crucial role to play in implementing the innovations. The study collected secondary data from across 58 countries and tried to find a relationship between entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation. It found that sustainable rural development was one of the keys towards alleviating poverty at large. The same has been confirmed by studies conducted by Sergaki
(2010), on the Greek economy. Recent research was conducted by Kazmi et al. (2016) on
the impact of social entrepreneurs on the Pakistan economy and it concluded that social
entrepreneurs create jobs and alleviate poverty. This research is unique from the perspective
of social service in Nigeria. Various programmes, policies and schemes exist in Nigeria for
poverty alleviation, but the expected outcomes have not been achieved (Abioro & Adefeso,
2016) as the level of poverty is still on the increase (World Bank, 2014; Agwu & Kadiri,
2014). Hence, it is crucial to investigate the impact of collective social entrepreneurship with
regard to poverty alleviation in Nigeria.

According to Montgomery et al. (2012), collective social entrepreneurship can play a
crucial role in shaping the social constructs of a country. There has been little research
on how poverty reduction can result from the execution of these programmes. Hence
this research also has an academic significance, as it can help to make some
contribution to closing the gaps. Several scholars have researched on the evolution of
collective strategies in the context of social entrepreneurship. Most of the strategies
are around the creation of trade alliances, industrial consortia, trade associations and
other forms of formal contracts (Montgomery et al., 2012). Most of these collective
organizations operate on different strategies, which can either be general or specific in
scope (Montgomery et al., 2012). However, most of the studies have neglected the
larger role that such strategies can play in alleviating poverty in a social environment.

Verschoore et al. (2015) evaluated the context in which collective social entrepreneurship
operates. They found that there are five motivating factors behind collective social
entrepreneurship. The first is in the form of advancement theory, which believes that society
would like to advance with regards to its socio-economic status. Secondly, is the intra-
organizational efficiency, whereby organizations can expect better outcomes through
improved collaboration amongst their functional teams. Thirdly, is the form of inter-
organizational gains, whereby cooperating organizations can help to complement each other
in terms of skills and capabilities. Next, is the economic growth and development and, lastly,
socio-political change (Verschoore et al., 2015). By analyzing evidence from across various
studies, Verschoore et al. (2015) were able to establish that organizations that employ
collective social entrepreneurship strategies are able to make better gains than sole
entrepreneurs. This research starts by developing a conceptual model and then stimulates
further research into collective social entrepreneurship in other developing countries,
such as Nigeria. This research also serves as a comparison with the research done in
other parts of the world, such as Asia and Europe, in the area of social entrepreneurship as a poverty reduction strategy. There is a cultural difference between western countries and developing countries such as Nigeria, and the research identifies the factors that favour collective social entrepreneurship practice in Nigeria.

1.11 Poverty in Nigeria

Poverty incidence in Nigeria is on the increase (World Bank, 2014). The term poverty connotes a situation where the majority of the people do not earn enough to fulfil their daily needs and live below poverty line (Aigbokhan, 2012). What is more, the available resources cannot meet the needs of the population. Poverty can lead to corruption, hunger, environmental degradation, sickness and death (Adesina, 2013). To avoid these situations, poverty alleviation is needed urgently.

Poverty alleviation is one of the major priorities of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). There is a need to reduce poverty in most developing countries, including Nigeria, which has become a great concern to the heads of nations and the international community as a result of the consequences of poverty. One of the mechanisms of such poverty alleviation is through the collaboration of social enterprises.

Nigeria as a nation is among the poorest countries in the world and many are still living in abject poverty, with more than 50% on a living wage of less than $2 per day (Adesina, 2012). The level of economic growth not only impacts poverty, but poverty incidence also affects lives and economic growth. Studies have confirmed that economic growth is one of the ways to address the problem of poverty and this can be done through the development of enterprise, entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship, which by their operation generate employment and the redistribution of wealth (Aiyedogbon & Ohwofasa, 2012). The World Bank (2014) has described Nigerian poverty as a paradox, which has also been confirmed by other academics (Aiyedogbon & Ohwofasa, 2012; Aigbokhan, 2012). This view asserts that Nigeria is rich but the people are poor and that the level of wealth of the nation does not reflect the lives of the people (Aigbokhan, 2012).

Despite it being over five decades since Nigeria received independence, Nigeria still remains poor, with an annual per capita income of less than $300 (Akinmulegun, 2014). This is below the average of $450 for sub-Saharan Africa (Akinmulegun, 2014). The World Bank (2014) reports that per capita consumption and per capita income are lower than in the early 1970s. PCI dropped from $1,600 in 1980 to $290 in 2002 and there was a further reduction in 2012.
to $120. This fall was as a result of unemployment, neglect in agriculture, currency depreciation, corruption and bad leadership (Adesina, 2013).

Studies show that there is a relationship between economic growth and poverty (Aiyedogbon & Ohwofasa, 2012). Therefore, poverty will slow economic growth and economic growth will improve poverty levels through the redistribution of income and the provision of employment (Adesina, 2013). The current economic recession in Nigeria is also caused by the high poverty situation (Aigbokhan, 2012). Unemployment is a major cause of poverty and is considered as a barrier to social progress and transparency (Akinmulegun, 2014). The level of poverty in Nigeria has led to a degeneration into armed robbery, kidnapping, terrorism, corruption, insecurity and other vices.

Many authorities have shown concern about the level of poverty in Nigeria and look at poverty from different perspectives. Idris and Yusof (2016) researched the proliferation of intervention programmes and poverty reduction and concluded that poverty is a major problem in Nigeria and requires a multidimensional approach. Policy implementation has a vital role in poverty eradication in Nigeria and this is the responsibility of policy makers (Edet, 2015). Kasali et al. (2015) asserted that, among other factors, microfinancing will help to alleviate poverty in Nigeria through entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship. Oyediran et al. (2015) posited that engagement and investment in agricultural cooperatives will alleviate poverty in Nigeria. In fact, Idris and Agbim (2015) supported the position of Kasali et al. (2015) on the importance of microfinancing on poverty alleviation. Gbenga et al. (2015) supported the position of Oyediran et al. (2015) on the investment in irrigation to support agriculture for poverty reduction in Nigeria. Effiom and Francis (2015) postulated that the only solution to poverty alleviation is multilevel marketing. Adiyia et al. (2016) are of the opinion that attention should be shifted to tourism as a poverty reduction mechanism. An economic evaluation of fiscal and monetary policies helps the Nigerian government in the fight against poverty alleviation (Abula & Adebayo, 2016). Jacob and Onwughalu (2015) criticized the position of Effiom and Francis (2015), which was that marketing will not alleviate poverty at any level. From another perspective, Aye et al. (2016) proposed that women’s development is a panacea to poverty alleviation and that education for women is education for all. Hassan (2015) looked at poverty alleviation from the point of view of GDP, and he stated that the government should make a concerted effort to increase GDP in order to reduce the level of poverty in Nigeria. Daniel (2016) claimed that international organizational development impacts on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Corruption is a major cause of
Nigeria’s poverty and curbing corruption will eradicate poverty in Nigeria (Gonzalez, 2016). Organizational development, such as small and medium enterprises, will grow the economy and alleviate poverty (Okon & Edet, 2016). Entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurship and social missions will eradicate poverty in Nigeria (Aigbokhan, 2000; Arogundade, 2011; Olayinka et al., 2013). Cooperatives play a major role in economic development and poverty alleviation (Maria, 2015). James (2012) supported the position of Maria (2015) in the use of a cooperative to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Whereas, Aniebonam (2012) opined that community development impacts positively on the community and helps local poverty eradication. From the foregoing, none of the research has examined the relevance of CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Therefore the contribution of this research is to investigate how CSE can be used as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

Corruption is a major cause of Nigeria’s poverty (Aigbokhan, 2012) and curbing corruption will eradicate poverty in Nigeria (Gonzalez, 2016). Organizational development, such as small and medium enterprises, will grow the economy and alleviate poverty (Okon & Edet, 2016). Entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurship and social missions would eradicate poverty in Nigeria (Aigbokhan, 2000; Arogundade, 2011; Olayinka et al., 2013; Abula & Adebayo, 2016). Cooperatives play a major role in economic development and poverty alleviation (Maria, 2015). James (2012) supported the position of Maria (2015) in the use of a cooperative to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Whereas, Aniebonam (2012) opined that community development impacts positively on the community and helps local poverty eradication. Many research has been conducted in the area of poverty alleviation in Nigeria from literature review but none has examined CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Therefore the contribution of this research is to investigate how CSE can be used as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

Literature suggest that corruption is a major cause of Nigeria’s poverty and curbing corruption will eradicate poverty in Nigeria (Gonzalez, 2016; Daniel 2016; Okon & Edet, 2016). Some researchers have discussed the level of corruption on economic growth in Nigeria, such as Abiodum et al. (2007). The Authors use descriptive survey and content analysis to investigate the effect of corruption and economic reforms on economic growth and development in Nigeria and concluded that there is a correlation between economic growth, poverty and corruption. Mnhuda (2013) also investigating the relationship between corruption, poverty and economic growth in Nigeria. The study employed regression analysis
and granger causality test, it was discovered that there is an existence of co-integration chance tanging a long run causality relationship between corruption, poverty and economic growth in Nigeria. Ade et al. (2011) in the study of Corruption, foreign direct investment and Economic growth in Nigeria. The result reveals that there is an inverse relationship between FDI inflow and corruption. This means that a large volume of FDI inflow is associated with a low level of corruption in the host countries.

Over the years, Nigeria has been concerned with tackling corruption (Okon & Edet, 2016), which led to the establishment of bodies such as Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC) and Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC, 2015) among others in order to combat poverty. As noted earlier, corruption influences both domestic and foreign investment; raises transaction costs and uncertainty in Nigeria (Okon & Edet, 2016).

In 1996 and 1997, Nigeria was rated the most corrupt country in the world economy with corrupt perception index of 6.90 and 6.75 respectively (Transparency International, 2005). According to the same Transparency International (2016), Nigeria is the 136 least corrupt nation out of 175 countries. Idome (2006) noted that Transparency International ranked Nigeria 81 in corruption index, 90 in 2001 and 132 in 2003. In 2009, 2010 and 2011, the corruption perception indices for Nigeria were respectively 2.5, 2.4 and 2.4. This upsurge in corruption is associated with lack of control of corruption and its negative multiplier effects in the nation, which results to the retardation of living standards and raise the poverty level. In 2017, it was reported that Nigeria scored 28 points out of 100 on the corruption perception index (Transparency International, 2017). Looking at the above corruption index, there is need to address the problem of corruption in Nigeria in other to solve the problem of poverty. The World Bank (2012); Okon & Edet (2016), noted that the poverty Headcount of Nigeria is 62.6%. It can be argued therefore that poverty in Nigeria will decline if corruption is addressed.
1.12 Thesis outline

This thesis is divided into seven (7) chapters. The first chapter presents the introduction, details the background of the research, the research problems, its objectives, description of the methodology adopted and the key concepts and definitions. It also outlines the scope of the study, as well as its limitations.

Chapter two details the relevant literature review on CSE as a poverty alleviation strategy. In this chapter, various forms of CSE collaborations and strategies are discussed, such as cooperatives, licensing arrangements, joint ventures, alliances, multivocality, framing, convening and product development. The subject of poverty will also be discussed in this chapter. Innovation and entrepreneurship, and other relevant theories, will be researched, as will analytical and theoretical frameworks and issues related to the field. Through this process gaps in the literature will become apparent and be identified.

Chapter three examines the conceptual framework of this study and the relationships among different variables are identified.

Chapter four of this study will discuss the research methodology employed within the research and the procedure for data collection and analysis. This will include the purpose of the study, developing the instruments, pilot study, sampling procedure, data collection methods and the techniques for data analysis.

Chapter five reports on the two hundred and twenty participants that will be surveyed in this research. This will look at the profile of the CSEs practitioners and their employees, and the analysis and findings of the impact of CSEs collaborations on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. It will look at the effect of the various forms of collaborations and strategies to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

Chapter six focuses on a discussion of the data analysis and the findings of the previous chapter; it will discuss the best form of collaborations and strategies employed to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.
Finally, Chapter seven will briefly review the previous chapters and draw conclusions based on the analysis and findings of the research debated in the literature. Recommendations will be made and suggestions for future research will be highlighted.

1.13 Chapter summary

There are many programmes, such as War Against Indiscipline, Go Back to the Land, Peoples Bank, Directorate for Food and Rural Infrastructure, National Directorate of Employment, Agricultural Development Programme, Family Economic Advancement Programme, Better Life for Rural Women, National Poverty Alleviation Programme, Youth Empowerment Scheme, Rural Infrastructure Development Scheme and the Capacity Acquisition Development Programme, aimed at alleviating poverty in Nigeria, which have failed (Ezekiel & Edwin, 2016). Social entrepreneurship is becoming a new strategy address the problem of poverty, especially unemployment (Hassan, 2013; Oluseyi et al., 2013). Researchers have tried to examine the impact of social entrepreneurship on poverty alleviation and social-economic problems. From a global perspective, it is evident that entrepreneurship generates employment and helps to grow the economy (Agwu & Kadiri, 2014).

Thus, there have been many successful instances of CSE. However, few such cases have been found that have been successful for alleviating poverty in countries such as Nigeria (Dauda, 2016). Many studies have been conducted to understand the impact of the new model in solving the specific issue of poverty in Nigeria. It has been identified that the evolution of the entrepreneurial model also depends on the environment of the organization, such as the social and economic environment, and the economy of the country it is in. Thus, there is a vicious cycle in the evolution and effectiveness of such a model in Nigeria, which is a major challenge that needs further research.

The goal of poverty alleviation may not be achieved unless a conscious effort is made and a strategy for social entrepreneurial development is laid down (Kolawole, 2013). Two important arguments have emanated from the literature. Firstly, that poverty, pervasiveness, unemployment and poor economic conditions will increase entrepreneurial opportunities in the country, while others argue that it will not (Hassan, 2013). However, if the idea of CSE is
not developed and encouraged, economic prosperity will continue to decline and poverty will increase (Achumba et al., 2013).

The depth of poverty will be far greater without social entrepreneurial activities (Singer, 2004; Hassan, 2013; Ofili, 2014). This shows that social entrepreneurship is a formidable tool for fighting poverty. Akpomi (2009) and Hassan (2013) argued that the government has not done enough in the areas of poverty in business start-ups, unemployment and alleviating poverty despite the increasing awareness of the need to reduce poverty. Lack of support and framework can undermine entrepreneurial goals (Baba et al., 2014). However, this research will investigate CSE as a poverty reduction measure in Nigeria. This study will provide a platform for future research in the context of CSE and recommendations will be made to stakeholders on the relevance of CSE as a mechanism for alleviating poverty based on the key findings of this study.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter reviews all the relevant literature relating to the concept of collective social entrepreneurship, the nature and strategies of CSE, the various developments in terms of entrepreneurship in Nigeria, poverty in Nigeria, the various programmes that facilitate entrepreneurship, social innovations, social entrepreneurship practices and collaborations. This chapter also examines the problems associated with poverty within the Nigerian context and critically analyzes the methods adopted to resolve this issue of concern.

According to the studies by the World Bank (2014), around 1.4 billion people around the world are living below the poverty line (Dauda, 2016). The economic growth in places such as the Caribbean and Latin America has been extremely slow and thus there have been huge concerns regarding poverty (Saraiva, 2016). The state of the economy in the Caribbean and Latin America has influenced the poverty level in the region (Saraiva, 2016). The reduction in poverty has been extremely slow in regions such as sub-Saharan Africa. The reduction in poverty in this area has been the slowest, when compared to other regions, and trends demonstrate that there will be further hindrances slowing down the reduction of poverty in the future (Kanbur, 2015). However, such conditions prevail even in some of the developed economies of the world (Peterson, 2015: 5). According to the US Bureau Censor report (2014), the poverty rate in the United States was around 12% (Sharply, 2016). This censor report is the official data and shows that around 37 million people are surviving in conditions of extreme poverty (Sharply, 2016). In fact, Lawanson (2016) said that the issues of inequity and poverty exist throughout the world and have become a major concern in today’s environment. This is the reason why it is the prime objective of the MDG to reduce the level of poverty existing in the world. The policies and strategies developed to reduce poverty levels have been the prime focus of the discussions that have been undertaken to improve the economic and social conditions of people (Begum & Abdin, 2015). What is more, there has been a huge decrease in the rate of poverty reduction over the years (Begum & Abdin, 2015).

According to Augsburg et al. (2015), there are several factors that contribute to the development of entrepreneurship, such as the availability of capital, access to markets, policies, power supply which have an impact on the development of entrepreneurship.
2.1 Collective social entrepreneurship

Collective Social Entrepreneurship (CSE) is often referred to as collectivism. It is the idea of different social entrepreneurs coming together to address social issue(s) (Kania & Kramer 2013; Smith & Woods, 2015). The nature of the social problems are such that it becomes extremely difficult for the individual actors to solve the problems individually, rather the collaboration of different actors is required at different levels across different industries and competencies in order to tackle the complications (Tan et al., 2015).

There are various ways in which firms work in collaboration with each other. These are coordinated by various external firms, such as trade associations, agricultural cooperatives, industrial alliances, consortia for development and research, government agencies, cultural organizations, associations and trade unions (Tan et al., 2015). To date academics have focused on the nature of these partnering organizations, and on collectivism and its impact on the growth and performance of these firms (Smith & Woods, 2015). The dynamics of the group formation are less well known and the structure of operation of these firms has been less focused upon by the researchers (Forsstrom-Tuominen et al., 2015).

Peredo (2006) argued that enterprise based on real people’s organizations can lead to improvements in local communities. She believes that entrepreneurships that focus on social capital and lay emphasis on culture are closely associated with positive economic developments and help in developing a positive entrepreneurship environment in the community. According to Peredo (2006), Community Based Enterprise (CBE) is responsible for the reduction of poverty, since it involves all aspects of the community, i.e. social, economic, political, environmental and cultural aspects, which helps in the holistic development of society and thus helps in the reduction of poverty. In fact, the traditions of the cooperatives merged with the cultural identity of the community and this helped in developing a driving force to improve the economic, social and environmental conditions (Peredo, 2006; Smith & Woods, 2015).

The literature on social entrepreneurship mainly involves the study of either single social enterprises or single entrepreneurs (Dacin et al., 2010). In recent times, a new focus has developed relating to multiple subjects who are working collaboratively in order to get the desired social impact. Montgomery et al. (2012: 376) suggest that collective social entrepreneurship can be defined as “the work of collaboration between similar or different types of protagonists over the same business principles in order to solve social problems”.
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Interestingly, Montgomery et al. (2012) are of the opinion that the concept of social entrepreneurship should be combined with the notion of collaboration and partnership, in order to solve social problems. However, it is highly unlikely that any single organization would be able to handle the situation in an apt manner, as the social problems generally involve many factors where input and actions from several parties are required in order to solve them permanently (Sud et al., 2008; Tan et al., 2015). Pies et al. (2010) propose that the concept of CSE should also involve the concept of joint actions by several parties. As joint efforts will be required to take action at every level of the value chain, as well as to mitigate the risks that may occur if a single organization operates in the segments of a particular socio-economic condition, where external factors cannot be controlled and are out of bounds, the different groups involved in the social ventures should focus more on creating value rather than capturing value (Santos, 2012).

Researchers, such as Kania & Kramer (2011), have suggested different perspectives of looking into social entrepreneurship with respect to the individual impact, but this literature review will aim to focus on the benefits that can be obtained from collective social entrepreneurship, which would not otherwise be seen from the eyes of a single actor (Cheney et al., 2014). In many cases, organizations fail to recognize their social impact directly, as they seem to underestimate the indirect effects of their objectives, which are in turn able to motivate and institutionalize social changes. In this case the institution should look from the perspective of broader collectives, which will help it to connect with the social ventures.

However, a problem emerges when the firm tries to generate the boundary within which it should look for the social objective. If the boundary is being made too wide, then any actor could have been included, and if the boundary is too narrow, then there will be no actual difference between the single actor and the collective as a whole and thus there will be no change in the perspectives (De Sousa & Docuyananam, 2016). If the firm is able to recognize its boundary, it will be able to channel its resources and the collectives associated with it for social ventures and only then will it be able to classify itself as social (Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016). There are many empirical ways by which a firm can also identify its boundaries of the collectives. The two primary empirical methods are: 1) defining the ethical principles and 2) defining the economic value dimension. These can help a firm to identify the flow of resources and the information flow between the actors and thus the firm will be able to identify its boundaries, which in turn will enable it to utilize them for further social objective realizations (Semali, 2015).
Within the social entrepreneurship literature, there are two key forms of social entrepreneurship: (1) relates to the social mission and (2) relates to entrepreneurial activity (Corner & Ho, 2010). Many researchers, such as Cheney et al. (2014) and Haugh and Talwar (2016) have analyzed the different characteristics that make a social entrepreneur and also the factors that have influenced them to take these types of actions in order to achieve their social goals or to solve social problems (Alvord et al., 2004). Bonfati et al. (2016) analyzed the different backgrounds and environments in which these individuals have grown up or the extent to which these have been modified in their past jobs or activities. In fact, Seelos & Mair (2005) have also documented several success stories of these types of entrepreneurs, whereas Tan et al. (2005) have tended to focus on the great details about the social entrepreneur and have explained and focused on the factors or the instances that can define a person as being both an entrepreneur and socially committed at the same time. In recent times, the definition of social entrepreneurship has evolved and tends to revolve around the field of work being done by an individual, by engaging all the resources and by enabling the resources to flow in order to solve a particular social problem (Light, 2009; Rivera-Santos et al., 2015). However, with the advent of new literature and with the advent of the concept of social collective actions, researchers have shifted their views from individuals to the collective groups or organizations (Haugh & Talwar, 2016). This can be seen in the literature, which focuses more on organizational based social entrepreneurship (Akemu et al., 2016).

Assudani et al. (2016) defines and describes the different paths that are being followed by the social entrepreneurs in order to achieve their objective of removing financial constraints among the different lower class members of society. Some of the researchers, on the other hand, have concentrated on how the social ventures mainly focus on complementing the work that is being done by the corporates or the profitable organizations (Mair & Martí, 2009; Bonfati et al., 2006). Researchers have also stated that, while assessing the impacts on the social environment by the organization (Nicholls, 2006) or in proposing the methodologies for the assessment that can be applied for measuring the social impact, the organization may have mainly focused on their benefits and not on the benefits to the social environment (Lepoutre et al., 2013). However, when their policies of engagement have conflicted with those of the different actors in the society, they have focused their objectives towards regional development. Mair et al. (2012) mentioned that there are several models by which organizations can engage in social entrepreneurial activities by leveraging the different types of capital resources they have at present. But recent trends demonstrate a rising awareness
among the organizations of the need to collaborate and to take collective action in order to institutionalize the social changes (Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Mueller et al., 2015).

On the other hand, many researchers have discussed in great detail how the different actors behave and interact with each other, as opposed to the work of a single entrepreneur (De Bruin & Lewis, 2015). The most notable work would be that of Montgomery et al. (2012), who have focused on a totally different perspective, describing the concept of collective social entrepreneurship as a “Collective lens”, which is important when considering the social objectives to be implemented by the collectives. Thus the definition of “Collective Social Entrepreneurship” is defined as the work of the different actors who collaborate and coordinate on different levels in order to solve the social problems by applying business principles (Montgomery et al., 2012; Morgan, 2016). In this context one thing is also being emphasized regarding the participation of the different actors, who can be from either similar or diverse fields, but are united on the similar objectives. In the process, many new institutions can be formed, merged, divided or even dismantled in order to achieve the broader objective, rather than achieving the singular objective (Montgomery et al., 2012). However, the collective action proposals can also be found in other similar studies. For example, Spear (2000) and Vidovic et al. (2015) have clearly shown that the nature of this type of collective action can be found easily within cooperatives, who work with different actors in order to achieve their common objective.

In a similar study by Sud et al. (2008), they suggested that when individuals work alone on social objectives they are often impeded or face obstacles, which are sometimes very difficult to overcome (Vidovic et al., 2015). The nature of the social problems is such that it becomes extremely difficult for the individual actors to solve the problems individually. Instead, the collaboration of different actors is required at different levels across different industries and competencies in order to tackle the complications (Chandra et al., 2016). This calls for the utilization of different resources across different sectors. Kania & Kramer (2013) have referred to the concept of “Collective Impact” as a result of collectivism, which will produce lasting results after the social problems have been tackled and dealt with. The individual impacts may create definitive results, but they will not be lasting and sustainable, whereas the collective impact will not only be sustainable but the interplay between the different actors will ensure its long lasting effects (Littlewood & Holt, 2015). Hanleybrown et al. (2012) are of the opinion that the collective impact will require the different protagonists to work together with a common mindset and towards a common goal to achieve the social objective,
which is clearly a contrast to the individual working towards a goal. Santos (2012) argued that the acts of social ventures mainly result in fruitful value creation, whereas the work of an individual subject results in only value capture. But in order to channel the captured values, the help of diverse actors from diverse fields is required. Thus collective social entrepreneurship focuses on the concept of association and partnership rather than individual work. The social ventures mainly result in the successful tackling of social problems and thereby the study of the collective and their actions are very important in order to determine the different factors and the reasons by which the social objectives could be achieved (Morgan, 2016).

2.2 Nature of collective social entrepreneurship

Collective actions can operate at different levels, both across different sectors and within the same sector (Montgomery et al., 2012); this refers to same sector and cross sector collaboration (Montgomery et al., 2012). The collective actions may assume different forms. The three major forms which are prevalent are: (1) social movements; (2) community cooperatives and (3) collaborations in cross sectors and same sectors (Montgomery et al., 2012; Chandra, 2016).

Social movements are very important in achieving social change and community or regional development (Cheney, 2014; Montgomery et al., 2012). For example, the market for green energy and sustainable energy was created after several social movements raised awareness amongst the different stakeholders involved in the process (Peterson, 2015). The social movements have created social pressure at a broader level and have institutionalized many social actions in the form of sustainable labour practices, along with access to pharmaceutical drugs in the emerging and underdeveloped nations (Hansen, 2014). Social movements emphasize the role of different agents, such as professionals, media, network supporters and activists, in spearheading the social objectives and engaging different groups to achieve those objectives (Hansen, 2014; Vidovic et al., 2015). The different types of connections and support helps to gain more legitimacy and helps in spreading the objectives so that the goals are institutionalized in order to bring about changes in commonly established practices (Mulloth et al., 2016).

Community cooperatives are another type of collective, as identified by the literature of the social collective actions (Montgomery et al., 2012). The cooperatives are a collection of
consumers, institutions and groups who collaborate on the same platform to bring about economic and social welfare (Montgomery et al., 2012; Akemu et al., 2016). Sala et al. (2016) argued that many forms of cooperative exist in the world, but the most famous ones are the ones in the banking segments. During the last century, cooperative banks of the Italian Rural have provided many ways of accessing credit for the agricultural and rural sectors. More importantly, they have not only been within government agencies, but also individuals and residents of the regions, and thus have helped the community of the region to fight socio-economic hardships (Cheney, 2015). The different credit unions continue this spirit of uniting different groups so that they help in the broader social objectives (Fidelis et al., 2015). Other researchers have opposed the opinion of Aremu and Adeyemi (2011) and instead have claimed that there are cooperative organizations in different sectors of the economy (Borgen & Aarset, 2016; Mathuva, 2015). In the Nigerian context, most of the cooperatives that exist are within the educational sector and the finance sector (Abubakar, 2010; Adeyeye et al., 2016).

Another form of collective is the partnerships across sectors, which displays how collective collaboration and action between various types of organizations can help in solving social problems. Vurro et al. (2009) and Moshtari (2016) argued that cross-sectoral collaborations are the best ways to fight and resolve social issues, as many of the institutions, starting with government, private and non-profit, are involved in the process and thus different views and perspectives help in the problem solving process. Collaboration traditionally refers to the clear profitable objectives of the stakeholders in acquiring knowledge, market share, resources and monetary benefits, but nowadays the main motivations are altruistic (Veilleux & Queenton, 2015). More recent literature has also highlighted the different forms of social collaboration, in the form of alliances between the social groups and private organizations, innovations by the disparate groups and the creation of community oriented social ventures (Hofstad & Torfing, 2015).

From all these social collaborative forms, one thing is very clear, and that is that social collaboration among the different actors occurs in order to facilitate the communication and exchange of resources so that the objectives are being handled and seen from different perspectives and thus dealt with accordingly (Hofstad & Torfing, 2015). Some of the benefits of social entrepreneurship are:
• Collective social entrepreneurship, if successful, helps in leveraging the existing forms of resources. The different cooperative models and collaborators help in harnessing the different cross-sectoral resources and draw power from the existing social movements.

• Collective social entrepreneurship also helps in examining the importance of the different resources and to evaluate the benefits due to partnering across the disparate sectors.

• The research flows and the pooling of resources are some of the most important points of the social entrepreneurship ventures (Austin, 2006; Ku et al., 2016).

Source: Ku et al. (2016)

Collaborations in Multiple Forms: CSE brings together different people from different facets of life (Montgomery et al., 2012). EcoPeace is one of the organizations that addresses the problem of environmental and water related issues and is successful in bringing major activist groups from around the world together. EcoPeace not only leverages the efficiency of the different groups in different segments but also highlights the significance of the independent working capabilities of these groups (Djernaes et al., 2015). They have started projects across Israel, Jordan and Palestine, in order to educate huge masses of the population from these three countries. The groups that are working together are not only trying to overcome the cultural differences but are engaging people across religions in order to bring forward the advantages of such collaborations. In other projects, EcoPeace have been successful in bringing together many government and corporate entities for investment in water infrastructure and have also convinced international institutions such as USAID and UNEP to participate with regards to different water related activities (Djernaes et al., 2015).

United Way operates in a collaborative environment, where members from different organizations, having different capabilities, are being pooled in single teams in order to work for the social good. Thus the knowledge, best practices, advocacy, fund allocation and publicity can all be managed by the team as people have diverse experiences. Their core motivation lies in the fact that by pooling their resources they will be able to get the best possible resources and thus could help society in the best possible ways (Phillips, 2012). In a recent venture, United Way has joined hands with some of the non-profit organizations for collective social development initiatives in Toronto. The main objective here is to engage the
different people having different experiences across the industries, and also from other sectors, in order to help the people achieve their goals and motivations.

From the examples above it is evident that each collaboration is dependent on varying strategies, but it is also evident that the overall objective behind all such collaborations lies in the motive of getting the best out of people by communicating the principle objective and by motivating the actors to work accordingly and independently towards achieving their mission. Some common factors involved in all such collaborations are sharing knowledge, building credibility and saving costs by working together and by servicing the common objectives (Bhardwaj et al., 2015). But for mobilizing the joint partners, the motivation and the strategy must be communicated from an upper level, so that all the partners are bound and tied up in the same string and work towards similar objectives (Bhardwaj et al., 2015).

2.3 CSE strategies

After classifying and summarizing the different ways in which successful CSE can help society as a whole through collaboration, three types of activities or strategies evolved from the discussions, which can help in achieving positive results. The success strategies for CSE can be summarized as follows: framing techniques are to be used by the different protagonists involved in the process, in order to interpret and communicate the different related ideas, along with mobilizing the followers for the greater good. CSE will require active participation from all the related institutions so that all the hindrances faced can be overcome (convenging) and, in turn, also promote the concept of multivocality, so that each and every individual or organization can contribute in the form of new ideas.

2. 3.1. Framing

The most crucial aspect of framing theory is that any scenario or issue in real life can be viewed from varying angles and perspectives (Udende, 2014). Framing can also be defined as the process of the development of a specific conceptualization of a scenario or an issue or altering an existing conceptualization of a situation (Choong, 2016).

The science and art of framing have obtained considerable importance in the domain of social sciences (Redman, 2013). Framing has been effectively used and implemented in several domains, such as cognitive psychology (Wright, 2011; Gallo-Cruz, 2012), the study of communication and media (Algar-Faria, 2014), the domain of political and social sciences (Choong, 2016) and linguistics and expression analysis (Wright, 2011).
Interestingly, Montgomery et al. (2012) has used the word framing to mean a collaborative strategy for collectives that can be used to alleviate poverty. Whereas, Udende (2014) carried out a comparative study of different organizations to assess the impact of framing on achieving a social mission and concluded that a framing strategy can be a tool for achieving a social mission such as poverty alleviation. In the work of Algar-Faria (2014) on social movement theory and resistance, it was argued that the concept of framing can be used to organize social movements and to overcome any form of challenge to achieve the set mission.

The extensive use of framing concepts in the domain of collective actions and the study of social movements has not only aided the operations of these processes, but has also inspired researchers such as Metcalf (2009) to research within the same field (Choong, 2016). Evidence of the increasing importance of framing concepts within social movements and collective actions can be found in several instances. Another example is the increase in the recent edited volumes based on research papers published for Social Movement Conferences (Gallo-Cruz, 2012; Choong, 2016). There has also been a tremendous increase in the parallel pattern of citations in the three major publications on social movement and concept-based framing articles (Gallo-Cruz, 2012). The number of citations on the framing concept has increased in these articles, starting from seven in 1990, increasing to 106 in 1998 and going up to about 250 after 2005 (Gallo-Cruz, 2012). There has also been an immense increase in the number of critiques on several works about the several dimensions of framing literature (Williams, 2012; Gallo-Cruz, 2012). There has clearly been an increased focus on the framing processes and methods in social movements and in other aspects of life. The sole aim of this analysis is to evaluate two key aspects of the literature relating to framing methodology and its processes. The application of framing involves some form of collaboration and this can also be combined with other strategies to achieve a particular social mission (Montgomery et al., 2012; Algar-Faria, 2014). Hrytsenko (2013) posited that framing is used to communicate ideas and intentions to the stakeholders. As a strategy for poverty alleviation and community development, framing can impact on income, employment, welfare, skills and development (Montgomery et al., 2012; Huang et al., 2016). Wardekker (2016) argued that framing can resolve social uncertainties and avoid the limitations of reaching corporate objectives. More recently, Meraz and Papacharissi (2016) have argued from a different perspective, as they posited that framing is effective in networking and strategy.
Collective Actions: The framing process has been highlighted by scholars of social movements who have an affinity towards the framing processes (Redman, 2013). These scholars have largely identified particular aspects of the framing process, which had mostly been ignored until the 1980s. In this regard it can be justified that social movements are not simply an extension to an existing ideology, coincident event or a structural arrangement (Schamel, Santos-Arteaga and Santos, 2015). On the contrary, social agents can be viewed as catalytic agents that play a critical role in the production and development of significance for observers, opposing stakeholders and supporters (Redman, 2013). In fact, these forces have been significantly involved with strong political, media and administrative forces to play a role in the politics of signification (Wright, 2011; Algar-Faria, 2014). Though the role of such actors and ideologies has played a significant part in determining and influencing history, the treatment of these concepts in terms of literature and importance has been unsatisfactory to date (Wright, 2011). There are two prominent reasons for this. One is that they were mostly discussed statistically, rather than using a subjective or analytic approach. The second reason was the disregard shown to their importance in the movements of social occurrences in the early literature (Santesson, 2011). However, recent developments regarding the research concerning the relationship of culture with social movements, framing theories, social events, etc. have increased the curiosity of stakeholders and enhanced the clarity between framing and ideologies (Choong, 2016). There is a clear distinction between ideologies and framing (Rosenbloom et al., 2016). Ideology can be defined as a set of more robust and durable beliefs than those held by individuals and society, impacting not only their perceptions in politics but also in general day to day life (Meraz & Papacharissi, 2016; Choong, 2016). In both ways the sense and existence of ideologies are strong and have considerable durability in terms of their time of existence (Verloo et al., 2016; Gallo-Cruz, 2012). On the contrary, collective action frames act as a change agent or opposing force to the existing ideologies (Algar-Faria, 2014). Several such elaborate discussions of the relationship between framing and ideologies have been explained by researchers. Collectives will use framing to address social issues as part of their mission (Montgomery et al., 2012; Wardekker, 2016). Huang et al. (2016) contested that framing will positively impact poverty through skills and education. On the same note, Semino et al. (2016) opposed the position of Huang et al. (2016) and posited that framing will contribute to employment creation if there are other strategies combined with framing. Framing is an important networking strategy for CSEs (Meraz & Papacarissi, 2016).
2.3.2 Convening

As stated by Austin and Seitanidi (2012) and Pan (2013), convenors can be regarded as those champions who can navigate through complex projects, act as interdepartmental task facilitators and drive projects to a successful conclusion. They prove to be a useful tool towards allowing for collaboration, tapping collective knowledge, intelligence and resources and achieving unique solutions (Austin & Seitanidi, 2014). If the process of convening is carefully examined across a disparate group of organizational stakeholders, three distinct phases can be observed. The first phase involves a preliminary outreach in which core goals are established, communications between groups are set up and issues are resolved (Gray & Stites, 2013). This is followed by a process of collective learning, which helps to build a shared understanding between the groups, as a means to facilitating better sharing of information and knowledge. The third phase is the stage in which co-creation and innovation are facilitated and a joint action is required on the part of the teams (Gray & Stites, 2013).

Convening can be used as a critical strategic practice when CSEs, institutional entrepreneurs or strategic actors identify a social problem that is too complex in nature to be solved at an individual level (Montgomery et al., 2012). Such a practice would be required when there is a need for change, or no single entity has the knowledge or know-how to handle the situation on their own (Dorado, 2006; Stephens et al., 2015). The likelihood of solving a complex issue is quite slim when the task is managed unilaterally. These convenors act as the agents who convince others to jointly address complex problems and combine their efforts (Dorado, 2006; Hahn & Gold, 2014). Some of the key resources that these convenors can use in this process are legitimacy, interpersonal trust and social capital (Phillips et al., 2015).

As stated by Dorado (2006) and McDonald et al. (2015), by bringing parties together, the shared resources are put to best use to fill individual gaps and reduce deficiencies. It allows the partners to view the problems from different perspectives. They can come together to constructively explore the possible solutions beyond their vision (McDonald et al., 2015). It is known that multiple organizational fields mandatorily require the role of a convenor to act as an interdepartmental bridge. For example, within healthcare practice, patient health is governed by a wide array of inputs obtained from various departments who together complete the medical health record of the patient. Healthcare practitioners cannot suggest an effective medication or intervention without sharing knowledge and expertise with the other care workers (Gray & Stites, 2013; Sakarya et al., 2012). Healthcare practices are especially critical as they have a direct impact on a patient’s health and any kind of missing information
can prove to be a fatal experience. Having a unilateral attitude and discouraging multi-party collaboration can act as a detrimental step towards patient health needs. CSEs can mobilize resources that can create employment and alleviate poverty through a convening strategy (Littlewood & Holt, 2015).

The Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) helps to bring about active collaboration between competing parties such as retailers and fisheries (Rodriguez et al., 2016). A convenor has a major role, as they have to bring about collaboration across the 170 fisheries that are currently covered under the MSC programme. The council conducts marketing and branding of sustainable seafood to encourage the participation of these fisheries. Individual fisheries cannot support the huge budget and expertise that is involved in achieving the required branding experience. The convening efforts of the council can also be seen in events like “meet the fishers”, in which face to face interaction between stakeholders is facilitated. A compilation of highly successful fisheries is also done and updated in the form of personalized reports, which are published as “fisheries stories” by the MSC. Active outreach activities for consumer education help to bring about collaboration between seafood retailers. Some of the other steps undertaken with convening efforts include label branding campaigns by the MSC and product finding applications (Rosenbloom et al., 2016).

A number of examples also exist for cross-sectoral convening. For example, International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labelling (ISEAL) is a global membership association that encourages members to implement and measure sustainability standards. It encourages knowledge sharing and allows disparate workers to meet, share templates, identify areas for collaboration and achieve sustainability objectives (Solansky et al., 2014). Similarly, Vancouver-based Vanity financial cooperative acts as a convenor to bring together not-for-profit organizations to perform sustainable operations. The Civic Action group in Toronto also performs a crucial convening function by hosting the Greater Toronto summit every four years. It allows leaders and city builders from across the region to come together and solve regional issues (Semino et al., 2016). De Bakker (2016) argued that convening is a tool that can work in all sectors and can be used by collectives when addressing a poverty alleviation mission. De Bakker (2016) further added that the convening strategy may not have a direct impact on poverty alleviation unless resources are sufficient and stakeholder support should be available.
2.3.3 *Multivocality*

Most of the examples given above illustrate the importance of considering multiple perspectives and opinions in a social entrepreneurship venture. The various literatures on the importance of collective action, social movements and instances of institutional changes brings out the importance of bringing in numerous stakeholders, government bodies and professional institutions (Montgomery et al., 2012; Fox, 2015). Alliances between various organizations in social movements bring out how diverse skills can be utilized to bring about the desired change (Huang et al., 2016). What is more, the need for social entrepreneurs is acknowledged in various areas, such as education, government, business and other bodies, to overcome institutional barriers (Knorringa, 2014).

Multivocality is the idea in which numerous voices can be combined and stakeholders can be spoken to in an accessible manner (Montgomery et al., 2012). Studies on multivocality range from professional social networks to social embedding in political power (Hemmati & Rogers, 2015). Combining multiple voices that come from a wide range of audiences helps to connect diverse communities together. It also helps to build a universal appeal (Breeman et al., 2015).

The importance of multivocality is evident from a number of the cases discussed above. It is vital for the success of any social entrepreneurship initiative (Ocasio & Radoynovska, 2016). For example, take the case of the Marine Stewardship Council. This organization found success by providing necessary outlets and forums for actors from across all fields. Actors in the form of retailers, consumers, processors and fishers can come together and share their input on sustainable seafood practices (Jensen & Sandström, 2011). The MSC is responsible for incorporating initiatives to counter and actively address issues pertaining to wildlife protection, environment and sustainability. The MSC manages to represent these multiple voices by means of its eco-labelling programme. Such programmes are crucial for the consumers, retailers and fisheries alike. The example of ISEAL can also be stated in terms of a need for multivocality. The strategic document of ISEAL clearly outlines the need for a ‘scaling up strategy’, which describes that the support of external stakeholders is crucial for attaining organizational objectives (Fowler & Biekart, 2013). The support of public procurement offices and financial institutions is one of the tactics that ISEAL adopts as a part of its multivocality strategy. ISEAL intends to gather the voices of these supporters to enhance credibility and build a broad-based government (Ocasio & Radoynovska, 2016).
From a theoretical perspective, multivocality implies that there are a variety of lenses that collectives can use to interpret their surroundings. As stated by Heinze et al. (2016), the benefits of multivocality can be obtained if these alliances and interactions are used to address social issues such as poverty, both at a local as well as a global level. It helps to accommodate a wide range of lenses in order to acquire cultural resources and diverse acumen. For example, in the case of the Latino Community Credit Union (LCCU), most of the large players in the credit union thought that they were not able to understand and service the unique requirements of the Latino community (Clark et al., 2016). Therefore, the community recruited a broad array of members comprising of representatives from the church, minority institutions and Latino community members. All this helped the organization to develop a successful and expanding community banking service (Fox, 2015). More examples can be given in the form of successful social entrepreneurship ventures, such as Peaceworks, EcoPeace and MetoWe Artisans organization. These organizations prove that cross-national and cultural boundaries can be easily overcome by means of deeper knowledge of communities and cultures and involving more external partners. These alliances provide new lenses through which to view problems and create win-win solutions (David et al., 2013).

When taking the impact of collective social entrepreneurship into account, it is important to understand that such an approach helps to leverage existing resources, build new ones and reshape institutional arrangements (Montgomery et al., 2012). However, economies of scale, both in terms of resources as well as skills, can be better obtained in an environment where collective social entrepreneurship is encouraged. However, as stated by Austin (2006) and Beisheim and Liese (2016), there could be some unique challenges that can occur in cross-sectoral alliances and collaborations. These challenges can come in the form of issues with differences in cultures, varying objectives, different professional languages, differences in the nature of the competitive environments, etc. (Austin, 2006, 93; Knorringa, 2014). Operations within the same sector tend to experience an ease in communication between actors who are quite synchronized with one another (Montgomery et al., 2012; Breeman et al., 2015). On the other hand, collaboration in a social entrepreneurial environment also has challenges in the way that partners communicate with each other. An effective translation is needed in many instances and that is where having a common objective has a role to play (Breeman et al., 2015). The concept of multivocality will work in an environment where there is the rule of law (Pacheco et al., 2014). An institution should not rely completely on multivocality and
should consider other variables that can impede the mission of the organizations (Hemmati & Rogers, 2015). Hemmati & Rogers (2015) were not specific about the variables that can be combined with multivocality to achieve poverty alleviation objectives. Montgomery et al. (2012) clearly stated that framing, convening and multivocality will alleviate poverty and encourage community development. However, more recently Klingebiel and Paulo (2015) posited that collectives should consider different poverty variables in order to adequately address the problem of poverty.

2.3.4 Licensing agreement
A commercial contract between the licensee and the licensor is defined as a licence agreement (Dauletshina, 2015). There are several key elements in the contract, even though this varies from contract to contract (Bonfanti et al., 2016). The contract is based on the patented technology, registered trademark, a copyright work, industrial design, trade secret or any kind of intangible asset (Littlewood & Holt, 2015). A licensing agreement is also referred to as a reference for providing technical support, assistance and training (the licensing agreement is provided by the licensor for the benefit of the licensee) (Chandra, 2016).

Licensing may be general, and this is due to the fact that only having one kind of right or patent will be insufficient in order for the licensee to produce as well as sell a particular item (the licensee needs to take the right of using a corresponding trademark) (Massey et al., 2015). Similarly, the licensing contract also specifies and permits the functional use of Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) (De Sousa & Docuyanan, 2016). The licence agreement gives the right to use the subject matter without distribution of the copyright, with respect to the competition (Jordan, 2015). Licences may be of an exclusive or non-exclusive nature. The non-exclusive licence permits the competition company to use licensees at par with the licensor (Duchene et al., 2015). The geographical market restrictions can be specified with regional, national and international laws. The expiry date is another important aspect of a licensing agreement. Other important elements of a licensing agreement include performance warranty (performance of the licence subject matter under the right conditions as per the licence agreement to give the desired results) and lastly termination contingencies (this is in the event of any kind of bankruptcy of either of the parties). Biggins and Scott (2015) argued that the licensing agreement is not only applicable to commercial businesses, but also in the social service sector for the purpose of poverty alleviation. Thomas and Wilkinson (2015) further supported the view of Biggins and Scott (2015), as they believe that CSEs can take advantage of licensing agreements to achieve the corporate mission of poverty alleviation.
When referring to the commercialization of universities, Wu et al. (2015) posited that the licensing agreement is a source of major innovation learning and clearly adds value to the economy and the local community through poverty alleviation. The policy framework could affect a successful licensing agreement in any society, therefore the government has a major role to play in the process (Fox & Sohnesen, 2016). The need for transparency from both the licensor and the licensee is important in a licensing agreement, as one must achieve their objectives (Akinwale, 2016). As in a commercial licensing agreement, CSE uses licensing agreements as a collaborative strategy to address their mission to alleviate poverty’ (Wu et al., 2015).

2.4 Types of CSE collaborations

2.4.1 Alliances
Companies who are involved in international business or other forms of ventures, either profit or non-profit, form strategic alliances in order to formalize their inter-organizational relationships (Hong et al., 2015). This helps to achieve the organizational goals and objectives in a much better way than the process of competition (Christ & Nicolaou, 2016). There are also some problems associated with the alliances at different levels of the organization (Albers et al., 2015). Several critical reasons related to strategic alliances are stated below: there are higher chances of accessing the global market due to alliances; the required rate of growth or the organic growth of an individual organization is not possible without the help of strategic alliances; alliances are required in order to increase the complexity and expertise within an organization to serve the customers and partnerships (Reuer & Devarakonda, 2016); the speed at which an organization enters into the market is an essential feature, as partnerships and strategic alliances act like a catalyst in increasing the speed of entry; research and development costs of an organization are defrayed due to partnerships (Albers et al., 2015). Albers et al. (2015) argued that alliances play a crucial role in the economy and that they help to improve competitive positioning when entering into a new strategic market, increasing the skill level in the company and sharing the cost and the risk of major developmental projects. Alliance is a strategy to pull together resources to address social issues such as crime and poverty alleviation (Albers et al., 2015).

Strategic alliances have led to growing product development and the proliferation of new products and services (Yee et al., 2015). The process of developing strategic alliances helps
in the sharing, exchange and co-development of products, services and technologies through collaborative arrangements (Christ & Nicolaou, 2016). Strategic alliances have a wide range of goals, as well as different forms, which exist across various horizontal and vertical boundaries (Hong et al., 2015). Alliances can be a collaborative strategy to foster economic development and poverty alleviation (Clyde & Karnani, 2015). Hickel (2016) supported the position of Clyde and Karnani (2015) and argued that alliances are a collaborative strategy to achieve a particular social mission. Furthermore, Clyde and Karnani (2015) posited that there are several strategic viewpoints with respect to the alliances. The major viewpoints include: choosing appropriate partners; deciding upon entry into an alliance; the structure and dynamics of an alliance and the basic relationship to be developed with the partner over a period of time. Importantly, institutions forming alliances must be able to answer key questions, such as; with whom to choose to form an alliance, what different forms of contracts are used by the firms to formalize the alliances and how the basic relationships between the alliance partners evolve over time (Moshtari, 2016).

**Perspectives of Strategic Alliance:** A strategic alliance is a mutual agreement or partnership between two or more companies or partners to seek a common interest and goal (Martin et al., 2016). Strategic alliances are referred to as one of the several options that companies use to reach their goals and objectives (Veilux & Queenton, 2015). A strategic alliance could also be an agreement between two independent and competitive companies (Cantele et al., 2016). Cantele et al. (2016) added that alliances are possible from a business perspective. Other authors such as Xu et al. (2016); Battistella et al. (2015) and Veltri et al. (2015) posited that social enterprise organizations can use alliances as a collaborative strategy to also achieve their social mission. More recently, Zucchella and Magnani (2016) with their work relating to the theoretical foundation of international entrepreneurship, posited that strategic alliances include all kinds of relationships with the alliance partners except: short-term contracts and transactions such as sales, loans and acquisitions. A long-term agreement between a buyer and a supplier could also be one form of an alliance (Zucchella and Magnani, 2016).

The process of strategic alliance includes the modification of basic business practices by the alliance partners (Christ & Nicolaou, 2016). This includes the reduction of waste and duplication in the entire process and the facilitation of improved performance (Hong et al., 2015). A strategic alliance helps with successful strategic planning implementation and the building up of relationships among the alliance partners (Bouncken et al., 2016). The building
up of the relationship starts from the lower levels and works its way up to the higher levels. This needs to be supported at the executive leadership and macro level, in order to facilitate the smooth functioning of the strategic alliance (Bhardwaj et al., 2015). The basic idea behind a strategic partnership is to form an alliance that will help in building relationships in order to implement and achieve a strategic plan (Hatak & Hyslop, 2015). A strategic alliance can also be referred to as a “partnership”, in which both of the firms enter into a business agreement. This business agreement is mutually beneficial for each of them and each firm enjoys a competitive advantage in the market (Kilubi, 2016).

The table below shows the literature review and various definitions of strategic alliances:

Table 2.1. Strategic alliances defined (adapted from Xu et al., 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A strategic alliance is defined as a temporary and contractual relationship between two or more independent companies. The basic aim is to reduce the uncertainties associated with the realization of mutually dependent partners. They also aim to achieve the strategic objectives of the partners by exerting an influence over the management policies of the alliances (Papastamatelou et al., 2016). There is a financial involvement for all the strategic partners. They share the profit, cost and risk among them (Wang et al., 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>An alliance is defined as a cooperative association or an agreement between two or more independent organizations. They manage with a common objective of one specific project for a definite period of time (Cantele et al., 2016). The alliances help in achieving the common goal by improving their competencies and allowing their partners to gather resources and coordinate with each other to obtain the desired results. The main parameters with which the alliances work together are necessity, speed and opportunism (Zucchella &amp; Magnani, 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A long-term agreement between the firms that is beyond market transactions. The general forms of alliances are joint ventures, inter-firm relationships and long-term supply agreements (Hatak &amp; Hyslop, 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A strategic alliance is defined as a mode of inter-organizational relationship. This is due to the partners in these relationships making huge investments to achieve a common goal and a long-term collaborative effort (Veltri et al., 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strategic alliances can be defined as a form of voluntary arrangement made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between the firms. This helps in the sharing, coordination and exchange of products, services and technologies (Masiello et al., 2015).

A strategic alliance is defined as a mutual partnership between two or more firms that agree to a common goal. However, they will remain independent before and after the formation of the alliance. This will help in sharing benefits in a mutual and continuous manner. The strategic areas include products, services and technologies (Zikic, 2016).

Alliances are referred to as trust based, long-term relationships, which includes investment in the ventures for the execution of a common goal (Bhattacharya et al., 2015).

Table 2.2. Factors leading to alliances (Veltri et al., 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position in the sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capabilities and competencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the most recent</td>
<td>Securing a designated</td>
<td>Accessing several new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technological products.</td>
<td>position in the sector.</td>
<td>opportunities through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the process of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>constant innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated and</td>
<td>Value creation through the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>designated position in the</td>
<td>anticipation of rivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International marketing beyond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the borders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economies of scope and</td>
<td>Reduction in total product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>economies of scale.</td>
<td>cost and client segmentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product performance based sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advantages with respect to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emerging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opportunities and changing conditions.

There are several similarities associated with strategic alliances (Loebbecke et al., 2016): both of the strategic partners have a common goal, which is compatible and directly related to each other’s strategic intent; both of the strategic partners are focused on commitment and ensuring that each partner has access to the resources of the other partner and that there is an opportunity for strategic learning between the partners.

2.4.2 Cooperative

Cooperative societies have been an important component for bringing forth improvements within society (Treager & Cooper, 2016). They are institutions that bring forth a significant amount of local resources in the context of a community and thus allow effective community oriented development tasks (Herbst & Prufer, 2016). A cooperative society can also be a voluntary association of people who have come together to share common or in sync economic, social, cultural or political goals (Long et al., 2015). A cooperative society is usually a democratic association with shared ownership of the members associated with it (Kutim, 2016). The cooperative has acted not only as a social entity but also as an important association for people to achieve their economic goals in a highly competitive environment (Paranque & Willmott, 2016). The cooperative has therefore acted as an important tool for alleviating poverty in society, as has been the case with Nigeria (Okafor, 2015). The role of cooperative societies in reducing the poverty level in a society and enhancing the sustainable development of the societies where they are engaged, have been thoroughly studied by several researchers (Poledrini, 2015; Abula & Adebayo, 2016). Moreira et al. (2016) inspired both of the thought processes regarding the usefulness of cooperative societies in alleviating poverty in Nigeria. While the majority of the researchers support the concept of cooperative societies having a role of high importance in alleviating poverty, a few researchers have also shown otherwise in their work (Aye et al., 2016). Thus, the role of cooperative societies in improving the sustainable development of society is still questionable and there is still room for a lot of academic work to be undertaken in assessing the role of cooperative societies in improving the economic conditions of society and its people (Aye et al., 2016). Aye et al. (2016) questioned why the poverty level is still high in Nigeria despite the increasing level of the
numbers of cooperative organizations. Cooperatives will not achieve any form of poverty alleviation if they do not consider the needs of society (Palsule-Desai, 2015). In the same line of argument, Cheney (2015), in his work relating to the economics of worker cooperatives, posited that cooperatives must be able to solve the problems relating to the basic needs of people, such as to increase income, generate employment and provide relevant skills and training. Fidelis et al. (2015) added that cooperatives are vehicles for economic development through employment creation. The success of any cooperative organization is a matter of government support and policies (Boone & Ozcan, 2015).

Cooperative Societies, Poverty reduction and Sustainable National Development:

The government and various agencies of Nigeria have developed various strategies and methods to reduce the impact of poverty and they also take a community based approach to find solutions to the issue of rising unemployment. The cooperatives are considered to be an efficient mechanism for tackling the issues of poverty (Palsule-Desai, 2015). This has been revealed by Fidelis et al. (2015) within their studies, as they believe that cooperatives are an effective tool that can act to curb poverty in Nigeria. It has been observed that many members join a cooperative society in order to have access to cheap loans. These loans are utilized by them for the buying of assets, which can be utilized as savings for a rainy day. An efficient cooperative model can be used as an efficient tool to fight the issues of the economy, such as poverty alleviation, and can give directions to the development of humanity (Cheney, 2015). Thus it serves the purpose of building a sustainable and attainable future for the generations to come through skills development and employment (Long et al., 2015). It can provide aid to help the development of the poor, create more job opportunities and provide financial and educational support to the needy (Boone & Ozcan, 2015). The cooperative society has used tools such as mutual aid, the exchange of labour and the facilitation of financial services to develop sustainable development plans in most of the countries of Africa, including Nigeria. Cooperatives improve the level of education and it is important to invest more in the expansion of educational services in order to promote the socio-economic development of the country (Tregear & Cooper, 2016). Cooperative societies can serve as an effective tool to curb poverty and can help in the sustainable development of the society (Kasmir, 2016). They can be used to provide financial aid to the people and can serve as credit delivery to the people. Paranque and Willmott (2016) also argued in the direction of employment creation,
that they help in the generation of various employment opportunities and thus serve as a great source for empowering people. This can result in the reduction of poverty as well as the development of economic growth in the state (Pasule-Desai, 2015). Melton et al. (2016) added that cooperatives can be used for capital formation and poverty reduction in the form of collaboration.

It is important that the cooperative societies develop strategies to enable sustainable and viable growth (Baba et al., 2014). The cooperative societies must have a plan to achieve two important goals, i.e. innovative enterprise and economic viability, as this can serve as the biggest factor for reducing poverty (Schamel et al., 2015). The government must support the cooperative society and develop plans to facilitate its operations, therefore the government role within cooperative development is important (Fidelis et al., 2015). According to Aremu and Adeyemi (2011), social capital is created with the help of cooperative societies, which are very useful in creating economic efficiency. A cooperative society that is well articulated runs on the principle of Rochdale, in which ample opportunities are provided to the members of the cooperative society in terms of job employment opportunities as well as investments, which results in decreasing the level of poverty and also the development of national capital (Kasmir, 2016).

**Employment Impact of Cooperative Societies:** The cooperative societies have had a major impact on the development of employment opportunities in various developed and developing economies, especially Nigeria (Idris & Yusof, 2016). The employment opportunities provided by cooperative societies are mainly achieved in three ways. The first is through direct employment within different government and non-government institutions (Okafor, 2015). For example, in cooperative colleges, ministries, etc., various employment opportunities are given to the members of the cooperative society. Secondly, various self-employment opportunities are provided by the cooperative society to its members, by providing them with loan facilities and financial aid (Okafor, 2015). Thirdly, the cooperative society helps members with getting indirect employment opportunities, where the source of income is from the relationship with the ventures of the cooperative (Aye et al., 2016). From the three different employment opportunities mentioned above, the direct employment opportunities are least likely to be available, even though many members of the cooperative society are employed in various government and non-government institutes. The cooperative society also provides seasonal labour employment in mills etc. for the people who are engaged in specific tasks and who are paid wages according to the work performed (Abula &
Adebayo, 2016). The members can avail themselves of loan facilities from the society according to the contribution made by them and develop their own enterprise, which serves as a source of income, as well as generating employment opportunities for others (Paranque & Willmott, 2016). This self-employment helps in the development of the country and contributes to the GDP of the country (Paranque & Willmott, 2016). The society not only provides employment opportunities but also develops plans to upgrade the skills of the members and employees by conducting various workshop programmes (Herbst & Prufer, 2016). Cooperatives are also collaborating with other institutions, which provide learning for the cooperative. These studies can result in more employment opportunities and help the members to develop their careers (Achumba et al., 2013).

2. 4. 3 Entrepreneurship development in Nigeria
Entrepreneurship development in Nigeria has resulted in an increase in the employment rate, a decrease in the level of poverty and also contributed to economic growth and development (Oluseyi et al., 2013; Baba et al., 2014). Many studies have been conducted based upon the above mentioned criteria and the results have been analyzed and conclusions reached on the impact of entrepreneurship on poverty alleviation (Ofili, 2014). This is the reason why there have been several changes in policies and programmes by the government to support entrepreneurship in Nigeria (Hansen, 2014). These changes in policies and programmes have helped Nigeria to build several small and medium-scale industries, which contribute to the economy and growth. But, in spite of these efforts by the government, there has been no decrease in the unemployment rate (Ofili, 2014). In the year 2001, the unemployment rate was 13%, which then increased to around 23% in the year 2011. This figure included around 50% of the youths, who are unemployed and looking for opportunities (Maria, 2015; Betrisey et al., 2016).

Researchers, such as Kayode (2015) and Kasali et al. (2015), have shown that more than 100 million Nigerians live below the poverty line and lack basic amenities to manage their daily life, but they believe that entrepreneurship development will help to solve the crises (Kasali et al., 2015). They have earnings of less than US$1 a day and thus this makes it difficult to manage their life and family. The poverty level has risen to 60% from 54% in the year 2015 (Chandra et al., 2016). Apart from this, the Human Development Index (HDI) of Nigeria is 0.4, which is much less than the average HDI of 0.7 throughout the world (Kasali et al., 2015).
There are several studies that associate entrepreneurship development with the factors of the environment. According to Akemu et al. (2016), both the environment and the people involved in entrepreneurship are closely related to each other. They contribute to the supply and demand sides, as the entrepreneurs are believed to be the individuals who identify opportunities and contribute to the supply side. Similarly, the environment and the culture contribute to the demand side in order to develop entrepreneurship (Akemu et al., 2016). The policies and programmes initiated by the government play a very important role in building an environment that is favourable towards economic growth, which is required for the development of entrepreneurship (Haugh & Talwar, 2016). Thus both play an important role in developing innovative strategies and business plans, which could benefit the people as a whole (Agwu & Kadiri, 2014). Innovation and social entrepreneurship plays a major role in economic development and poverty alleviation (Balkema & Romijn, 2015) and technology drives innovation through social entrepreneurship (Mulloth et al., 2016). Chandra (2016) argued that social entrepreneurs create institutional change in a positive direction, thereby reducing poverty. Si et al. (2015) posited that entrepreneurship is known for its poverty reduction mission. Oyediran et al. (2015) supported the work of Si et al. (2015) on the role of entrepreneurship in poverty alleviation. Interestingly, Semali (2015) argued that women will alleviate poverty through empowering grass root initiatives.

The entrepreneurship concept can be easily applied in providing solutions to the social problems faced by individuals (Dees, 1998; Emerson & Tlrsky, 1996; Zadek & Thake, 1997; Dant et al., 2013; Hansen, 2014). Social entrepreneurship as a concept has been discussed in the literature as a tool for solving social problems (Smith & Woods, 2015). The word entrepreneurship is mostly discussed in a business context. It is important to find sustainable solutions to the social problems existing in the world today. The solution to these lies in the various innovations of businesses. There have been issues of poverty that can only be resolved by bringing about a drastic change in the existing economic, political and social systems (Littlewood & Holt, 2015).

The Nigerian Government has been making various efforts to enhance skill acquisition of youths and unemployment to alleviate poverty in the last decades (Daniel, 2016). However, Education for All (EFA) reported by Babalola (2011) showed that sufficient attention has not been given to skill training for youth and adults. This form the basis of the then President Obasanjo (1999-2003) to mandate all university students in Nigeria, regardless of which major, to be exposed to entrepreneurship development
Entrepreneurship education was initiated by presidential directive in 2004 to the National University Commission which subsequently made it compulsory two-credit general study course that was implemented in all Nigeria Universities in 2007 (Dantani & Ibrahim, 2014). It is now about ten years that entrepreneurship education has been embraced as a compulsory General Studies course in all Nigerian universities with varying levels of successes (Ekoja & Odu, 2016). In most of the universities, this course is still taught only theoretically while in others, there are entrepreneurship centres (Ekoja & Odu, 2016).

According to Abdullahi & Zainol (2016), entrepreneurial education has been introduced into the Nigeria curriculum. At the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, in 2010 the Centre for Entrepreneurship and Development Research (CEDR) was set up to promote entrepreneurial culture and mind-set, skill acquisition, self-employment, economic independence and self-actualization. The University of Ilorin was reported to have agreed since 2005 to create a directorate to handle entrepreneurship training however, it was only in 2008/2009 the University established the directorate of Technical and Entrepreneurship Centre (TEC).

University of Benin also established an entrepreneurship development center to; develop and offer courses, seminars, workshops and conferences to advance and propagate entrepreneurship.

Considering the importance of entrepreneurship in Nigeria, the National Universities Commission (NUC) made it a national policy to encourage Nigerian Universities to provide entrepreneurship education for undergraduates to address the challenges of unemployment and reduce poverty (Abdullahi & Zainol, 2016). This made NUC design an entrepreneurship course titled Graduate Self Employment (GSE, 301) with the theory and practice components to be taught in Nigerian Universities.

In Delta State University, it is the policy of the University that those reading Business Management or Accounting courses must register, study and pass courses in
entrepreneurship. While it forms part of the general courses required to be passed before graduating.

In other state Universities in Nigeria, it is only offered as general courses (Akanbi, 2013). However, there are other Universities where effort have been made to integrate entrepreneurship development study into the curriculum since the inception of the University in 2001. All the students from 100 to 400 levels are made to register for, study and pass Entrepreneurship Development Study (Kalimasi & Herman, 2016).

The GEM reports (2016) that cultural values and the level of entrepreneurial training obtained during the university education in Nigeria has increased. Transforming the university into an entrepreneurial institution is also a process to entrench the entrepreneurial attitude among youths (Abdullahi & Zainol, 2016).

Many nations are recognizing the importance of entrepreneurship in national development, sustainability and security (Maria, 2015). This is reflected in Global Entrepreneurship Monitoring (GEM) report of countries participating in entrepreneurship education as at 2012 cited in Martinaz et al. (2015), the nations were categorized into innovation driven, factor driven and efficiency driven as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation Driven Countries</th>
<th>Factor Driven Countries</th>
<th>Efficiency Driven Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South-Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Global Economic Monitor (GEM, 2000) reported that in research findings by the
Ewing Marion Kauffman center for Entrepreneurial leadership at the Babson College, USA established that there is a strong relationship between the level of entrepreneurship in a country and national economic development. The GEM (2000) report also shows a correlation between the prevalence of new firms and projected Gross Domestic Product (GDP), also there is correlation between the Total Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA) and projected GDP. The GEM (2016, 2017) research systematically assessed the level of start-up activity in relation to nascent firms and the prevalence of new or young firms. New or young firms are not necessarily business start-ups but those who have survived the start-up phase which is usually 1-3 years. Findings from GEM research shows that countries (such as Australia, Norway, USA, Brazil, Canada and Korea) that were more entrepreneurial than others had higher number of nascent firms and higher numbers of new firms. Such correlation suggests that new or young firms survived partly due to their relationship with nascent firms to create a robust economy.

2.5 Social entrepreneurship

There have been several definitions of social entrepreneurship that have been conceptualized in various literatures (Iqbal et al., 2015). Therefore social entrepreneurship can be explained from two different perspectives. The first one focuses on the non-profit aspect, where social entrepreneurship can be categorized in the non-profit domain. The second approach to social entrepreneurship puts it into the economic domain and its various sectors (Morgan, 2016). Social entrepreneurship is defined as the strategies that are developed and planned to tackle the issues and challenges faced by the non-profit organizations (Morgan, 2016). This was initiated in the 1980s, when non-profit organizations were finding it difficult to sustain their businesses in a competitive working environment (Morgan, 2016). Thus they adopted various sustainable strategies to face the issue of a lack of investment, since the government had reduced the amount of subsidies provided to them and donations provided by private organizations had also reduced (Clyde & Karnani, 2015). According to Habib and Jubb (2015), this definition of social entrepreneurship is not totally accepted by researchers, as they believe it to be too narrow and lacking the ability to define the complexities and diversities involved in the practices of social entrepreneurship. The second approach towards social entrepreneurship puts it into the category of the economic domain in all three sectors of the economy, i.e. the public, private and the non-profit sectors. According to the current study, social entrepreneurship is regarded as an initiative to improve the social conditions of
society and provide social values. This value creation is not dependent on the format of business strategy adopted by the organizations and thus it can be related to the public, private and the non-profit sectors (Betrisey et al., 2016).

Social entrepreneurship is considered as a phenomenon that can be realized at an organizational level and an individual level, as well as an inter-organizational level. The founder of the initiative normally focuses on the individual level of consideration of the social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship is defined differently at an inter-organizational level (Gbenga et al., 2015). It is considered as a process that begins with the identification of opportunity and then develops strategies and plans to develop this opportunity into a feasible business plan. It involves the formation of objectives and missions to create value, indulging in activities such as innovation, continuous learning and the sharing of knowledge and resources (Fujisawa et al., 2015). Thus it aims at being a process that is used to create value. The table below shows the review report conducted to understand the concepts of social entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurship. According to the study, it is innovation that is the most important aspect of social entrepreneurship (Adiyia et al., 2016.).

Table 2.3. Definitions emphasizing innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Unit of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fujisawa et al.</td>
<td>The definition of social entrepreneurship is the innovation that results from changing people’s lives in a positive manner by providing them with solutions to the issues that they face. This social change is considered innovative, irrespective of the mechanism used in its implementation, i.e. irrespective of whether the change involves contributed income or involves earned income.</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mair &amp; Marti (2006);</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurship is the method by which innovative solutions are provided to</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moshtari (2016)</td>
<td>the people based upon their needs and wants by efficiently channelling the resources available. This change is used to bring about solutions to the needs of the people and thus bring about a social change in the community that is economically benefitting and also sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin et al., (2006); Hofstad &amp; Torfing (2015)</td>
<td>A value creating activity, which is innovative in nature and can lead to solving the problems of the people and thus bringing social change. It can occur in the environments of both government sectors and non-profit organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvord et al. (2004); Fujisawa et al. (2015)</td>
<td>Social innovation is a series of steps that are followed in order to achieve the desired objective of bringing innovative change to society. It aims at the creation of innovative solutions to the problems of the people by the proper mobilization of skills, ideas, knowledge and resources. This helps economic as well as social change in the environment and is also a sustainable process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mort et al. (2003); Martin et al. (2016)</td>
<td>A multidimensional construct that requires entrepreneur behaviour and aims at achieving social goals, which would benefit society as a whole. It helps in uplifting society and bringing an improvement in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Social Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Social Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts &amp; Woods (2005); Pink &amp; White (2016)</td>
<td>People who have solutions that are innovative and cater to the needs of people. This brings a radical change in society and uplifts society.</td>
<td>Social entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabhu, (1999); Pink &amp; White (2016)</td>
<td>Social entrepreneurs are the innovative thinkers who manage the innovation aspect of an organization and come up with solutions to the problems of society. Their prime objective is achieving a social change, which often also leads to economic development. Thus they aim at accomplishing positive change in people’s lives.</td>
<td>Social entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink &amp; White (2016)</td>
<td>There are five important characteristics of social entrepreneurs: 1) They have an aim or mission to bring about social change in society and thus cater to the needs and wants of society. 2) They often look for different opportunities by which they can attain social change and thus fulfil their mission. 3) They believe in constant learning and the sharing of knowledge. Thus they are focused on innovation, learning and adaptation from the</td>
<td>Social entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
existing norms. 4) They work to bring social change irrespective of the available resources. 5) They are totally aware of the stakes involved and are totally accountable for their actions. They believe in fulfilling their aim and finding innovative solutions to the problems faced by society (Idris & Agbim, 2015).

The common factor derived from the above table is that social entrepreneurship involves the concept of innovation. It is aimed at achieving social change, which is innovative in nature, can benefit society as a whole and bring about social and economic development within society. People involved in social entrepreneurship are innovative by nature (Pink & White, 2016). The innovators or the social entrepreneurs are engaged in creating new value from the existing resources (Idris & Agbim, 2015). They often combine several goods and services and the organization survives on this thrust to create innovativeness and bring change into society (Pink & White, 2016). In the view of Alden Rivers et al. (2015), the best characteristic of an entrepreneur is the existence of innovation and social entrepreneurship. They are often innovative and aim at fulfilling the needs and wants of society. Entrepreneurs aim at uplifting society and improving their living standards by finding creative ideas that could solve their social and economic issues (Chandra, 2016).

The social entrepreneurs are proactive by nature and are constantly seeking opportunities that could bring radical change into society (Hansen, 2014). They are risk takers by nature and are also extremely innovative (Faboyede et al., 2015). They are very much like the commercial entrepreneurs and are often involved in bringing about innovative products, creating unique and innovative implementation programmes and also establishing new business ideas and opportunities (Chandra, 2016). They are also involved in combining goods and services and bringing innovative offerings for the people (Phillips et al., 2015). The three most important characteristics of an entrepreneur are the ability to take risks, the proactive ability that allows them to understand the problems and solutions and also to look for constant opportunities to build them, and innovativeness, i.e. bringing innovative solutions (Chandra, 2016). Thus these are some of the commonalities between a social entrepreneur and a commercial
entrepreneur. There are several differences between them as well. The social entrepreneurs are aimed and focused on bringing social change into society (Faridi et al., 2015). Their work is more focused on the people and on solving the needs of the people, whereas a commercial entrepreneur is more focused on achieving commercial changes and development and thus caters to the commercial needs of the people. According to Prabhu (1999), the social entrepreneurs believe in accomplishing social change and focusing on the problems, needs and wants of their client group. They create innovative solutions and entrepreneurship to manage the problems of their client group. The commercial entrepreneurs are more motivated by profit and focus on bringing innovative solutions that can make a lot of money and thus fulfil the commercial needs of the organizations (De Bruin & Lewis, 2015).

2.6 Social innovation

There is no clear definition of the term social innovation within the literature (Alden Rivers et al., 2015). It is important for a firm to work on its innovation and strategies in order to gain a competitive edge over others in the market and also to sustain their position in the highly competitive market (Phillips et al., 2015). This is applicable for both commercial as well as social businesses. The social innovation focuses more on the issues and needs, which is completely different to the focus of the technological innovations (Phillips et al., 2015). Thus both of them are completely different and focus on different things. The aim of social innovation is to bring about a difference in the lives of the poor segment of society and also have an impact on the economic, social and environmental aspects for them (Van der Have & Rubalcaba, 2016).

In order to achieve sustainable transformations in society, it is imperative to be involved in social innovations that provide instant solutions for several of the social problems of society (Jacob & Onwughalu, 2015). They help to channel the resources, i.e. the ideas, skills and resources, in order to develop the lives of the poor and the excluded section of society. The innovation literature has defined studies, as well as conceptualized the real meaning of innovation and proposed new definitions for it (Phillips et al., 2015). It is important to develop plans to include the definition of social innovation within the innovation literature (Jacob & Onwughalu, 2015). It is important to develop and improve knowledge in order to improve the innovations and sustainability. From the point of view of knowledge, innovation is utilizing existing knowledge in the development of new skills and knowledge to provide both viable and commercial solutions to problems (Fujisawa et al., 2015). This definition of
innovation focuses more on the acquisition and sharing of knowledge in order to increase the innovation in the market.

Evers and Ewert (2015) differentiated between invention and innovation. Invention is a basic part of innovation, but there is a minor difference in the conception of invention and innovation. Innovation involves the converting of new ideas into useful ones by implementation and innovative strategies (Evers & Ewert, 2015). Innovation is also completely different from improvements (Moshtari, 2016). A firm working towards small incremental changes in order to increase the efficiency of its operations is an example of improvements, whereas innovation focuses on identifying new ideas and knowledge that can be used to provide solutions to problems (Hofstad & Torfing, 2015). It aims at offering new solutions and services by the acquisition of new knowledge and skills (Paturas et al., 2016). It is very important to commercialize innovation in order to make it more viable (Martin et al., 2016). This is where entrepreneurship plays its role in innovation. A social innovation can be defined as an activity that leads to the creation of innovative values and provides solutions to the problems existing in society, with the help of new knowledge (Haugh & Talwar, 2016). Thus according to the latest study, social innovation can be defined as the utilization of existing knowledge in order to gain new knowledge and skills, which lead to the development of solutions to the problems of society (Herrera, 2015). These solutions are viable and require the firm to adapt to new behaviours, in order to adopt this knowledge. Collective social entrepreneurship is sustained through collaborative innovation (Verschoore et al., 2015).

There are several examples of social innovations described by researchers (Edet, 2015). For example, the initiative by the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, this offers micro financing in the development of a huge microfinance industry which led to the development of poor and needy (Evers & Ewert, 2015). It provided self-employment to millions of people, including women, and allowed them to earn their income by investing in small businesses. This has helped them with identifying opportunities and the development of their economic and social lives. This initiative by the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh helped Dr Muhammad Younus to receive the Noble Prize in the field of peace for his efforts to improve the living conditions of the people (Evers & Ewert, 2015). This is a great example of radical social innovation that led to the development of millions of people. Another example of social innovation is the Big Issue magazine in the UK, which provided opportunities to earn income for thousands of homeless people and also improved the sales of the Big Issue magazine in the UK. It is considered to be one of the best examples of social entrepreneurship, which led to
developments for homeless people in the UK. This firm allows the needy to be involved in the selling of the Big Issue magazine and enables them to earn their own livelihood through the sales of the magazine. This is now a limited company, but it initially started as a non-profit organization. It serves as a source of income for thousands of people in the UK. John Bird initiated this innovation and also later replicated the same innovation in New York. Thus social innovation can be both an innovation and also imitation in the commercial sector (Bonfanti, et al., 2016).

Social innovations also help to fill the gap in the services provided by the private and public sectors (Jensen & Fersch, 2016). They cater for the needs of the population, which clearly needs special attention. They channel their resources, time, energy and skills into the development of society (Lai, 2016). They work towards delivering new services and identifying opportunities, to cater to the needs of the poor segment of society who are deprived of the basic needs and amenities (Herrera, 2015). They identify opportunities for business, develop plans and strategies to implement them and cater to the needs of the excluded sections of society (Akemu, et al., 2016).

The entrepreneurs of the social innovations have a good knowledge of the market and its conditions (Voorberg et al., 2015). They understand the needs and wants of the people. A social entrepreneur believes in developing ideological goals and works towards achieving them without forcing them on the people (Brown & Wyatt, 2015). The entrepreneurs often come up with varied offerings that create a disturbance in the market and bring enormous changes to the market. These changes can be in the form of coming up with new products, services, processes, industry or supplies. Thus there can be various sources of innovations. The table below shows various innovations by social entrepreneurs. The table shows varied categories of social innovations, which includes the microcredit initiative by the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh and the low cost eye surgery that is done by Arvind Hospital in India. Thus it shows the various offerings that can be provided by social entrepreneurs in the field of social innovation (Abula & Adebayo, 2016).

Table 2.4. Some examples of social innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Enterprise Ventures (SEVs)</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grameen Bank,</td>
<td>The provision of a microcredit package for poor people. Group loans were provided to empower</td>
<td>Alvord et al. (2004);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>The Grameen Bank, Bangladesh helped the people to indulge in income generating activities and thus helped in the social and economic development of both the people and society. This helped in building a microfinance environment, which helped in creating a better living environment for the poor and underprivileged section of society in Bangladesh. It played an important role in reducing the poverty level.</td>
<td>Voorberg et al. (2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAC (Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee), Bangladesh</td>
<td>An initiative to develop the villages of Bangladesh. This involved the creation of groups in the villages who were competent in providing solutions to the problems of the local people. They also provided various support services, such as facilitating in getting the loans to implement business plans, and thus led to the development and growth of the village. This was a unique effort to empower the local people and thus helped in the development of the social conditions of society.</td>
<td>Alvord et al. (2004); Voorberg et al. (2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Research and Education Centre, USA</td>
<td>It involved the building of a local movement. This initiative used adult education as the tool to empower the people and organize them to work as a group. They were made to form local unions to voice their opinions and needs. It also included the formation of civil rights groups, which worked towards raising their concerns over the issues and problems faced by the people. These groups helped the poor section of society to fight against the abusive elites, and thus helped in the improvement of the social conditions of the community.</td>
<td>Alvord et al. (2004); Voorberg et al. (2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Puebla, Mexico</td>
<td>It included the provision of an agricultural package to the people. It helped the farmers in Mexico in developing and implementing innovative techniques to improve the production of maize. This led to improvements in the income level of the farmers and also helped them to improve the welfare of their families. This was another unique social innovation that led to the betterment of life for several farmers in Mexico.</td>
<td>Alvord et al. (2004); Voorberg et al. (2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt Movement, Kenya</td>
<td>This initiative focused on building the capacity of the local people in Kenya. It included several civic education programmes, which aimed at building people’s skills and thus involving them in performing self-help activities. It also helped the people to become trained in tree plantation, which helped them to improve their economic conditions. Thus it worked towards empowering people and in turn improved their social environment.</td>
<td>Alvord et al. (2004); Voorberg et al. (2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed Women’s Association: (SEWA), India</td>
<td>It helped in the building of the local movement. It encouraged the self-employed women to work towards campaigning for different policies that would support their life activities. Thus it helped the people to raise their voice regarding the concerns they faced in day to day life. It helped in fulfilling the needs and wants of the people and also made the government understand the issues faced by the local people and provide feasible solutions to them. It helped to improve both the</td>
<td>Alvord et al. (2004); Voorberg et al. (2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Innovation</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aravind Eye Hospital, India</td>
<td>This is one of the most innovative steps towards providing health care to the people. It involved giving eye treatments to poor people, which included eye services and cataract surgeries at low costs and thus helped in the improvement of the living conditions of the people.</td>
<td>Mair &amp; Marti, (2006); Abula &amp; Adebayo, (2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekem, Egypt</td>
<td>This initiative had a strong impact on the society of Egypt. This was a social venture that was aimed at improving the social, economic and cultural conditions of the people. It included the provision of education facilities for the poor and also included education centres for people. It also helped in the reduction of the use of pesticide in cotton agriculture, which had a huge impact on the quality of cotton produced by them. Thus it improved the quality of the product provided and thus helped in creating more value.</td>
<td>Mair &amp; Marti, (2006); Abula &amp; Adebayo, (2016).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major outcome of social innovation is the economic development and poverty alleviation that it provides (Voorberg et al., 2015). It provides a source of income for the poor segments of society and caters to the varied needs of customers. Several examples have been given in the table above, such as BRAC, Grameen Bank, SEWA, etc., which led to both the social as well as the economic development of society and also helped in human development (Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016).
According to Haugh & Talwar (2016), the prime purpose of social entrepreneurship is to provide value to the organization as well as to the people and also to develop sustainable plans for the organization to flourish. This definition of social entrepreneurship blends well with the definition of social innovation, where social innovation focuses on providing values from existing knowledge and the acquisition of new knowledge (Paturas et al., 2016). Social innovation focuses on the problems faced by society, i.e. the social problems, and provides solutions to the same (Phillips et al., 2015). However, in commercial entrepreneurship innovation is focused more on achieving profits in business and thus involves monetary aspects of the business. On the other hand, social innovation works to resolve the social problems faced by the people. It helps in developing new business plans, which can help the poor segments of society to manage their needs and wants (Paturas et al., 2016).

Jolly and Raven (2015) suggest that the definitions of social entrepreneurship can help in the identification of social innovation. The results of social innovation are the formation of new knowledge and concepts, which when implemented lead to the development of society. It is important that the social innovation is viable and also it must provide solutions to the issues faced by the general public (Alden et al., 2015).

There are various studies of social entrepreneurship that help to understand social innovation in a better way. According to Haugh & Talwar (2016), there are three different types of innovations. First is the innovation to build the local capacity, second is the building of an innovative movement and third is the distribution of a package. The innovation type that focuses on capacity building tends to focus on the local groups, by giving them the required resources to improve their capacity, and also organizes them by leveraging on their cultural commonalities. Thus it aims at utilizing the human resources to improve their capacity and capability and involving them in the activities of implementing innovation (Iwasaki et al., 2015). This can help to empower these people and lead to social and economic development in society. The second type of innovation is the distribution of the package, which focuses on the end users and the distribution stakeholders. It aims at improving the packaged services and also leveraging the economic usage of them and thus has a tremendous impact on economic conditions. The third type of innovation includes building relationships with the external relations and thus improving the cultural as well as political aspects (De Sousa & Docuyanan, 2016). Innovations can channel existing resources in the direction of solving social issues. In an organization, the value created from the utilization of resources is called
capital. This capital is used in the mobilization of resources and thus helps in explaining the concept of social innovation (Iwasaki et al., 2015).

2.7 Innovation and entrepreneurship

The entrepreneurs are the ones who are responsible for identifying opportunities in business and understanding the factors that would contribute to the business (Ezekiel & Edwin, 2016). They help in the creation of new values and thus bring about social change and economic growth and development (Emeh et al., 2012). They are the ones who foster innovations and believe in constantly evolving strategies to tackle the issues faced by the business (Kayode, 2015). They work towards improving the strategies of the firm and work on the innovations and development of the firm (Chandra et al., 2016).

This study focuses on an investigation of CSEs as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty within Nigeria. Studies have researched different poverty alleviation measures, but have not considered CSE as a collaborative strategy within Nigeria. In small scale industries, it is the entrepreneurs who have the most impact on the various strategies of the firm and they work towards the identification of new opportunities. Higginbotham (2016) assessed the role of social entrepreneurship in poverty alleviation and concluded that, in order for entrepreneurs and any economy to experience meaningful development, there needed to be an ability to create employment opportunities. Colombelli et al. (2016) added that entrepreneurship and innovation are vital tools for national development and poverty alleviation. Hassan (2013) supported the position of previous authors such as Colombelli et al. (2016) and concluded that innovation will propel entrepreneurship, while entrepreneurship will impact community development through poverty alleviation.

2.8 Collaboration

The literature on collaboration says that the partnership between organizations helps to attain resource which the organization originally do not have such as skills, improvements in technology and the sharing of knowledge and resources, which is difficult for the firm to manage when working alone (Moshtari, 2016). Collaboration is referred to as the exchange of ideas and information, enhancing resources, altering activities and sharing resources with other organizations for mutual benefit and to achieve a common purpose (Verschoore et al.,
In the context of this study, collaboration is referred to as one organization working with other organizations for mutual benefit.

Firms have different needs and collaboration helps them to fulfil their resource constraints and complement each other’s needs (Paturas et al., 2016). A collaboration of the research and development divisions of various firms helps them to tackle technical issues that are common to them and that cannot be solved when working alone (Pink & White, 2016). The research undertaken by Kanter (1994), affirms that the firms working in collaboration generate new values when working together and this can benefit the individual organization and the nation at large (Veilleux & Queenton, 2015). The collaborating firms help each other to achieve their prime objectives and also work together in solving issues that need joint attention (Van der Have & Rubalcaba, 2016). According to Alden Rivers et al. (2015), the firms that are involved in value chain alliances and collaboration have needs that are complementary to each other and are most closely bound and have successful collaborations.

There have been several studies (Emeh et al., 2012; Colombelli et al., 2016) that have revealed that the collaborations and alliances that involve firms working together with regards to research and development have been the most successful ones and these firms have benefitted the most from the relationships (Martin et al., 2016). There are several factors that make the partnership a successful one; these include an expanding and complex knowledge base of the industry, a widely-spread source of expertise and having new innovative technology, which can be shared for mutual benefit (Aremu & Adeyemi, 2011). Collaboration generates employment opportunities and increases income and business opportunities (Hu et al., 2016). The firms focus on the sharing of knowledge and information and thus there is more involvement in the development of partnering firms than in individual ones. Hu et al. (2016) researched the ways in which collaboration is undertaken when doing university research and concluded that this form of collaboration will generate more income and employment opportunities. Ku et al. (2016) supported the position of Verschoore et al. (2015), as they too believe that research and institutional collaboration is an innovative and positive development strategy. Bessant et al. (2012) posited that collaboration could be in the form of a licensing agreement, joint venture, alliances or cooperatives. Abubarkar (2012) supported this position and added that, in the Nigerian context, these forms of collaboration are common because of the policies and legal framework of formation. The success of any form of collaboration will depend on the environment or region, added Abukakar (2012).
Considering the ease of the formation of these forms of collaborations, more CSE can be formed to help alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

According to Chandra (2016), there are two basic perspectives with regards to firms working in collaboration or partnership. The two different perspectives are the joint exploration and the joint exploitation. The work of Chandra (2016) was based on literature review of other academics in the field of organizational relationships, which included joint ventures, licensing, franchising, networks, alliances, supply agreements, etc. According to the findings of Ku et al. (2016), the joint exploration and the joint exploitation are the most important intentions of the partnering organization, in comparison to the mode or type of collaboration they are involved in. There are several reasons for firms collaborating with each other. The partnership between firms helps to improve their efficiency with respect to the economic perspective (Littlewood & Holt, 2015). The primary intention of partnering is to achieve a successful collaboration, with a clear focus on the governance structure of the joint firm. However, it is important to have a focus on the availability and utilization of complementary resources and to consider the individual benefits to the partnering firms, as well as the organizational mission itself (Oly Ndubisi & Iftikhar 2012). The firms also form collaborations in order to improve their relations and social structures (Dant et al., 2013). They often collaborate to reduce their dependency on the stakeholders and also to remove the uncertainty of doing business. This is from the organizational perspective and helps the firm to improve their trust issues and gain legitimacy status (Desai, 2016). The collaboration between firms helps them to improve their innovation, share resources and drive similar objectives (Desai, 2016). Since they share their technology and skills, it helps them to come up with innovative products and strategies to utilize resources in order to achieve their social mission (Hofstad & Torfing, 2015). Thus it serves as a learning platform for the firms. It requires a shift of focus from working in a single organization environment to a partnership environment to facilitate innovation in firms (Mulloth et al., 2016). Working together, sharing knowledge and resources to produce innovative products, should be the prime focus of the partnering firms (Mulloth et al., 2016).

2.9 The Schumpeterian and Kirznerian View of Entrepreneurship

The Entrepreneurial theory of innovation stipulates that, in the economic system, entrepreneurial activities disrupt or destroy existing structure and create a new institution that is referred to as creative destruction (Schumpeter, 1952). Innovation drives Entrepreneurship
and social entrepreneurship. In the theory of Entrepreneurship, Cantillon linked the role of entrepreneur to the work of Schumpeter, Knight and Kirzner who developed a distinct and sophisticated approach to entrepreneurship phenomena. Schumpeter (1934), in his book Theory of Economic Development said that development is a dynamic process which involves the disturbing of the economic status quo. He added that entrepreneurship was an activity of great important and the economy grows through innovative steps and thus the role of the entrepreneur was to promote such innovative steps and the fundamental disturbances to the market predictability. Schumpeter considers the economic system as a close circular flow, being in a state of equilibrium through a monotonous replication of interaction between buyers and sellers. However, changes could occur to this stationary position through creative destruction process. Schumpeter considered a development a disturbance of the circular flow and attributed to the entrepreneur as fundamental role as innovator by introducing innovation in the form of a new product, market or methods of production (Herbert & Link, 2006).

Cantillon (2011) stated that the singular role of entrepreneurs is neglected in the economic theory. In his work, he explained that the entrepreneurs are people who are aware certain market mismatch between demand and supply generate opportunities for buying cheaply and selling at a higher price, adding that such entrepreneurs by taking advantage of the situation would bring equilibrium to a competitive market. The definition does not depict entrepreneurship a mere act of speculation, but describe entrepreneurs as people who attempt to comprehend the trends and market mismatches so that they can make decisions in order to make profit.

As previously discussed, authors like (Herbert and Link, 1989), Cantillon's depiction of the entrepreneur's role in socio-economic interactivity had only considerable attention in the beginning of the 20th century as many economists, particularly Joseph Schumpeter (1934), Knight (1921) and, later, Israel Kirzner (1973) explored Cantillon's approach to the entrepreneurship phenomenon, resulting in three different ramifications of the 18th century original definition of the “entrepreneur” and each with its unique contributions and comprehensive deviations.

Also, looking at the theoretical debate and the increasing attention of Economics towards the entrepreneurial phenomenon, such mater is becoming more relevant for Economic Modelling, which had before attempted to describe the firm operation, but this is limited by assumptions in neoclassical economics, particularly the ones related to perfect competition. On the other
hand, Knight (1921) was not so distant from the “entrepreneur” depicted in Cantillon's work. Knight clearly separated the concept of risk from the one of uncertainty, as he emphasizes the fact that risk existed when outcomes were uncertain but could be predicted with some probability and, thus, insurable, whereas uncertainty arose when the probability of outcomes could not be estimated. Therefore, for Frank Knight, true uncertainty occurred when the future was not only unknown, but also unknowable with unclassifiable instances and a non-existent distribution of outcomes (Bebert and Link, 2006).

Hence, Knight explored Cantillon's ideas about the entrepreneur's role in a dynamic market economy, where the uncertainty about the success of an enterprise is the central feature in the decision between being an employee and becoming self-employed (Parker, 1996). Thus, while the Schumpeterian entrepreneur was the dynamic innovator, disturbing the continuous flow of the markets, the Knightian entrepreneur assumed the business hazard as he was the residual uncertainty-bearer (Martin, 1979).

Kirzner (1973, 1997), later developed a different concept such as “spontaneous learning”, “alertness” and “entrepreneurial discovery”. This Author stated that entrepreneurial discovery is important in pushing back the boundaries of sheer ignorance by increasing mutual awareness among market participants and therefore driving prices, output and input quantities and qualities toward the values consistent with equilibrium, where prevails a scenario of perfect information or absence of sheer ignorance (Kirzner, 1997). Therefore, contrary to the Schumpeterian approach, the dynamic competitive process of entrepreneurial discovery developed by Kirzner tends systematically towards equilibrium.

Schumpeter argued that entrepreneurial rewards are obtained from the temporary monopoly scenario that arises as the entrepreneur successfully develops his business through “new combinations” of ideas and resources (Schumpeter, 1934). Additionally, as some other authors emphasize (Montanye, 2006), as well Schumpeter himself, innovating, improving existing goods and services, creating or expanding markets, and improving production processes and organizational structures were some of the leading characteristics of the entrepreneur.

Looking at Schumpeter, knight and kirzner theories, entrepreneurs are innovative and creative individual who is able to transform resources into profit by matching demand and supply in the market place. In addition to the creativity and innovation that drives
entrepreneurs, spontaneous learning, alertness and entrepreneurial discovery also sustain the entrepreneurial venture (Kirzner, 1997; Palsule-Desai, 2015).

2. 10 Theories

**Resource Based View (RBV):** Resource based view theory argues that resources are an effective and competitive advantage to the organization (Maritan, 2001; Lei et al., 1996; Colbert, 2004; Lado et al., 1992; Backman et al., 2015). They are usually rare, non-imitable and specific to the organization, which makes them valuable for establishing sustainable development for the organization (Lado et al., 2006; McWilliams et al., 2006; Ray et al., 2004; Bromiley & Rau, 2016). The strength and effectiveness of the resources of an organization lies in the strength of their value creation (Amit & Zott, 2001; Ferlie et al., 2016). Thus, RBV can be considered as one of the important factors within the value creation process, and by studying the role of RBV strategy, the process of developing a strong business model from a social and cooperative organization can also be effectively understood (Sirmon et al., 2007; Backman et al., 2015). Resources that contribute to the growth and increased competitive advantage of an organization possess some very unique characteristics, a concept with which most of the researchers agree (Miemczyk et al., 2016).

According to Backman et al. (2015), resources are also an important factor in determining the profit or loss of the organization. Miemczyk (2016) also state that the existence of resources in an organization adds value to the business and at the same time is complex and inimitable for the competitors. What is more, the resources add great value to the business, as well as to the competitiveness of the organization. Along with having effective resources, it is also crucial that they are being efficiently utilized and nurtured by the organization (Cheney, 2015). In fact, the manner in which organizations manage their resources determines the degree of their sustainable growth and development (Ferlie et al., 2016).

The availability of useful resources also allows the organization to develop effective strategies for sustainable growth and development (Ferlie et al., 2016). The use of these resources defines the development of a competitive advantage for the organization in the long term, which competitor organizations cannot copy effectively (Bromiley & Rau, 2016). In fact, the development of efficient and inimitable resources at the disposal of an organization is key to the development of its competitive advantage (Paranque and Willmott, 2016). Thus,
it is essential that the organization safeguards their resources and nurtures them in order to be more effective (Pee & Kankanhalli, 2016). The availability of effective resources allows the organization to grow and develop its business by quickly reacting to the environmental changes of the business. This is critical, as the environment is not something that is under the control of the business, but by focusing on its internal strengths, an organization can prosper due to the benefits of the external environment, as and when the opportunity arrives (Miemczyk, et al., 2016). However, the role of the environment in determining the growth and development of the organization can also never be ignored. Thus, it is essential that the resource based view of business should not be looked at in isolation to the environmental study of the business. It is also important that both the internal and external business factors are studied in order to have a better understanding of the growth story of the business (Pee & Kankanhalli, 2016).

**Resource Mobilization Theory**: Resource mobilization theory is one of the prominent aspects of social movements, which argues that the presence of resources strengthens the pace of a movement, whereas the lack of resources acts against the strengthening of the movement (Lo, 2015). Though there are several resources that aid the growth of a movement, there are primarily four kinds of resources that are extremely crucial for the growth of a movement (Dennis, 2016). They are:

- People - which involves leadership as well as employees
- Financial and knowledge based resources – such as databases and information
- Degree of expertise or experience
- Authenticity in terms of brand image and customer trust

These are the four major resources that aid the growth and development of the organization and thus stakeholders involved in the formation of an organization must cater to these needs (Herbst & Prüfer, 2016). The efficacy and character of the founding members plays a critical role in determining the degree of success of an organization. The impact of the inclusion of effective human capital on the growth of entrepreneurship has been studied by several researchers (Acher & Prufer 2016). Cooperation enhances the ability of an organization to have access to resources, capabilities and competencies, which under normal circumstances would not have been feasible for the organization (Long et al., 2015). This includes both tangible as well as intangible resources, such as reputation. However, it is not necessary that the resources made available from cooperation will always be profitable for both of the
parties, as the degree of profitability depends on the difference between the costs and earnings associated with the resource. However, the choice and effectiveness of resource sharing depends on the availability and the necessity of resources for the organization (Lee, 2015).

**Vicious Cycle of Poverty:** This theory states that the issue of poverty is a vicious circular phenomenon (Sodhi, 2016). Thus, a poor person remains poor as he/she is already poor and a country or society remains poor and underdeveloped as it is already so (Potts, 2016). Therefore, there exists a relationship between the existing poverty or underdevelopment of a society or nation and its continuance in the same way. Thus, the existing deficiencies in terms of resources prohibit a society or nation from growing and therefore an underdeveloped nation remains underdeveloped (Fidelis et al., 2015). The low income of individuals in a low income society causes low savings, which in turn causes low investments. Low investment means low growth and the vicious cycle of poverty thus continues (Takahashi et al., 2016).

According to Gbenga et al. (2015), the very existence of poverty in a society makes it tougher for an organization to acquire basic resources such as capital, trained personnel, market strength, etc., which does not allow an organization to grow and develop. The existence of poverty in society is itself a big reason for the underdevelopment of society, as it affects the demand and supply end of business (Wollni & Fischer, 2015). The lack of purchasing capacity because of the low income of the individuals in the society makes the demand side weak, as there are not enough buyers for the business. On the supply side, low productivity because of low resource availability again impacts the supply in a negative manner. Thus, there is a weakness with regards to both the supply and demand side of the business owing to the poverty of the individuals and the underdevelopment of society, and this clearly creates a vicious circle of poverty (Potts, 2016).

**Theoretical Framework:** Various writers and scholars have defined social entrepreneurship in the literature (Short et al., 2009; Hansen, 2014). Dant et al. (2013) asserted that social entrepreneurship research is still in the development stage and that the definition of the concept of SE has not as yet been agreed by scholars. Assudani et al. (2016) argued that the concept of social entrepreneurship can be well defined by using three major concepts. The first is that SEs address social issues that are not met by private organizations and the government, the second is that social benefits motivate social entrepreneurs and, lastly, social entrepreneurs do not work against market forces but work with market forces (Worren et al.,
The last concept connotes that social entrepreneurs adopt a business-like approach to address social issues (Brown & Wyatt, 2015). Also, the difference between commercial entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs is not in the entrepreneurship process but in the reward that SE provides. Jensen et al. (2016) suggest that the approach to social entrepreneurship is more to do with value creation motives through economic means.

Previous studies investigated the process of entrepreneurship and suggested that it is made up of different components (Tan et al., 2015). Entrepreneurship was described as a complex process that is the result of other influences (Morgan, 2016). The process of entrepreneurship involves the identification of an opportunity, resource mobilization and resource organization (Dorado, 2006; De Bruin & Lewis, 2015). Skills are important in the entrepreneurship process, as are skills management or personnel (Bonfanti et al., 2016).

2.11 Gap in the literature

There are several studies that have been conducted in the domain of social entrepreneurship and others on poverty alleviation in Nigeria (Abubakar, 2012). Similarly, there are several actors that play different roles in social entrepreneurship, such as the identification of a social cause, development of a feasible business solution for the same and replacement of outdated business forms (Achumba et al., 2013). There are also several sets of actions that are undertaken by social entrepreneurs, such as the partnership of stakeholders, resource allocation and utilization. Therefore, Hansen (2014) identified the important role of social entrepreneurship, which replaces an existing system with a more efficient entrepreneurship business model and, in turn, addresses an important social cause in the process. The research conducted by Morgan (2016) also identifies the role of collaborative actions and working through cooperation in the same business model. Morgan (2016) suggested that it is important to focus on the development and discussion of a community based enterprise and the role that it can play in improvising a sustainable development pace for a poor population and the deprived members of society. According to Peredo (2014), the role played by the cultural and political identity of society also plays a critical role in determining the nature of the community based enterprises, which in turn impacts the social entrepreneurship programmes. Montgomery et al. (2012) investigated the role that several actors play in a social entrepreneurship model, which includes the dismantling of old institutions, new idea generation and organization set up. Akemu et al. (2016) investigated the strategic approach to collective action and concluded that framing is an important collaborative tool. Innovation
and collective entrepreneurship was researched by Evers & Ewert (2015) and his findings revealed that innovation drives entrepreneurship and collective action.

Olayinka et al. (2013) focused on the context of social entrepreneurship and poverty reduction in Nigeria, by highlighting the importance of entrepreneurship, public policies and education in poverty reduction in society. The research shows how social entrepreneurship organizations can reduce poverty in society by generating wealth and creating employment along with addressing a social cause, but the process of achieving this is undefined. Primary research in the form of interviews and surveys has been conducted by Agbi (2009) in Kano state to discuss the importance of social entrepreneurs in small and micro industries. It also assessed the economic situation of the country using both primary as well as secondary data. The lack of the effective development and maintenance of infrastructure, along with policy ineffectiveness, are major causes of economic decay and poverty in Nigeria. Thus, Agbi (2009) recommended that the Nigerian administration develop policies that would identify and inspire the development of effective entrepreneurship, which would actually aid the development of the economy and reduce poverty through job creation. The research conducted by Agbi (2009) did not focus on Lagos state of Nigeria and this research will fill this gap.

According to the research conducted by Aliyu et al. (2014), micro-entrepreneurship has taken the lead in poverty eradication in the Malaysian economy. As per the report, micro-entrepreneurship is an effective approach to reducing poverty within society, as it generates wealth and creates employment opportunities. However, more importantly, micro-entrepreneurship allows businesses to effectively overcome several environmental and economy based challenges by innovation and strategizing (Liang & Hendrikse, 2016). The central focus, however, should remain the ability of micro-entrepreneurs to inspire small and medium-scale entrepreneurs, which can have a greater impact on society. The research effectively projects the important role of micro-entrepreneurs in small and medium-scale industries and also the role they play in eradicating poverty within Malaysian society. The research on micro-entrepreneurs by Aliyu et al. (2014) also presents an effective framework to explain the role played by micro-entrepreneurs in business in order to inspire small and large-scale entrepreneurs, which in turn plays a positive role in poverty reduction.

The research conducted by Salisu & Ogwumike (2010) on the eradication of poverty in Nigeria provides insight for further discussion on strategies for the alleviation of poverty in
Nigeria. Salisu & Ogwumike (2010) posited that it is important to shift the emphasis to target poverty reduction in Nigeria. Considering the fact that research on poverty alleviation has generated so much interest in the last few years, there is a need to maintain such momentum and, at the same time, it should be used as a vehicle for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Salisu & Ogwumike (2010) has not specified any specific strategy for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. However, to date, existing research has not considered collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria, as this study does.

According to a study conducted by Peterson (2015), two major proxies have played a significant role in eradicating poverty in the 58 countries that were chosen for his research. These two proxies were innovation and entrepreneurship. The scatter plots in the research emphasized the important role of innovation and entrepreneurship in the eradication of poverty in the chosen nations. The result of the study shows that these two variables can alleviate poverty significantly. Moreover, poverty was reduced drastically when innovation interacted with entrepreneurship. Arguably, the result of the findings of Peterson (2015) cannot be generalized and not true in all cases, as Nigeria was not one of the nations under investigation. The current research will fill this gap by investigating CSE as a poverty alleviation mechanism in Nigeria. A very recent research study was carried out in Lagos State in Nigeria by Obamuyi & Fapetu (2016) with regards to poverty alleviation, using methods such as foreign aid. In fact Obamuyi & Fapetu (2016) recommended that governments should strengthen institutions such as CSEs to ensure that adequate training centres are provided to accommodate those who are willing to undergo training and skills development. Many academics have researched poverty alleviation. For example, Mohamed and Xavier (2015) investigated poverty alleviation strategies using an economic model. Iqbal et al. (2015) studied poverty alleviation through microcredit. Adiyia et al. (2015) investigated poverty alleviation through tourism and employment. Gbenga investigated poverty alleviation through irrigation and income. Idris and Agbim (2015) researched poverty alleviation through the financing of women entrepreneurs. Edet (2015) researched institution and capacity building for poverty alleviation. Abula and Adebayo (2016) investigated poverty alleviation through the effectiveness of monetary and fiscal policies. Hassan (2015) researched using GDP for poverty alleviation. There have been many other studies relating to the field of poverty alleviation, but none have attempted to investigate collectivism as a poverty alleviation mechanism. Therefore this research will investigate collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria and therefore fill this
gap and contribute significantly to the field of entrepreneurship. Previous studies have not considered a mix methodology to establish an empirical evidence in poverty alleviation as this research will fill this gap.

It is therefore imperative to investigate and survey variables that have not been represented in the literature, in order to effectively alleviate poverty in Nigeria. It is also important to close this gap found in the literature so that empirical evidence can be established. In chapter three of this research, a diagrammatic conceptual framework has been depicted to reflect the argument of this research which literature has not recognized. The argument is that CSE can be used as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria, which is a major contribution of this research work. The position of this research also illustrates the gap in the knowledge and the literature that this study intends to fill, thus providing a focus of the research.

2.12 Literature review search strategy
The term social entrepreneur is not new but it became popular in research in the 2000s, after the publication of “The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur” by Charles Leadbeater (Lai, 2016). Social entrepreneurs focus on addressing social impact in society (Windrum et al., 2016). The term social entrepreneurship was first used in the literature in 1953 by H. Bowen when he wrote the book “Social Responsibility of the Businessman”. The concept became widespread in the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s (Higginbotham, 2016).

For this study, the researcher searched through the length and breadth of the social entrepreneurship literature using keywords to establish the originality of this work, but found none that investigate CSE as a poverty alleviation mechanism. There are literatures on poverty alleviation, but none has investigated CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. A search was carried out back to the year 1980 using search criteria such as entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, collective social entrepreneurship, strategy, collaborations, collaborative, alleviate, poverty, Nigeria and investigation. These keywords were searched for in different research databases, such as google scholar, EBSCO publishing, ProQuest, African Journal Online, Elsevier, JSTOR, Reed Elsevier, Mendeley, Springer and Wiley, but no research on CSE collaborations and strategies to alleviate poverty in Nigeria was found.
2.13 Conclusion

This chapter has examined in detail the concept and nature of entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship and collective social entrepreneurship within an organizational context. It has also looked at the different forms of collaboration, such as cooperatives, alliances, joint ventures and licensing agreements. It was noted that the nature of CSE can be either within the same sector or cross sector. The insight generated from the literature has helped to achieve objective one of the study. Collective social entrepreneurship was examined and linked to the theoretical underpinnings of the Resource Based View (RBV), Resource Mobilization Theory (RMT) and the Vicious Cycle of Poverty. Furthermore, this chapter enumerated the various concepts associated with CSEs, such as innovation, organization and structure. It also looked at the various forms of collaboration and the strategies adopted by CSEs to alleviate poverty. Finally, the gap in the literature was identified, and it was clear that previous study has omitted an investigation into CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty with Nigeria. Existing research has identified the cooperative as a form of collaboration, but the idea of the cooperative and other forms of collaborations and strategies have not been conceptualized and the extent by which cooperative organizations can reduce poverty is not known, which this research has also found. The following chapter will look at the variables identified for this study and their relationship to form the conceptual framework.
3.0 Introduction

The conceptual framework of this study emerged out of a critical analysis of the existing literature on poverty alleviation strategies. A list of variables has been identified based on common observations and secondary research. The figure below illustrates the emergent conceptual framework.

Figure 3.1. A conceptual framework: CSEs vs poverty alleviation.

Source: Author
The central focus of this framework is the CSEs, who collaborate and formulate strategies to address the problem of poverty. This framework has been constructed by drawing from several variables; one dependent variable (poverty alleviation) and two independent variables (collaboration and strategy). The two independent variables have sub-elements, namely, Licensing arrangements, Joint ventures, Cooperative, Alliances, Framing, Convensing, Multivocality and Product development. Two of the factors that characterized collective social entrepreneurship are strategy and collaboration (Jolly et al., 2015). CSEs formulate strategies and collaborate to address the problem of poverty. Poverty alleviation is the goal of the CSEs and, in order to achieve this, there is strategy and collaboration. The organizational structure and framework of CSEs results in the nature of the strategy formulation and the implementation of collective organizations. CSE collaboration and a well implemented strategy will translate into poverty reduction through income generation, employment creation, training, education, welfare, consumption, and knowledge transfer and skills development (measurement of poverty). Poverty alleviation is also influenced by gender, income, belief and educational background (Chandra, 2016).

Each of the key variables, as depicted in Figure 3.1, is discussed in turn.

3.1 Collaboration

Collaboration and strategy are the two factors that help in collective social entrepreneurship (Jolly et al., 2015). Strategy formulations, along with collective organization implementation, are a result of the CSE framework and organizational structure. On the other hand, for successful strategy implementation, organization fostering policies along with institutional framework policies are required for regulating any organization and industry. The most common examples are tax structure, access to capital, competition policies, start-up policies, minimum wage policies, along with safety, health and environmental policies. Strategy implementation will result in the reduction of poverty by income generation, creation of employment, education, training, knowledge transfer and skill development, along with the welfare of the society. Alleviation of poverty depends on income, belief, gender and educational background (Chandra, 2016). The sub-elements of collaboration, as depicted in Figure 3.1, are discussed in turn.
3.1.1 Cooperatives
Cooperative societies have been claimed to have an impact on the employment levels within both developing and underdeveloped nations (Wanyama et. al., 2009; Melton et. al., 2016). As stated by Binder and Sautter (2006) and Schamel et. al. (2015), there are three prominent ways in which such societies can have a positive contribution towards employment generation. Firstly, by providing direct employment to those personnel running these organizations. Secondly, by creating more opportunities in those government and non-government bodies that provide support services to such organizations. Thirdly, by virtue of the spillover effect. This could be in the form of related industries, departments or bodies whose income comes in the form of a transactional relationship with these cooperative bodies. It is interesting to note that the direct form of employment contributes the least percentage to the overall employment generated (Aremu & Adeyemi, 2011). On the other hand, spillover and indirect employment have a greater share, as a substantial number of people find themselves benefiting from these activities and transactions. Fidelis et al. (2015) claimed that cooperatives in Nigeria are instituted only to address members’ problems and have not been able to address the problems of poverty effectively.

3.1.2 Licensing arrangements
Licensing is the method by which an organization allows the usage of its technological processes by another organization for entering a new business market (Massey et. al., 2015). The idea behind licensing is to allow an initial access to the supporting infrastructure to initiate the business. For an organization that does not have the resources and time to spend on research and development activities, licensing serves as the right kind of tool to develop a necessary background competency for executing a business plan (Albers et. al., 2015). It also serves as an additional source of income for the organization that owns the technology, so that it can earn in the form of licence fees charged (Kock & Have, 2016). The formation of a licensing arrangement requires a series of processes and formalities between the licensor and the licensee (Dauletshina, 2015).

3.1.3 Joint ventures
A joint venture is a form of business arrangement in which two or more parties come together to design strategies, create common agendas and indulge in collaborative decision making (Verschoore et. al., 2015). Joint ventures can be of two major types. The first form of joint ventures is known as “Specialization Based Ventures”. In these ventures, each of the partners tries to leverage on his core competency (Reuer & Devarakonda, 2016). For example, while
one of the partners may be better at manufacturing, the other might have a strong marketing channel (Christ & Nicolaou, 2016). According to the value chain partnership model proposed by Kanter (1994) the merging of skills and expertise is a crucial tool in order to gain better control of the value chain and business processes (Reuer & Devarakonda, 2016). The ultimate end users are interested in the best possible solution and the merging of competencies serves to strengthen the hold on customers (Christ & Nicolaou, 2016). However, there should exist a mutual need, whereby both organizations should demonstrate adequate levels of commitment towards executing the relationship.

The second form of joint ventures is “Shared Value Adding Ventures”. These ventures have a greater level of participation and they generally work together to design, produce and market the product jointly. Such forms of ventures show a high level of organizational synchronization and coherence (Albers et al., 2015). Joint venture is becoming more popular in Nigeria, but the rate of failure of the joint venture is high, and in some cases the joint venture fails before the project is completed (Williams & Vonortas, 2015).

3.1.4 Alliances
An alliance is an association of organizations formed for the mutual benefit of the members (Christ & Nikolaou, 2016). As stated by Mourdoukoutas (1999), collective entrepreneurship creates abundant opportunities for entrepreneurs within an industry. These entrepreneurs may be in the form of suppliers, distributors, retailers or manufacturers within the industry with a new idea or innovation in their part of the value chain (Mourdoukoutas & Papadimitriou, 2002; Cantele et al., 2016). The process of entrepreneurial network development requires that organizations come together and bring ideas collectively towards business value development (Haugh & Talwar, 2016). Battistella et al. (2015) described alliance as a collaborative strategy. The process of collective entrepreneurship can comprise of both same sector and cross sector collaborations. Same sector collaborations may include trade associations, networks, supply agreements, etc. Some of the methods might be informal, based on trust and understanding, apart from those based on formal contracts (Montgomery et al., 2012; Loebbecke et al., 2016).

According to Zucchella and Magnani (2016), personal networking is also a form of collective entrepreneurship. An emerging entrepreneur may make use of personal networking to gain greater access to financial capital. As stated by Wang et al. (2016), networking is the core component for the development of collective entrepreneurship because it helps entrepreneurs to find like-minded people with common goals, objectives or structures. Social entrepreneurs
are forming alliances in different ways but the individual SEs could lose some degree of control over how their enterprise is run and managed (Gursoy et al., 2015).

3.2 Poverty alleviation

Poverty is essentially a multidimensional attribute and does not have a standard definition (Gbenga et al., 2013). It is believed to be a situation whereby low income leads to low consumption and the inability to satisfy daily needs (Mohamed & Xavier, 2015). Individuals suffering from poverty struggle to provide shelter, education, health facilities and basic security for themselves and their family members (Qi & Tang, 2015). The same concept has been stressed by Aida Idris (2011), who believes that poverty is a function of demographic variables, such as education, child mortality, health, etc., and that the lack of the above parameters creates poverty in the first place. In a similar vein, the World Bank (2014) suggests that poverty is a state of the short-term deprivation of basic human needs. Almost all definitions stress the economic, social and psychological incapacitation that individuals suffering from poverty tend to face (Santos, 2012). Abubarkar (2012) argued that the alleviation of poverty requires the consideration of such factors as increased income, education and training, employment creation and business opportunities, welfare and standard of living, skills development, savings and investment.

Poverty alleviation is the reduction of the level of poverty (Mohammed & Mohamed, 2015). African poverty programmes have been functioning on a 20-point approach system (Zindiye & Mwangolela, 2007). Such a system has been quite productive for small and medium enterprises in the long run. The key features within the 20-point approach include financial capital outlay, technology upscaling, human resource development, knowledge management, women and youth development, etc. This approach has contributed towards social and economic progress in the region. It has helped in creating more employment opportunities, increased means of livelihood, better management of skilled resources and better per capita income (Zindiye & Mwangolela, 2007; Alix-Garcia et al., 2015). According to Ofori (2008), entrepreneurial initiatives have been largely responsible for eradicating poverty and creating wealth in the region of Ghana. Chen et al. (2015) state that there should be initiatives towards promoting CSE activities in the region. It would require regional, national and international bodies coming together to build comprehensive plans. The same has been echoed by Saraiva (2016), who state that micro-entrepreneurship and the ease of availability of microfinance are the areas that should be looked into the most. A sustainable development plan would mean
that job creation could be promoted by investing in skill development. The wages of people can be increased by helping them to improve their employability (Ofori, 2008; Idris & Yusuf, 2016).

Meanwhile, Mulloth et al. (2016) and Adiyia et al. (2016) mentioned that promoting CSEs will help in poverty reduction at local and national level. It has to be part of a comprehensive plan for raising the standard of living of the population. According to Edet (2015), the concept of sustainable micro-entrepreneurship is a development process combining the three aspects of microfinance, CSEs and sustainability. Abubarkar (2012) and Gbenga et al. (2015) mentioned that there are variables that can be used to measure the rate and level of poverty in any economy, such as increased income, employment creation, business opportunities, attracting investors, training received, level of education, welfare, level of consumption, skills development, standard of living, level of savings, amount of investment and good health. Poverty can be reduced through the development of productive enterprise, which provides an adequate income for the entrepreneurs and the employees (Ofori, 2008; Idris & Agbin, 2015). Low productivity can limit wages and income, and reduces the overall viability of an enterprise (Oyediran et al., 2015; Habib & Jubb, 2015; Kasali et al., 2015).

Table 3.1. Poverty trend in Nigeria, 1980-2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poverty incidence %</th>
<th>Estimated population (in millions)</th>
<th>Population in poverty (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>39.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>67.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>126.3</td>
<td>112.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>112.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>186.2</td>
<td>124.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The National Bureau of Statistics (2016) reports that the Nigerian population has risen to 186.2 million as at 2015, poverty incidence is at 75.2% and about 124 million people live in poverty. This record calls for the need to examine and investigate possible solutions to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.
## 3.3 Strategy

Strategy refers to the scope and direction of an enterprise over a long period of time, which is achieved through a combination of resources within a challenging environment (Peterson, 2015). To achieve the long-term goals of CSEs, they need to formulate strategies within the challenging environment. Butler (2016) suggest that strategy establish a plan of action for the future, determining the nature of product and services to launch in the market and how. The nature of strategy is such that if give organizations direction and determine the scope of future course of action over a long term, which matches the resources of the organization with the changing environment (Peterson, 2015; Graham & Hede, 2016).

### 3.3.1 Framing

Framing is the process in which ideas are interpreted and social constructions are made (Redman, 2013; Udende, 2014). Framing allows change to be mobilized in order for collective action to be taken (Benford & Snow, 2000; Choong, 2016). Collective actions are the key driving force for a social movement organization (Wright, 2011). The idea behind framing is to give an individual the basic idea for interpretation. It can be used to bring together strategic resources and mobilize towards the attainment of strategic objectives (Algar-Faria, 2014).

The theory of social movement refers to a process called the “Framing Process”, through which ideas can be socially constructed after being interpreted properly (German et al., 2016). This will finally give rise to the mobilization of the collected resources, which will ultimately result in collective action (Isidor et al., 2015). Benford and Snow (2000) and Prange and Mayrhofer, (2015) suggest that collective actions help to organize beliefs and thus help in the process of working towards a common objective. Framing helps each and every protagonist to identify their individual objectives and thereby identify their goals, which will ultimately unite to form the greater strategic objective (Monios & Bergqvist, 2015; Wang et al, 2016).

In order to publicize movements and to recruit adherents, the movements also sometimes use the framing objectives (Spekkink, 2015). Framing is also being used to change or to transform notions from the old cultural perspectives to new perspectives. Communication
plays an important role in putting forward these ideas (Benford & Snow, 2000; Andrews et al., 2015).

Previous studies on framing focus on social movements (Udende, 2014; Algar-Faria, 2014), but it is to be understood that framing is by no means only used for movements. It is a tool that enables movements as well as collective actions (Baker, 2016). Thus, framing plays an important role in collaborating and bringing both the internal and external stakeholders to a common platform (Baker, 2016), and thereby impacting the perceptions of the common people (Ankrah & Omar, 2015). The framing process helps to clearly build the underlying objective so that it can be communicated to the related stakeholders effectively and with ease. The Frame Resonance principle is the main core principle used to communicate the ideas to the public and to the other related parties (Kumar et al., 2015; Ruiz-Ballesteros & Caceres-Feria, 2016). Thus by using framing resonant principles, the actors should be able to build their credibility and develop a common understanding so that the ideas for collaboration could be successfully translated (Lee, 2015; Ruiz-Ballesteros & Caceres-Feria, 2016). Achieving social missions through framing could be time consuming, as framers need time to conceptualize the ideals and deliver them to the stakeholders (Choong, 2016).

3.3.2 Convening

The coming together of different organizations is important in achieving the collaborative mission (Pan, 2013). De Bakker (2016) share the view that there are various problems in both inter- and intra-organizational domains. Such problems usually need a convenor who can understand the complexity behind the operations. By collaborating, knowledge sharing and expertise development, convenors can help to bridge the gaps existing between organizational functions. On many occasions, collective thinking helps to generate innovative solutions and intelligence (Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016). A convenor operates during three stages of problem solving. The first stage is when fellow entrepreneurs create the supportive environment for complex problem solving (Dorado, 2006). The second is when an obstacle is identified and expert advice is being sought. Third is when interpersonal trust-based relationships call for convenors to intervene (Frynas & Stephens, 2015). Convening can also be a multiparty operation, whereby a platform can be created to share crucial information and facilitate cross-boundary thinking (Dahan et al., 2010; Scheneider et al., 2016). Convening strategy could be very effective, but the drawback is that members with different objectives and ideas could express different views on the same subject and this
might cause setbacks and delays in decision making (Cacciatore et al., 2016).

3.3.3 Multivocality
The most commonly available literature on social movements discusses the role of collective actions and institutional changes in gathering numerous voices on one platform (Knorringa, 2014). According to Hemmati and Rogers, (2015), institutions tend to have diverse perspectives, skill sets, attitudes and alliances, and hence social movements create a platform for unifying the multivocal nature of these attitudes. The diverse institutions are in the form of government, educational institutions, social enterprises and other local bodies (Fowler & Biekart, 2013). Multimodality is the process in which a combination of these individual voices is used to communicate with stakeholders and audiences (Carolan 2008; Montgomery et al., 2012; Breeman et al., 2015). It helps to build connections with diverse communities simultaneously (Pacheco, 2004). Multivocality is one of the key premises in encouraging social entrepreneurship and is called the ‘Scaling up strategy’ (Bardhan, 2014). Again, a drawback in multivocality is that members with different objectives and ideas could express different views on the same subject and this might cause setbacks and delays in decision making (Cacciatore et al., 2016).

3.3.4 Product development
Porter (1996), in his work “What is Strategy”, argued that companies must choose between low cost and differentiation or they are at risk of being “stuck in the middle”. He further argued that, rather than choose between the two strategies, companies should look to create greater value by using different sets of activities. This could involve using both strategies (Dayan et al., 2016; Elvers & Song, 2016).

In the 1960s Igor Ansoff developed a model describing the alternative directions of development. The model looked at combinations of existing and new products and markets. He identified four alternatives: market penetration, market development, product development and diversification (Tajvidi & Karami, 2015; Durkin et al., 2016; Ciarapica et al., 2016). Identifying the needs of some groups of people and delivering their needs is a challenge to CSEs (Beisheim & Liese, 2016). To be able to develop a product, CSEs have to engage with those at the grass roots who are the beneficiaries of poverty alleviation (Beisheim & Liese, 2016).
3.4 Collective social entrepreneurs (CSEs)

Collective social entrepreneurship is the idea of different social entrepreneurs coming together to address social issue(s) (Kania & Kramer, 2013; Smith & Woods, 2015). The nature of the social problems are such that it becomes extremely difficult for the individual actors to solve the problems individually, rather the collaboration of different actors is required at different levels across different industries and competencies in order to tackle the complications (Tan et al., 2015). CSEs as an organization have structures and these are discussed below:

3.4.1 Organizational structure
The structure of an organization defines the hierarchy within the organization. The structure identifies the different positions and functions and it defines who reports to who (Biemans et al., 2016). The structure helps to define how the organization operates and the relationship between the various functions. The structure of the organization can influence the objective either positively or negatively (Kach et al., 2015).

3.4.2 Matrix organizational structure
The matrix structure of an organization comprises of both a vertical as well as a horizontal reporting framework. Such a structure ensures that employees are part of a dedicated function along with an individual project (Van de Ven, 2005; Kach et al., 2015).

3.4.3 Functional structure
A functional structure is that in which individuals, teams or members are segregated based on the nature of the function that they perform. For example, the most common functions within an enterprise are: human resource management, financial management, sales, marketing, sourcing and procurement, etc. These functions may exist as separate departments having separate heads (Van de Ven, 2005; Kach et al., 2015). Although these departments operate individually, they also collaborate through common heads or teams if required.

3.4.4 Product structure
A product structure is such that individual departments exist based on the product or service lines. Individual department heads are responsible for managing the operations of an entire product (Webb, 2016). The product department will comprise of members of all other related functions, such as sales, marketing, finance, human resource management, etc. Such a structure is needed when individual products need a high degree of attention (Jonsson, 1995; Webb, 2016).
3.4.5 Customer structure
An organization is said to be using a customer structure when the departments are arranged keeping in mind customer needs (Jonsson, 1995; Ocasio & Radoynovska, 2016). A classic example of this kind of structure is that in healthcare. The needs of outpatients are completely different from those of inpatients. Similarly, chronic care needs are different from the needs of general patients.

3.4.6 Geographic structure
An organization is said to follow a geographic based structure when its departments are arranged to fulfil the needs of customers of individual geographies (Johannisson, 2004; Ocasio & Radoynovska, 2016). For example, the requirements of customers from urban locations might be different from those of rural customers. The idea behind following a geographic structure is to allow for the effective customization of products and services based on the tastes and preferences of individual customers (Johannisson, 2004; Johnson et al., 2011).

3.4.7 Centralization and decentralization
A centralization based structure within an organization is that in which there is a definite flow of authority. It is essentially a hierarchical structure, in which top management take most of the decisions (Johnson et al., 2011), although individual departments may be responsible for executive functions (Marume & Jubenkanda). Under a decentralized based structure, individual departments have a high level of flexibility or decision-making power. Such a structure does not encourage strict hierarchy (Johnson et al., 2011). A centralized structure may be favourable in businesses where a high level of standardization is required. On the other hand, those jobs requiring high creativity may encourage decentralization in the structural arrangement.

3.5 Factors impacting successful collective entrepreneurship
A number of factors can be said to contribute towards the success of collective entrepreneurship. Some of the key factors are discussed below (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992; Mulloth et al., 2016).

3.5.1 Membership
Collective entrepreneurship depends to a large extent on the contributing members. The competency of partners, their skill levels (Huxham, 1996; Chandra et al., 2016), vision and contribution towards the platform (Bergquist et al., 1995; Bonfanti et al., 2016), are some of
the factors that determine the success of the entrepreneurship. Incompetent partners may not have the resources or expertise to contribute more towards the entrepreneurship. As stated by Gray (1989), a high level of member involvement is needed towards planning and designing as well as implementing solutions. According to De Bruin and Lewis (2015), trust between the contributing members plays a crucial role in determining the success of the entrepreneurial arrangement. Successful collectivism would not only require competency, but also a dedication towards respecting the interests of other team members, suppliers or partners (Littlewood & Holt, 2015).

3.5.2 Purpose
Collective entrepreneurship can attain success when the purpose and vision is streamlined with the objectives (Morgan, 2016). The alliances should work towards defining the problems and identifying the goals of the entrepreneurship plan (Bergquist et al., 1995; Semali, 2015). The success of a CSE would depend on whether the purpose it initially outlined and the strategic steps taken are defined in the right direction (Cropper, 1996; Tan et al., 2015; Akemu et al., 2016).

3.5.3 Process
The role of a defined process is to provide efficiency of collectivism (Bergquist et al., 1995; Kanter, 1994; De Sousa & Docuyanan, 2016). It is important to understand that, in the absence of a defined process, the collaborative efforts may not be able to attain their objectives (Gray, 1996; Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016). When working on a collective entrepreneurship framework, the role of a process framework is to lay down the policy guidelines, define the roles, elaborate on the expected outcomes and provide promises (Haugh & Talwar, 2016). The idea behind defined processes is to lay down a mechanism for defining accountability, providing commitments and better relationship management (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992; Si et al., 2015; Pink & White, 2016).

In order to ensure that efficient processes exist, researchers have focused on the significance of effective management and coordination (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992). Gray (1996) and Jolly and Raven (2015) state that, taking the example of skilled labourers in an industry, dynamics of power are important for defining processes and ensuring adherence to the same. The stakeholders must define the stages in which power would be used during problem solving (Bergquist, et al., 1995; Jolly & Raven, 2015). Problem setting would involve a process in which resources would convene and shape the right agenda. This phase would also involve adequate information sharing. The implementation phase would involve administrative actions, where influence and power would be exercised.
3.5.4 Communications
Successful collectivism would also require that an open and frequent communication process be established (Kanter, 1994; Moshtari, 2016). Powell et al. (1996) and Gustafsson and Wihlborg (2016) believe that communication is a common pitfall when it comes to management within collectivism. Obstacles for communication may be either physical or virtual in nature. Physical communication obstacles exist where no channels or mediums are defined for the exchange of information. Virtual communication obstacles exist when the structure itself is such that communication is not encouraged (Paturas et al., 2016). As stated by Gray (1996) and Martin et al. (2016), lack of communication is the reason behind the presence of goal conflicts within collectivism. Regular interaction and well-defined communication mediums help to ensure that information flow is consistent in the entire process.

3.5.5 Funds
Securing the right amount of funds is an important prerequisite for providing support to these collaborations (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992; Vidovic et al., 2015; Tan et al., 2015). Most of the time, only the costs to be incurred during the start-up phase are taken into consideration, while the developmental costs are mostly ignored (Werner & Bremer, 1992; Mueller et al., 2015). Therefore, while planning for a collectivism driven venture it is important to define the mechanism by which funds would be procured and the process by which they would be allocated, as this will determine the success of the CSE (Bonfanti et al., 2016). These are also the areas of potential future conflicts (Bergquist et al., 1995, Smith & Woods, 2015). It is important that each member makes the right kind of contribution within the defined collaborative environment. Adequate levels of trust and commitment can be built by ensuring transparency in the allocation and management of funds. As stated by Evan & Olk (1990), members are required to make their contributions based on their current size and the relative benefits expected. Those with greater contributions can be said to have a higher influence in the decision-making process (Gray, 1989; Paturas et al., 2016). Sufficient numbers of resources should be present in order to provide the necessary support and participation (Smith & Woods, 2015).
3.6 Innovation

Innovation is the process of continuous evolution or development within processes or products (Alden Rivers et al., 2015). An individual entrepreneur may not be capable of creating a significant difference due to limited resources, skills or experience. On the other hand, collective entrepreneurship helps in the creation of radical innovation by allowing for a common platform for collaboration (Roberts & King, 1996; Elmes et al., 2016).

Van Der Have and Rubalcaba (2016) posited that the process of innovation comprises of both an individual as well as a collective dimension. Similarly, Sydow et al. (2004) stated that economic development requires that both dimensions of innovation must be in place. During their entrepreneurial journey, organizations need to create the right kind of legitimate power along with the resources and services. Any kind of change within an industry comes through a process of innovation with regard to the nature of the product, the quality of the services, or by collective development created by entrepreneurs (Van de Ven, 2005, p.365; Phillips et al., 2015). The same has been stressed by Montgomery et al. (2012), who state that portfolio expansion within an industry is a direct outcome of the collective efforts of its players. Van de Ven (2005) and Iwasaki et al. (2015) stated that collective entrepreneurship may also require that collaboration be undertaken with competitors, industry partners or other members within the network. Such a move may be indispensable within a highly competitive market scenario (Idris, 2011). Technological upgrading is no longer a slow, gradual process and organizations need to devise the right kind of strategies to identify areas in which mutual collaboration can be achieved. The focus of the members within a collective entrepreneurship framework should be on institutional factors that promote innovation. It helps them in building up greater competency, both at an individual as well as a collective level in the industry (Iwasaki et al., 2015).

3.7 Role of the social entrepreneur in CSE strategy

As stated by Morgan (2016), entrepreneurs in CSE should always plan in such a way that a high level of flexibility and adaptability exists within the collectivism framework. The social entrepreneur plays a strategic role in decision making and strategy formulation, as well as implementation (Baron, 2016). The personal orientation, goals and traits of the entrepreneurs will impact on the strategy (Berry, 1998; Hooshangi & Loewenstein, 2016). In some cases, the leadership style and orientation of the SE plays a major part in the
decision-making process. Social entrepreneurs also have to define their strategic option and the mode of implementation. The entry strategies of the CSE are important as they form a basis for gaining advantage in the market (Vracheva et al., 2016). The position of the organization in the market affects its performance. According to generic strategies by Porter (1985) and Vracheva et al. (2016), three options exist for most firms within the market in which they operate:

- Cost leadership based strategy, whereby the start-up focuses on providing the lowest possible cost in the existing markets and products.
- Differentiation strategy, whereby the start-up has one or more unique offerings or services.
- Niche market based strategy, whereby a small section of customers are focused upon in order to cater to their unique needs.

From the foregoing, Nigerian SEs will decide on their entry strategies in order to achieve their long-term goals.

3.8 Concluding remarks: Conceptual framework

One of the major challenges faced by Nigerians is the problem of poverty. It is revealed from the literature that the problem of poverty is a root cause of corruption and economic stagnation. Despite programmes that have been evolved to eradicate poverty, the problems still persist. Therefore, there is a need to investigate CSEs as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. A conceptual framework has been developed in this chapter by looking at the different variables that can translate into poverty alleviation and the theories that underpin poverty alleviation in Nigeria. The next chapter will review the research methods and the research procedure in order to achieve the objectives highlighted in Chapter one of this study.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the research methodology. The chapter is divided into four main sections. The first section outlines the overall aims and objectives of this study. The second section details the development and construction of the research instruments, such as the interview and questionnaire. The third section deals with the sampling procedure, data collection and the statistical techniques used for the data analysis; the research philosophy, approach and strategy will also be considered. The fourth section details ethical issues relating to the conduct of the research within the context of the study and the country of the study. This study adopts a pragmatic philosophy, as the research takes both the positivist position and the interpretive position based on the philosophical assumptions they underpin, to aid in answering the research questions. Because of the complex nature of this study, there is no single research paradigm that can satisfactorily deal with the methodological phases. Therefore, a combination of a positivistic / quantitative paradigm has been used with an interpretive / qualitative paradigm. This kind of blending helps the researcher to establish a deeper understanding of the phenomena under investigation, thus creating a better understanding of the complex emotional and psychological factors that influence CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

4.1 Research Philosophy

Research philosophy is the world view or the system of belief that guides researcher in the right direction (Johnson et al., 2007, Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The interpretive and positivist line of enquiry is deemed fit for this study after considering the research aim and objectives, research questions and the hypothesis. The rational for the interpretive and positivist philosophy is that it helps understands CSE collaborations as a strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. The chosen philosophy will allow the interaction between the objects of investigation and the investigator as this will help gain a deeper comprehension (Easterby-smith et al., 2012).

4.1.1 Interpretive research

An interpretive methodology allows the development of the qualitative data and uses methods such as interviews (Manly et al., 2007). An interpretive research approach was
adopted in order to allow the researcher to maintain a close contact with participants, help to interpret their realities and get an understanding of the practices of the organizations (Jackson, 2016). Moreover, interpretive research also helps to understand the complex nature of social entrepreneurship (Smith, 2015). From the interpretive perspective, this study used a multidisciplinary approach to investigate CSEs, such as economics, sociology, organizational behaviour and entrepreneurship. More important is the fact that interpretive research allows data gathering from different respondents, such as employers and employees of the CSEs, in the context of this study. Interpretive research provides the opportunity to capture the experiences of the actors involved in CSEs and their target beneficiaries. Using interpretive research, such as semi-structured in-depth interviews, allowed the views and experiences of different stakeholders to be gathered and analyzed to develop a deeper understanding of the nature of CSEs. This approach is consistent with Caillaud (2016), when they suggest that interpretive research provides an explanation and mission of CSEs as a tool for poverty alleviation. In a similar vein, interpretive research has previously been used in SE studies, for instance, an empirical study carried out by Ayegba (2015) to examine unemployment and poverty as sources and consequences of insecurity in Nigeria. As such, my approach is consistent with previous studies.

4.1.2 Positivist research

This approach is regarded as a scientific approach because the methods used are organized, measurable and quantitative. The positivist believes that they are separated from the environment of the research. They see themselves as outsiders looking in on to the research and not having any relationship with the area of the research, i.e. independent of the research. For the positivist, the objective of the research is to form an explanation rather than an understanding. This form of research is objective with no personal bias that could affect the result of the study. The data collected is measurable, i.e. it uses numerical data, also known as quantitative data.

The interpretive researchers consider themselves to be within the research circle, interpreting the world around them. Considering the characteristics of both interpretive and positivist perspectives, the researcher decided to use both approaches. A mixed method research uses both qualitative and quantitative methods to elicit data and analyze data. The researcher adopts both quantitative and qualitative methods, tries to understand the nature of SEs and CSEs by maintaining a close contact with the participants uses both interview and questionnaire for data collection, and uses multiple regression and NVIVO for data analysis.
With this approach, the researcher is able to investigate CSEs as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Carrying out this research within Nigeria is a major contribution of this study, as previous empirical researches in such fields have been conducted in Anglo Saxon countries, such as the USA (Short et., 2009); New Zealand (Tapsell & Woods, 2010); Australia (Nourafrouz, 2016) and the United Kingdom (Bridgstock et al., 2010).

4.2 Research strategy

Research strategy can be refer to the process used to collect empirical data in a research study and this is influenced by the objectives of the researcher and the topic under investigation (Au et al., 2016). According to Yin (2003), the nature of research questions will influence the research study. Of these research strategies, stratified sampling was found to most suitable for the nature of this research. Also, the strategy is chosen because it is most associated with mix method research approach which this study adopts (Yin, 2003).

4.3 Mixed method research

Mixed method research joins both the quantitative and qualitative methods of investigation. Quantitative research focuses on numerical data and analyses, while qualitative research focuses on narrative data and analyses (Valerie et al., 2010). Mixed method research approach is able to provide more comprehensive for investigating research problem than either qualitative or quantitative research alone (Valerie et al., 2010). The use of mixed methods approach provides strengths that offset the weaknesses of both qualitative and quantitative research. It helps to answer the questions that cannot be answered by qualitative and quantitative research alone. Mixed methods help to understand the mind-set, perspective and the emotions of the CSE operatives in relation to poverty alleviation.

Consequently, the following arguments support the choice of a mix method research strategy necessary for this thesis: (1) the facts gathered from the literature and the theoretical framework of this study. Only a mixed method approach can really deduce understanding and explain the roles of the actors (in this case CSE employers and employees) and the level of interaction among them. This kind of understanding cannot be possible if applying a single technique or single approach. (2) To investigate CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria, an in-depth and holistic approach is needed to carry out such an investigation. This approach also captures the social demographic variable of the respondents, at the same time providing insights for further studies. However, if a quantitative approach is applied in this study, it will be difficult to capture these details. The
detailed information that is captured with this case study emphasizes it as a research strategy that focuses on understanding the dynamism within a single setting (Stangor & Walinga, 2010). It could also involve a multiple case, single case and numerous levels of analysis within a single study (Yin, 1993, 2009; Natee et al., 2016).

4.4 Data collection methods

In business and management research, the term data collection means the acquisition of data in quantitative and qualitative terms (Saunders et al., 2009). Qualitative and quantitative are used to differentiate data collection techniques and the procedure for data analysis (Yin, 2009). Quantitative is mostly used for data collection technique (such as questionnaire) or data analysis procedure (such as chart and graph) that generates numerical data (Saunders et al., 2012). Meanwhile, qualitative is mostly used for data collection techniques (such as interview) or data analysis procedure (such as categorizing data) that generates non numerical data (Saunders et al., 2012).

4.4.1 Population, sampling and data collection
As stated by Cottrell and McKenzie (2010), population refers to a target group of individuals who would be ideal for the research objective under consideration. For the purpose of this research, the population comprises of all the CSE organizations within the education and finance sectors in Lagos state of Nigeria. The sample includes the employers and employees of the twenty selected CSE organizations within the finance and education subsectors in Lagos state, Nigeria, as these sectors generate the highest number of CSEs in Lagos state and the number of CSEs in Lagos state represents about 50% of the total CSEs in Nigeria (Abubakar, 2012; Salami, 2016). The target group is the employees and employers of the CSE organizations located in Lagos state, Nigeria. According to Pruzan (2016), the research samples chosen should be highly representative of the population and this selection should preferably be free from any form of sampling bias. Therefore, the researcher adopts a disproportionate stratified sampling approach towards shortlisting the respondents for the survey. Disproportionate stratified sampling helps to get a true reflection of how the phenomenon under study occurs in its natural form, without trying to influence the outcome by choosing a biased sample. An unduly large and poor sample may fail to meet the research validity and credibility (Jackson, 2016). A probability based sampling technique can help to enforce the required level of discipline in shortlisting the participants for the primary interaction (Bryman, 2011).
4.4.2 Stratified sampling

Stratified sampling is a form of probability sampling where the population is divided into different subgroups or strata and a selected proportion is taken from different strata. Stratified sampling is used when it is necessary to highlight a specific subgroup within the population, when researchers want to observe the relationship between the subgroups (Pruzan, 2016). In this case, the researcher only considered Lagos state out of thirty-six states in Nigeria, even though Lagos state has the highest population. Only two subsectors were examined in Lagos state out of over twenty different sectors, which were the finance and education subsectors. In these two subsectors, only the social enterprise organizations that are collectives were examined.

4.4.3 Disproportionate stratified sampling

This is a sampling technique where the strata or subgroups have different sampling fractions, unlike the proportionate stratified technique that has proportional sampling from the various strata. The disproportionate sampling method divides the population into different strata and employs a sampling fraction that is not equal in all strata (Kazmi et al., 2016). This sampling method divides the population into subgroups or strata but employs a sampling fraction that is not similar for all strata; some of the strata are oversampled compared to others. The sampling method allows the researcher to give a larger representation to one or more strata to avoid under-representation of the strata (Kazmi et al., 2016). In this case, the sectors under investigation had disproportionate samples - nine (9) CSEs were selected from the education sector while eleven (11) were selected from the finance sector.

4.4.4 Justification for the chosen research sample

As stated earlier, the sample for this research was chosen on a disproportionate stratified sampling basis. Natee et al. (2016) argued that, when the selection of a sample requires that mutually exclusive and yet homogenous segments be created, then a stratified sampling approach can be the best option. By adopting this technique, the whole population is divided into various strata or segments and then sampling is applied on these individual segments or strata. Bryman (2011) and Smith (2015) state that disproportionate stratified sampling selection can help to bring about a balanced and fair representation of each segment in the finally chosen sample. Using the disproportionate stratified sampling of unequal allocation technique, specifically, an average of twenty (20) CSEs from two (2) different sectors of the economy, which has over two hundred (200) entrepreneurship and SE organizations, were selected for this study. This study considered the record of the Corporate Affair Commission
(CAC), who are responsible for registering all SE and CSE organizations, and the number of registered CSE organizations by sector are, namely, education (99) and finance (102) (Nigeria National Bureau of Statistics, 2016). From these figures, nine (9) CSEs were selected from the education sector while eleven (11) CSEs were selected from the finance sector, making a total of twenty (20) CSEs selected for this study, based on their size in terms of the number of employees and capital of the organization. For each of the selected organizations, 100 questionnaires were sent to education sector organizations, with 95 returned questionnaires, while 120 questionnaires were sent to the finance sector organizations, with 106 returned questionnaires. The criteria for determining sample size was studied by Cochran (1977) cited in Cohen et al. (2000) and Lodico et al. (2006). There is software for determining sample size (Morse, 1999) and spreadsheets that calculate sample size. In deciding the sample size of this study, the researcher considered the population under study, aim of the study, techniques for analysis, methodology, sample size in similar research and Yamane sample size determination, which is recommended in most social science research (Davies et al., 2004). However, a sample size of between 15 and 500 at 5% confidence level is sufficient for many researchers (Altunisik et al., 2004). The decision of sample size should reflect the quality of the sample and the population, which should be enough for generalization (Morse, 1991; Thomson, 2004). According to Davies et al. (2004), a single data collection methodology will need a larger sample size, and for a mixed method a smaller sample size is justified using the formula \( n_Y = \frac{N}{1+N^*x^2} \). Where \( n_Y \) is Yamane sample size, \( N \) is population, and \( x \) is error level. Based on the above factors and Yamane sample size calculation, the sample size of twenty selected CSE organizations for this study is justified for generalization and inference.
Table 4.1. Number of CSE registered organizations and sample selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered SE organizations</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample selected from each sector</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of questionnaires sent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of questionnaires retrieved</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author*

### 4.5 Recruitment of participants

Participants for this study were recruited and accessed through the Corporate Affairs Commission, Nigeria, which is the body responsible for the registration of all organizations in Nigeria, the Ministry of Statistics and the Nigerian yellow pages, which is a body for documenting information about all registered companies and relevant statistics in Nigeria. These organizations were contacted and told the purpose of my inquiries. The researcher obtained the list and contact details of CSEs in Nigeria from the records of these institutions, such as their email addresses and names of the organizations.

The selected CSEs were contacted through a non-disguised self-administered Likert scale questionnaire form of non-parametric data. The questionnaire that was employed for this study was divided into nine (9) sections, licensing agreement, cooperative, joint venture,
alliances, multivocality, convening, framing, product development and CSEs demography, with varying numbers of questions in each section. Section A: these questions are aimed at finding out whether the licensing agreement form of collaboration can reduce poverty. Section B: this section is aimed at finding out how joint venture as a collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty. Section C: this section is aimed at finding out how cooperatives as a collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty. Section D: this section aims at finding out how alliances as collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty. Section E: this section aims at finding out how framing strategy can be used to alleviate poverty. Section F: this section aims at finding out how the convening form of strategy can be used to alleviate poverty. Section G: this section aims at finding out how the multivocality form of SE strategy can be used to alleviate poverty. Section H: this section is on the product development form of strategy. Section I: this section aims at finding out background information about the SE organizations and their employees.

Questionnaires were created using a word document and distributed electronically on the survey website (Google form). Participants were also mailed the link to the survey on their individual corporate email addresses. See link on Appendix B.

**Interview** – the CSE employers and employees were contacted directly for interviews. The interview questions are to complement the questionnaire items.

### 4.6 Response rate

As previously stated, about eighty (80) email addresses were initially collated from CAC and the other one hundred and forty (140) were internally collated within the CSE organizations, making a total of two hundred and twenty (220) emails collated. The electronic online link and Word document copy were sent to the email addresses collated. A total of two hundred and one (201) returned the responses through the online link, representing a response rate of eighty-three per cent (83%). This response rate exceeded the fifty per cent margin that is adequate for analysis and reporting (Au et al., 2016).

Gale (2015) and Au et al. (2016) state that for any academic study involving both individuals as well as organizational representatives, achieving a response rate of greater than 50% is highly reasonable. The same has been stated by Babbie (2010), that for the data to be suitable for reporting and analysis, approximately a 50% response rate can be regarded to be fair and sufficient. A response rate between 50%-60% is regarded as very good, while a response rate
greater than 60% can be seen as excellent. In the context of this research, it was difficult to
determine the response rate of individual sources, primarily because an online method of
communication was used. By using the hyperlink, individual participants responded to the
survey and the sources of the responses were not a major consideration for the researcher.
What mattered in the end was the number of responses, which was good enough for the
research analysis and reporting to be done.

4.7 Questionnaire instrument

Questionnaire: a survey strategy to use questions to gather primary data. These sets of
questions are asked to the participants in a predetermined order (Bechhofer & Paterson, 2012)
and these questions are self-completed. The reason for self-completed questions for these
kinds of studies is that it allows access to a greater number of samples. Also, the response
rate is greater when compared to other methods. Again the limitation for self-completed
questionnaires is that open-ended questions will be limiting and collecting responses from the
respondents is time-consuming.

Questionnaires have proved to be one of the most cost-effective means of gathering data from
a large number of respondents. It is also an effective and efficient means of reaching a
diverse audience when reviewing a large sample. There are varying degrees of self-
administered questionnaires (Godvindan et al., 2016). A common form of questionnaire is the
postal questionnaire, which the internet and technology has made easier to use. Just as the
name suggests, the questionnaire is intended to be completed and returned to the researcher.
Bell and Wray-Bliss (2009) and Zikmund et al. (2012) said that questionnaires have their
advantages and disadvantages, which includes cost effectiveness, easy administration and
analysis through computer software packages. Questionnaires are also more convenient for
the respondents and allows them the opportunity to reflect and give thoughtful responses;
they are simple and fast to complete, and allow the respondent to provide answers more
willingly. More so, they also argued that questionnaires give easier access to the respondents
who are hard to reach, respondents can complete them at their own convenience and it
preserves confidentiality.

Bell and Wray-Bliss (2009); Zikmund et al. (2012) and Smith et al. (2016) also identified
some of the disadvantages of using questionnaires for data collection: the rate of recovery is
low and sometimes weak, the researcher has little or no control because he is not present, it is
more challenging when the question is open-ended and complex in nature, there could be errors during completion, the completion time could be lengthy, and some questions may be completed incorrectly. Despite the weaknesses of the questionnaire, it is still considered to be the most acceptable method in conducting research, and it is more convenient for the targeted sample for most research (Smith et al., 2016). In designing questionnaires, they can cover a wide range of questions, such as open-ended, Likert scale or multiple choice questions. When designing questionnaires, it is important to consider the following steps: define the objectives of the survey, determine the sample group, determine the best approach for administering the questionnaire among the other options and how best to interpret the result of the questionnaire. In this study, the researcher has defined the objective of the study and research sample, and the questionnaire was written, administered, and the result interpreted by the researcher. From the technical perspective of questionnaire design, the following should be given consideration (Best, 2016); clarity of the questions, avoiding asking hypothetical questions, and questions that have prestige bias. These factors were all considered when the researcher was designing the questionnaire.

4.7.1 Questionnaire design and interview guide

For the purpose of this research, the questionnaire and interview guide were designed to cover all aspects pertaining to the research objectives stated in Section 4.1. In order to get relevant information on collective social entrepreneurship, the guide was used as a sample listing from the informant perspective (Gleeson & O’Flaherty, 2016). The guide plays a major role in helping the researcher to get effective coverage of the interview questions. In this case, the guide (See Appendix B) was piloted and later amended as per the feedback obtained from peers and my supervisors from the university.

The questionnaire used for this research was amended after the pilot study phase was completed. Various aspects of the questions, such as terminology, style, information flow, etc., were revised to reflect the feedback obtained. The questions were made more comprehensive and easier for the respondents to understand. For example, a few questions on the structure of the organization and its hierarchy were amended. Similarly, questions such as ‘Do you think this collaboration is sustainable to be able to address poverty in Nigeria?’, ‘In your opinion what form of SEs strategy suitably addresses poverty reduction in Nigeria?’, ‘Framing strategy can be used to reduce poverty in Nigeria’, ‘Convening strategy could have an impact on poverty reduction in Nigeria’, ‘Multivocality can help CSE organization to achieve poverty alleviation mission in Nigeria’, ‘Product development as a strategy will
impact greatly on poverty reduction in Nigeria’ were all amended, simplified and the choice of options were modified to allow the respondents to respond easily after the pilot study phase. Most of the questionnaires were designed so that they could be easily modified at a later stage. A better understanding of the data collection process helps to refine the questions based on the exact needs (Eisenhardt, 1989; Smith et al., 2016).

The interview guide or the schedule was comprised of three distinct steps. In the first step, a short briefing was given on the background of the researcher, the objective of the project, confidentiality aspects of the information, the purpose and aim of the research, etc. The introductory phase also included a request for permission to use a tape recorder for data collection. Some general questions on the background of the informant were also included as a part of this phase. In the next step, called the development stage, the main sections of the research were included. It had the main body, mission, and the purpose. The last or closing phase was the one in which informants were asked to give a general feedback. This was followed by respondents giving a general recommendation on what more could be relevant for the research.

Table 4.2. Research methodology- data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Stage</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td></td>
<td>Likert scale (multiple choice)</td>
<td>Semi-structured in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose (For)</td>
<td></td>
<td>All the CSE employers and employees</td>
<td>All the CSE employers and employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of participants</td>
<td>Selected CSEs collated from:</td>
<td>Corporate Affairs Commission (CAC)</td>
<td>Corporate Affairs Commission (CAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Nigerian Yellow pages</td>
<td>The Nigerian Yellow pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria Bureau of Statistics</td>
<td>Nigeria Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of participants | 201 participants from both the education and finance sector | 20 participants from both the education and finance sector
Method of distribution | Email of hard copy and online link | Face-to-face

Source: Author

Table 4.3. Research methodology- data analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Analysis Stage</th>
<th>Analytical Tools</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Tool Used</th>
<th>Purpose (For)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptive Analysis</td>
<td>Tables, percentages and cross tabulation</td>
<td>SPSS for IBM version 21</td>
<td>Analyzing the responses of the CSE employers and employees, analyzing the social demographic variables of the respondents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
<td>Table, notes</td>
<td>NVIVO</td>
<td>Analyzing the effect of CSE collaboration on poverty alleviation. Analyzing the effect of CSE strategy on poverty alleviation. Analyzing the best poverty reduction strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Gaining access

For conducting any form of field work, whether quantitative or qualitative, gaining access is the first step (Best, 2016). Both formal as well as informal means can be adopted to gain access (Patton, 2006). In this case the researcher was able to gain an initial access through an informant, which was the social entrepreneur himself. The initial contact was done through emails, as this helps to build initial credibility (Johl & Renganathan, 2010; Taylor et al., 2015). Consent for a meeting was obtained and the gatekeepers were asked to identify other potential participants. The researcher contacted the organizations through telephone calls and emails prior to sending the questionnaires and conducting interviews. Introductory emails were sent by the author to the CSEs from the online directory of the CAC. Signed letters were sent from the PhD programme leader. The details of the research, objectives, background and mission were clarified. Gradually all consent was obtained from the relevant
CSEs. A strategy of openness was used, which helped to gain initial access (Govindan et al., 2016). The gatekeeper also gave relevant connections to reach out to others that were included in this research. Given the fact that this study also followed an interpretive approach, a diversity of perspectives was analyzed by contacting the available participants.

4.9 Justification of the study research instrument

The choice of research instrument is influenced by the nature of the research (Keutmann et al., 2015). This study uses a mixed method (questionnaire and interview). The choice of the research instrument is to enable the gathering of comprehensive evidence for analysis.

4.9.1 Questionnaire design
As mentioned above, the researcher took time to follow the technical requirements for designing a questionnaire. The questionnaire was piloted to help to avoid foreseeable errors caused by misunderstanding the questions in order to present a questionnaire with clarity (see Appendix F for the pilot questionnaire). After piloting the questionnaire, the researcher created an online link to the Likert scale questionnaire via the google domain (see Appendix B).

The choice of the online google form was to allow the researcher to receive immediate responses from the respondents as they replied to the questions, as well as for the convenience and cost. Internet coverage and connectivity is another reason for the choice of the online google form, as a wider population of Nigerians now have access to the internet (Abioro & Adefeso, 2016).

Also, the researcher further obtained the email addresses of the respondents through the CSE gateways and these email addresses were then sent a word document of the questionnaire alongside the online link for completion. Four days after the initial email was sent, a follow up email was sent twice as a reminder, in order to enhance the completion rate. After that, the researcher travelled back to the United Kingdom to commence data coding, classification and analysis. This was done using an Excel spreadsheet and IBM SPSS Statistics version 21. Prior to that, the researcher had attended various training on research methods and the use of statistical tools offered by the London School of Commerce, an associate college of Cardiff Metropolitan University.

On completion of the data analysis, the researcher then proceeded to the report writing stage. The questionnaire was designed in an electronic and paper format to adapt to the preference
of the respondents, thereby yielding a higher response rate than would be achieved when relying on a single response mode (Smith, 2015). The researcher projected two hundred (200) responses, but eventually collated two hundred and one (201) responses, thus justifying using two mediums of distribution (Schonlau et al., 2002; Keutmann et al., 2015). The email addresses of the potential respondents were collated from the CSE organizations and the online link was then sent to the email addresses. In total, about two hundred and twenty (220) addresses were collated from all the CSE organizations.

4.9.2 Research instrument
For the purpose of this research, and taking advantage of technology, the researcher used two main instruments: questionnaire (Likert scale type) and interview for the employers and employees of the CSE organizations under investigation. A mixed method enables the researcher to offset the weaknesses that are inherent in using either quantitative or qualitative methods. Also, it enables the researcher to gain in-depth knowledge of the nature of CSE strategies and collaboration in Nigeria. The database used for this study emanated from the Corporate Affairs Commission (CAC), the body responsible for all registered organizations in Nigeria.

4.9.3 The non-parametric analysis
Non-parametric statistics are a method that does not require fitting into a normal distribution. It uses data that is often ordinal in nature; this does not rely on numbers but rather it relies on ranking or sorts of order. It is based on parametrized data of probability distributions (Babbie, 2010). Unlike the parametric statistics, non-parametric statistics make no assumptions about the distribution probability of the variables being investigated. The parametric has a fixed number of parameters, while the non-parametric has no fixed number. The non-parametric method is mostly used for studying population or samples that take on a ranked order (such as investigating the impact of CSE collaboration on poverty). The non-parametric statistics are necessary when data have a ranking but no clear numerical direction or interpretation (Curtis-Lake et al., 2016).

Since non-parametric analysis makes few assumptions, its application is far wider than the parametric methods. In particular, it may be applied to situations where less is known regarding the application in question. Also, since it relies on fewer assumptions, non-parametric is more robust for analysis of this nature. The application of the non-parametric method is simple. In some cases, the use of the parametric method may be justified but the non-parametric method is easier to use (Au et al., 2016). In this study, the researcher made
use of data relating to the demographic characteristics of CSEs, such as number of employees, sex, age, size of the organization in terms of profit and capital structure. The data also uses the Likert scale to measure the responses of the respondents.

4.9.4 Questionnaire items
The questionnaire instrument employed in this study comprised of a total of eighty-four (84) questions, comprising seventy-one (71) Likert scale questions and thirteen (13) others.

The instrument was divided into nine (9) sections, namely, licensing agreement, cooperative, joint venture, alliances, multivocality, convening, framing, product development and the demography of the CSEs, with a varying number of questions in each section. Section A comprises twelve (12) questions concerning how a licensing arrangement as a collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty through increased income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living / welfare, savings and investment of employees. These questions are aimed at finding out whether a licensing agreement form of collaboration can reduce poverty. Respondents were asked to tick the correct answers. Section B comprises seven (7) questions about the joint venture form of collaboration. This section is aimed at finding out how joint venture as collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty through increased income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living / welfare, savings and investment of employees. Section C comprises eight (8) questions on cooperatives. This section is aimed at finding out how cooperatives as a form of collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty through increased income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living / welfare, savings and investment of employees. Section D comprises six (6) questions about alliances. This section aims to find out how alliances as a form of collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty through increased income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living / welfare, savings and investment of employees. Section E also comprises six (6) questions about framing strategy. This section aims at finding out how framing strategy can be used to alleviate poverty through increased income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living / welfare, savings and investment of employees. Section F comprises six (6) questions about the convening form of strategy. This section aims to find out how the convening form of strategy can be used to alleviate poverty through increased income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living / welfare, savings and investment of employees. Section G comprises six (6) questions about the
multivocality form of strategy. This section aims at finding out how the multivocality form of SE strategy can be used to alleviate poverty through increased income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living / welfare, savings and investment of employees. The next section is H, which comprises seventeen (17) questions on the product development form of strategy and other questions about the best form of collaborations and strategies to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria. This section aims to find out how the product development form of strategy can be used to alleviate poverty through increased income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living / welfare, savings and investment of employees, and the best poverty reduction strategy and collaboration. All the questions from sections A to H are all Likert five point. The scale consisted of the following statements: strongly disagree, disagree, indifferent, agree and strongly agree. Respondents were required to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. Respondents were asked to tick the correct answer from various options. Section I comprises sixteen (16) questions concerning the demographic variables of the CSE employers and employees. This section aims at finding out background information about the CSE organizations and their employees, such as income, number of years in employment, capital, size of the organization, religion, qualifications, marital status and gender. In this section, respondents were asked to respond to the following questions accordingly by ticking the right answer: ‘Year of establishment of your organization?’, ‘Which sector does the underlying organization belong to?’, ‘What is the size of your organization in terms of number?’, ‘What is the size of your organization in terms of capital?’, ‘What is your gender?’, ‘What is your highest level of education?’, ‘What is your religion?’, ‘Which of the following best describes your time in this employment?’, ‘My income has increased tremendously since I joined this organization’, ‘Do you think this organization create employment opportunities?’, ‘This organization provide the necessary training when the need arises’, ‘Joining this organization has improved my standard of living’, ‘Skills development is a major consideration of this organization’, ‘Do you have savings and investment since you joined the organization?’.

4.9.5 Questionnaire item coding
Table 4.4. Coding and classification of the questionnaire items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Nature of collective social</th>
<th>Impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation in</th>
<th>Impact of CSE strategy on poverty alleviation in</th>
<th>Best poverty reduction collaborative strategy for CSE in Nigeria.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4.10 Semi-structured in-depth interview

The semi-structured interview is a method where the researcher does not follow the standard method of interviewing. In this method the researcher has a list of themes and some key questions, which vary from interviewee to interviewee. The objective is to collect more and more information regarding the research. Sometimes audio recordings are also used to capture qualitative primary data, which are transcribed later on. A list of themes is generally kept ready by the researcher within the context of the research. These themes aim to cover the key questions, which are important in order to meet the research objectives. The exact order of the questions may vary depending on the person being interviewed, although the overall theme remains the same. On many occasions the nature of the interview is such that additional questions are required to be asked so as to drill down and explore the responses given in more detail. For this purpose, an audio recording of the conversation is also used to analyze and reanalyze the captured responses at a later time.

As stated by King et al. (1994) and Caillaud et al. (2016), semi-structured interviews have a list of questions that the researcher wants to cover. The idea is to have effective coverage and comprehensively design questions with the audience in mind. A structured interview was not possible in the context of this research.

At the same time, unstructured interviews in this case might not be able to get the relevant themes of data required for the research. Therefore, semi-structured interviews were selected as the best option. The qualitative nature of the research guaranteed that semi-structured interviews could help to conduct an exploratory study (Au et al., 2016). For instance, if social entrepreneurs agreed that they collaborated with similar organizations, the next level of questions was on the nature of collaboration, the key benefits expected, etc. This allowed for
a better degree of drilling down and improved the nature of probing. Similarly, the order and logic of these questions were also varied based on the nature of the responses and the context. This allowed the researcher to have a flexible approach towards data collection (Archer et al., 2015). The nature of the questions raised during the process means that a semi-structured interview should be recorded by taking notes or, even better, audio recording of the discussions.

However, a few drawbacks remain with regards to the usage of semi-structured interviews. Firstly, the order of the questions was supposed to reflect the emphasis of the issues or the objectives, which was often not possible due to the flexible flow of responses. In order to mitigate this, a top-down approach can be adopted, which helps the researcher to list down all of the key areas for questioning and proceed one by one, ensuring that all relevant points are covered. In this case, CEOs of the organizations were interviewed first, followed by their representatives. A hierarchical order was followed so as to get a good view of the different perspectives. Sufficient care was taken to ensure that the interviewees could understand the relevance of each question and could clarify issues on the spot if required (Hussey & Hussey, 1997; Dumay & Cai, 2015).

Similarly, confidentiality was another issue that needed to be managed in the data collection process. In order to take care of that, the initial consent of all the respondents was obtained and they were assured of data confidentiality. In most of the cases, the interviewees did not have any objection to revealing their identity, as they believed that social entrepreneurship should encourage a culture of openness for better stakeholder management (Austin et al., 2006; Karp et al., 2016). Similarly, several scholars believe that in a face-to-face interview, an element of bias can be present in the nature of the responses (Hussey & Hussey, 1997; Young et al., 2015). It is not possible to gauge the presence of such a bias prior to the interview. However, allowing for effective clarifications can help to eliminate most of these biases. Questions asked could include: ‘What impact has your alliance made on poverty alleviation?’, ‘Does your cooperative help you achieve your corporate mission?’, ‘What is the impact of your joint venture on poverty alleviation?’, ‘What is the effect of licensing arrangement on poverty alleviation?’, ‘How has framing impacted on your corporate goal?’, ‘Does CSE have any impact on poverty alleviation?’

Despite the above mentioned disadvantages, semi-structured interviews can be regarded as one of the most suitable ways for conducting research of this nature (Austin et al., 2006;
4.10.1 Interview guide questions: rationale

As shown in the appendix, the various questions were framed so as to get an effective coverage of the CSEs collaborations and strategies. The questions were developed to reflect the CSE themes and framework.

As presented in Appendix A, each interview question was asked to cover the various aspects of the CSEs collaborations and strategies.

Firstly, to understand the nature of CSEs collaboration and strategy, the following questions were asked: ‘Please tell me something about the mission of your organization and how it has impacted on the life of the employees?’, ‘Which sector does the underlying organization belong to?’

To understand the current impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation in Nigeria, these questions were asked: ‘What is the nature of your collaboration?’, ‘Has your collaboration made any impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria?’

To understand the impact of CSE strategy on poverty alleviation in Nigeria, these questions were asked: ‘Do you adopt any strategy as a collective organization?’, ‘Do you think the strategy is effective?’, ‘How does your strategy help in alleviating poverty in Nigeria?’

To understand the impact of CSE strategy on poverty alleviation in Nigeria, the following questions were asked: ‘Does CSE have any impact of poverty alleviation in Nigeria?’, ‘As an organization, what form of collaboration and strategy would you prefer to adopt in order to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria?’

In summary, the questions included in the interview guide were developed as per key themes in the CSEs framework.
4.11 Data analysis and interpretation

The data collected during the course of the research is subjected to rigorous analysis in order to draw conclusions. The next section will elicit the analytical tools for this study.

Table 4.5. Overview of the CSE interviewees. The table below represents the interviewees for the qualitative analysis with their demographic characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years in Employment</th>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSE1</td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Since 2009</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE2</td>
<td>Head, IT</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Since 2011</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE3</td>
<td>Human Resource Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Since 2010</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE4</td>
<td>Chief Operations Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Since 2000</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE5</td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Since 2010</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE6</td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Since 1990</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE7</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Since 1999</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE8</td>
<td>Human Resource Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Since 1998</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE9</td>
<td>Human Resource Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Since 2012</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE10</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Since 2013</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As stated by Archer et al. (2016) and Dumay and Cai (2015), the data gathered from any form of primary research technique, such as surveys, observations or interviews, needs to be processed and analyzed so as to arrive at critical findings. Similarly, in this research, the data collected from the questionnaires, as well as the background information obtained from secondary sources, needs to be processed for analysis. Bryman and Bell (2015) argue that when managing primary data collected through questionnaires, attention should be given to blank responses, a categorization scheme should be decided and all forms of data coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSE11</td>
<td>Head, IT</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Since 2000</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE12</td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Since 1998</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE13</td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Since 2000</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE14</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Since 2008</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE15</td>
<td>Director of Operations</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Since 2011</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE16</td>
<td>External Relations Director</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Since 2009</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE17</td>
<td>Director of Operations</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Since 2009</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE18</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Since 2001</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE19</td>
<td>Human Resource Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Since 2006</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE20</td>
<td>Finance Director</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Since 2000</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should be planned. This makes it easy for the processing software to identify valid data and process the same. In this case, SPSS was the software package that was used to conduct the data analysis. All invalid responses were removed for the sake of simplicity. SPSS is one of the most widely used software packages in research processes. The wide range of functions offered and the high reliability of results make it an application of choice amongst many researchers (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Young et al., 2015). In this case, the findings were formatted and input into the SPSS worksheet for effective analysis. After giving attention to the nature of the data to be processed and the research objectives, a descriptive statistical method was chosen along with multiple regression technique. The relationship between the variables was expressed using percentages. In terms of descriptive statistics, various techniques using frequencies, percentages and cross tables were employed to analyze the participant responses. Similarly, in terms of multiple regression analysis, the relationship between the variables was studied. According to Bryman and Bell (2015), multiple regression has a wide range of applications in a research process. It provides a stable and reliable basis for studying complex phenomenon or variables. According to Saunders et al. (2012), variables are essentially of two types, namely, dependent variables and independent variables. Multiple regression not only helps one to study the nature of the relationship but also helps determine the strength and reliability of the correlation (Saunders et al., 2012; Roberts et al., 2015). Coefficient of determination helps to assess the extent to which the variables are interrelated. Hence, in this research, multiple regression analysis was used as one of the key statistical tools for understanding the relationship between CSEs and poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Both dependent and independent variables were designed the research objectives as set out in Chapter 1 and Section 4.1. SPSS version 21 was used for conducting the necessary analysis of these formulated variables. SPSS has been chosen as the analytical tools because it is well equipped, it contains the appropriate statistical tools, such as regression and multiple regression, and it has the appropriate cells for my analysis, forward method, enter method, etc.

4.11.2 Assumptions for the application of multiple regression analysis
Statistical research relies on some form of assumptions about the variables used in the analysis. Errors therefore occur when these assumptions are not met and the result may not be trustworthy (Schroeder et al., 2016). The researcher has considered the following assumptions when using multiple regression analysis:
1. Normal distribution: the variables are assumed to have a normal distribution to avoid skewness.
2. Linear relationship: a change in an independent variable will produce a corresponding change in the dependent variable. There should be a linear relationship between the dependent and independent variables in order to produce an accurate estimate.
3. Little or no multicollinearity: two or more of the predictor variables in the multiple regression model should not be highly correlated.
4. No autocorrelation: the dependent and independent variables will not be serially or auto correlated.
5. Homoscedasticity: the variance of error should be the same across all the levels of the independent variables to avoid heteroscedasticity. Heteroscedasticity could lead to distortion in the findings by increasing the error level.

4.11.3 Dealing with outliers
To make sure that there are no outliers that could impact negatively on the findings of this study, the researcher carried out data checks to avoid coding errors and also to make sure that missing data codes were correct.

4.11.4 Analyzing qualitative data
Qualitative analysis: this particular research study undertakes qualitative data analysis by making use of qualitative primary data. The result helps to determine the nature of CSE collaborations and strategies and to gain a deeper understanding of what the dichotomies are. The result also reveals the best CSE collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. The data collected by the use of the qualitative method of recording audio conversations of semi-structured interviews was replicated in a written format by the use of the exact words present in the recordings (Saunders et al., 2012; Roberts et al., 2015). Reproducing the interviews in a written format has often been thought of as a time-consuming process. To reduce the amount of time needed for this process, the researcher used the method of data sampling to extract those particular sections in the interview that were deemed to be relevant in the context of this particular research (Saunders et al., 2012; Roberts et al., 2015).

4.11.5 Integrating data collection with analysis
One of the major challenges faced by a qualitative researcher is to understand the amount of truth that was revealed in the interviews conducted as part of the research (Roberts et al., 2015). As per many scholars, data analysis can be an intellectually demanding activity and there are no clear ways to identify one single method with which to conduct such an analysis.
(Young et al., 2015; Scott-Parker & Senserrick, 2016). Coffey and Atkinson (1996); Miles and Huberman (1994) and King et al. (2016) suggest that the data collection process needs to be integrated with the process of data analysis. As part of this study, the author took the time to replicate the interview recordings into words during the course of the field research. Due to the process of converting the audio recordings into words immediately after conducting the interviews, the author was able to save a lot of time. The author was also able to find out missing information by running through the transcripts. The data analysis started after the extraction of data and continued until the end of the research. Due to the simultaneous process of collecting and replicating the data into transcripts, the possibility of missing out on information was reduced to a great extent.

4.11.6 Preparation for data analysis
Field notes were used by the researcher to record the details related to the collection of data, which helped the researcher to prepare the groundwork before doing the analysis of the data. The researcher transcribed the interviews to words immediately in order to help the research information to be documented correctly. This helped in collecting good quality information, as both verbal and non-verbal data could be captured efficiently and documented just after the completion of the interviews.

The next step was to become familiar with the collected data. This consumed a lot of time as it required the researcher to go through the entire collected data set. The various interview recordings were listened to a number of times in order to understand fully the emotions as well as the information given by the interviewees. The possible interpretations, as well as the emergent themes, were identified. The documented transcripts were also referred to during this process to better understand the data collected. This stage helped to guide the future analysis due to the identification of the major themes in the study.

4.11.7 Use of computers to aid data analysis
The use of software applications for the process of data analysis has become popular since the 1980s (Roberts et al., 2015). It has helped to eliminate various sorting or stacking processes, such as colour coding. For example, the software NVivo helps to find out the relationships between textual data by using data management tools. This kind of software application helps to develop theoretical as well as test hypotheses in qualitative research. These applications can help the researcher in the interpretation of the data (King et al., 2016).

At the university, the author received basic training for using the NVivo software. However,
the author realized that Microsoft Word and Excel could be used for analysis, as both were user-friendly and effective. Word could be used to colour code data and Excel could help to categorize data as per the correspondents (King et al., 2016; Youssef & Youseff, 2016). So, during the course of this research, Microsoft tools and NVIVO were used to help in the analysis of the collected data to identify the themes in the research.

4.11.8 Analytical method and strategy justification for this study

The mixed method approach towards data analysis and collection that has been used in this research is quite apt in this context. The nature and volume of data generated for this study is categorical and nominal. This being a socio-science inclined research, which focuses on identifying the relationship between dependent and independent variables, both quantitative as well as qualitative variables are therefore important. For identifying whether CSE collaboration and strategies have any form of impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria, the variables denoting the various forms of CSE collaborations can be designated to be the independent variables. On the other hand, the outcome or the poverty alleviation output can be regarded as the dependent variable in this context.

According to Scott-Parker and Senserrick (2016), the relationship between two variables can be studied by applying bivariate analysis technique, while if the number of independent variables is greater, a multivariate analysis technique can serve the purpose. In the context of this research, the various forms of activities conducted by the CSEs can be regarded to impact poverty alleviation. Moreover, since the CSE activities may likely influence poverty alleviation, a better understanding of such a relationship is achieved with multiple regression.

Furthermore, multiple regression and its application has also been stressed by most of the scholars, such as Saunders et al. (2012) and Au et al. (2016), who have been appreciative of the wide applications and credibility of results that the analysis derives. As a data analysis tool, scholars point out how multiple regression can be used to determine which quantitative and qualitative variables interact to produce the desired outcomes, and what is the strength of such interactions. In relation to justifying the adoption of multiple regression analysis for this research, Au et al. (2016) states that multiple regression can perform four basic operations, which have huge implications in such studies. First, it gives a good idea of the predictive ability of the model. Second, the R-square generated can be used to predict the value of the dependent variables based on the summation of other independent variables. Third, it helps to arrive at partial regression coefficients, which bring out the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. Fourth, it helps to arrive at beta weights, which give a rough
indication of the relative strength of each independent variable. All of this helps to get a good picture of the nature of the relationship between CSE collaboration and poverty alleviation. It will help to predict the influence of CSE collaboration on poverty alleviation, and it also helps to determine the effect of CSE strategies on poverty alleviation and the relative strength of each form of collaboration and strategy on the poverty indices.

4.11.9 Data coding and classification
The raw data collected through the questionnaire was tabulated in an Excel spreadsheet for easy coding and classification. The CSE collaboration and strategies contained in sections A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H were coded and classified as represented in Section 4.12.5. 1,2,3,4 and 5 were used to represent ‘strongly disagree’, ‘disagree’, ‘neither agree nor disagree’, ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’. Questions with a yes or no answer were coded as 1 and 2. The CSE employers and employees demographic variables in section I were coded according to the nature of the questions, in any case all codings are 1, 2, 3, 4 … depending on the number of options. A question that requires the answer male or female is coded as 1 and 2.

4.11.10 Validity and reliability test of research instrument
It is important in research surveys, and almost compulsory, to make sure that the instrument for collecting the data is absolutely valid and reliable. The more valid and reliable an instrument, the more reliable the results and the findings of the research. The researcher developed a draft questionnaire in English, which was reviewed by two supervisors of the researcher, before it was sent to Cardiff Metropolitan University research degree committee for ethics approval. The questionnaire was also reviewed by the Professor Emeritus at the London School of Economics and at the same time subjected to peer review by two senior Ph.D. colleagues. Based on their comments and recommendations, significant changes were made to the questionnaire. After the collation of the data, it is important that results pass the validity and reliability test and there are two ways of achieving this in the social science domain. King et al. (2016) suggest that validity is more important, as when a measure is high validity, then that assures reliability. Validity can be internal or external. Internal validity is the extent to which the subject being studied reflects the exact concept being investigated by the researcher, while external validity is the extent to which a generalization can be made of the subject under investigation. On the other hand, reliability measures the level of consistency under the same circumstance by different researchers or by the same researcher under different circumstances (Smith 2015; Kovach, 2015).
Reliability could also be referred to as the degree to which an instrument measured is used under the same situation, on the same topic and the same way each time. One of the most used measures of reliability tests is Cronbach’s Alpha test (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Norlyk et al., 2015). On the same note, Keutmann et al. (2015) argue that the figure 0.80 is a highly acceptable level of reliability. Other writers accept a slightly lower value, for example, Dumay and Cai (2015) argues that a reliable test should have a high alpha coefficient of at least 0.7. The reliability test carried out in this study using SPSS version 21 shows a value of 0.811, which connotes high reliability. See Appendix G.

4.11.11 Research reflexivity
Research reflexivity is about reflecting on oneself as a researcher to avoid bias and ensure impartial analysis of results (Frank, 2016). We are all human and hold some pre-formulated ideas based on our experiences and our background and therefore can easily form opinions and make assumptions (Kadiri et al., 2015). Such assumptions and opinions could be based on our thought patterns, experiences, behaviour, personal values, culture, ethnicity, religion, age, gender, what we do, etc. (Frank, 2016). In the course of the research, the researcher has considered ethics and reflexivity throughout the research process. Reflexivity could be a threat to the accuracy of our qualitative research outcomes (Finlay, 2002). For this reason, the researcher adopted the following approach:

1. Careful with wordings before and during the interview - the interview questions were subjected to rigorous analysis to avoid bias and sentiments.
2. The researcher was empathic during the interview process.
3. During the interview, the researcher was thinking reflexively by reflecting on himself and making the research process a point of attention, as this reduces the risk of being misled by the researcher’s own experience and interpretations. The researcher has not allowed emotion to affect the findings, as he focused on the key themes of the research during the data analysis stage. The researcher was moderate in his approach; not too formal and not too personal in order to get the best responses from the interviewees. There was nothing unusual during the interview process and the result turned out positively by collecting the required data.

4.11.12 Role of pilot testing of survey questionnaire
A pilot study is a process whereby potential participants in a survey are asked to react to questions and make a remark (Sunindijo, 2015). The objective of the pilot study is to refine the questionnaire, such that the respondents will find it easy to answer the questions and there
will be no problems recording the data (Saunders et al., 2012). It is also a means of obtaining the assessment of the validity of the questions and the reliability of the data that will be collected. The role of the twenty CSE organizations selected in two key subsectors in Nigeria (education and finance) was to ensure the validity and reliability of the questions posed to them in the questionnaire that was used for this study. One of the main objectives of the pilot study is to check that every question in the questionnaire is not only answered completely, but also to ensure that the respondents have no problems in understanding or answering the questions (Rani et al., 2016).

The researcher conducted a pilot study in November 2015 of a small sample of CSE employers and employees from the two subsectors mentioned earlier. The researcher decided to conduct the pilot study to: 1) unfold the level of validity and reliability of the instrument; 2) test the clarity of each item in the questionnaire; 3) find out whether the questions were relevant to the subject under investigation; 4) request the respondent to give their comments and suggestions. After the pilot study, the researcher then incorporated the feedback into the questionnaire and a few modifications were made to the questions that were not clear or led to misunderstanding.

The checklist consisting of eighty-four questions (see Appendix B) was designed for the CSEs employers and employees in order to ascertain whether their collaborations and strategies, such as cooperative, licensing agreement, joint venture, alliances, multivocality, convening, framing and product development, can alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Some of the questions were changed after the pilot, such as questions 5, 12, 15, 22, 25, 34, 41, 44, 47, 49, 52, 56, 58, 61 and 63 (see Appendix F - pilot study questionnaire).

**4.12 Research protocol: Planning the field study**

The idea behind using a case study in the research is to develop a formal protocol and a disciplined approach (Friedman, 1998; Pruzan, 2016). According to Saunders et al. (2009), any research protocol is essentially a formalized action plan aimed at attaining an empirical inquiry. When working on a case study, the researcher creates a protocol or a formal document that lays down the proposed procedures and rules for an investigator. A case study can also be treated as a form of data collection and organization approach (Pruzan, 2016). Yin (2009) states that when working on a case study based data collection approach, four levels of questioning needs to be achieved: a) an overview of the case study, b) a discussion
on the research methodology, c) addressing the research questions and d) choosing an output format for the research.

a) **Case study introduction and purpose of the protocol:** This serves to give all the necessary background information that can cover the underlying issue. It helps to create perspective for a reader. In the context of this research, this has been included in the stated objectives in Chapter 1 and in Section 4.2 of this chapter.

b) **Field research procedures:** A case study serves to investigate the real life scenarios of an issue or subject area (Yin, 2013). Various evidence can be put to use in this regard, such as archival records, interviews, questionnaires, other documents, etc. Some of the crucial fieldwork protocols in this research are:

a. Defining the people to be interviewed: In the context of this research, the researcher sent out the survey, using a semi-structured questionnaire, to two hundred and twenty respondents from each of the CSEs comprising employers and employees. These respondents included employers as well as employees in the CSE organizations. The researcher was able to collect two hundred and one (201) responses, which surpassed the expectation of the researcher and represented a more than satisfactory response rate to the questionnaire.

b. Identifying data gathering methods and lines of inquiry: The questionnaire that was initially designed was used as a tool towards inquiry. For this research, a sample questionnaire was designed to steer and gather rich empirical data as a pilot study for the design and distribution of the final questionnaires. This was to assist in overcoming distortions in the questionnaire items and in overcoming the challenges in misunderstanding the questions. It helped to drive initial conversations, gather empirical data and produce further inquiries for clarification.

c. Creating an interview schedule: The researcher departed to Nigeria after agreeing on the interview dates with the interviewees. The schedule of the interviews was planned based on the convenience and input from the participants. A data collection plan was also developed to account for contingencies (Yin, 2013; Kazmi et al., 2016).

d. Laying down the field work procedure: An additional field work procedure was identified and discussed. This included guidelines towards ensuring data confidentiality, restriction against data manipulation, respecting individual
privacy, keeping the identity of respondents anonymous and refraining from publishing any names or details without consent.

c) **Case study questions:** A comprehensive list of questions was designed to carry out the research inquiry. Questions were framed keeping in mind the key research objectives and questions to answer (Yin, 2009). Each question was accompanied by sources of evidence in the form of positions, observations, documents, etc. It helped the researcher to stay on the right track with respect to data collection.

4.13 **CSEs case study report**

This session was not to gather data for any form of analysis, but the purpose was to elicit relevant information about the CSE organizations. The case study was to assist the researcher to ascertain the relationship between the CSEs, the organizational structure, the mission, formation and nature of the collaboration. The researcher found from the initial case study that the CSEs are engaged in different forms of collaboration, such as cooperative, joint venture, licensing agreement and alliance. CSEs vary in their sizes in terms of the number of employees and capital, as revealed in the case study. They operate different kinds of structures depending on the nature of collaboration and resources available.

As stated by Yin (2009), case studies can be used to work on multiple perspectives as well as to record and measure behaviour. In the context of this research, the opinions and perspectives of a large group of CSE employers and employees is to be studied. This makes the application of a case study based strategy more relevant. When investigating the relationship between CSEs and poverty in Nigeria, such a strategy can bring about various advantages, such as a) getting a better understanding of CSE as a concept, b) interacting with the CSE workforce in Nigeria to ascertain the purpose of their mission and c) previously inaccessible situations can be accessed during the course of this investigative study.

4.14 **Ethical considerations**

The ethics form, which consisted of topics such as confidentiality, privacy and other information related issues, was provided to the Cardiff Metropolitan University's Research Ethics Committee. The Committee has given their approval for the research. The researcher followed all the guidelines during the process of collection of the data from the participants. This helped the participants to share information without any issues and enabled the researcher to collect good quality data during the interviews. My approach was consistent
with Saunders et al. (2012), when he suggested that research ethics as a standard can guide the behavior of the researcher regarding the right of those who become subjects to the researcher’s work or are affected by the work of the researcher (Saunders et al., 2012). Nonetheless, the researcher demonstrates in the subsequent paragraph how to address ethical issues that might arise in the course of the study.

Furthermore, the researcher had to adhere to the code of ethics that are in line with Cardiff Metropolitan University’s ethical guidelines in order to guide the conduct of the research. These codes highlight the ethical and unethical practices in conducting a research which helps the researcher not to violate the behavioural norms established by Cardiff Metropolitan University. Code of ethics is designed to guide and prevent any form of misconduct by the researcher (Wang & Bao, 2015). Therefore, the standards and principles contained in the code of ethics that the researcher will apply in this study, in line with Cardiff Metropolitan University’s code of ethics are:

- The researcher negotiated access to the participating organizations in which the survey was carried out.
  - The researcher sent the university approved formal consent letter to the organizations that are participating in the research, informing them of the researcher’s identity, the degree pursuit, the topic under investigation, the purpose of the research and the method(s) through which the researcher collected primary data (administering questionnaire and semi-structured in-depth interview) from the research target participants.

- Informed all the participants with a voluntary consent letter attached to each questionnaire and also informed the interviewees of the nature and purpose of the research, also seeking the participants’ the permission to participate in the survey and / or respond to the interview.

- Informed participants / respondents of their rights to withdraw from the survey at any time and for any reason.

- Assured participants / respondents of the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses and informed them that the responses from the survey would be used solely for academic purpose of the research and shredded or properly discarded afterwards.
- Provided the participants an assurance that no one would be harmed in any way as a result of their participation in the study.

- Pseudonym names were used for the interview analysis.

The researcher provided an introduction letter, information sheet and consent form to all participants (see appendices C, D and E). Participants were introduced to the purpose of the research and the procedure to be followed. After the interview was concluded, the participant’s personal information/data was not included in the research report but was coded and the coding system will only be accessed by the researcher.

### 4.15 Conclusions

This chapter presents and discusses the main components of the research methods adopted in this study. The previous section identified the research objectives and the purpose of the research as well as the questions to be answered using the questionnaire and interview schedule. This section summarizes the development of the research instruments, sampling procedure, sources of data, collection of data, analytical techniques and tool and data interpretation. Tables 4.2 and 4.3 represent a summary of the research methodology of this study at the data collection and analysis stage respectively.
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter analyzes the impact of CSE on poverty alleviation within Nigeria and also looks at how the various collaborations that may take place impact on poverty alleviation within Nigeria. The main focus of the analysis in this chapter is the impact of strategy and collaboration on poverty alleviation within Nigeria. The aim of the study is to investigate CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. The specific objectives are to: (1) study the current impact of collective social entrepreneurs and collaboration on poverty alleviation in Nigeria; (2) examine the extent to which CSE strategy can impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria; (3) determine the strategies employed by collective social entrepreneurs to address poverty in Nigeria and (4) suggest the best poverty reduction collaborative strategy for CSE in Nigeria.

The chapter also reports on the analysis and findings of the data gathered from 201 respondents, from two different subsectors of the Nigerian social entrepreneurial sector, with regards to their collaborative strategy to reduce poverty. The hypothesis formulated in chapter four was tested in this chapter using a multiple regression analysis. The data for this survey was obtained using questionnaires that were focused on establishing factual information and recording statements on CSEs in general, their collaborations and strategies. Furthermore, this research chapter reports on the characteristics of the 201 participating CSE employers and employees surveyed in this study through the administration of a questionnaire. Moreover, it also aims to find out whether the socio-demographic attributes of Nigerian CSEs have any implication on their collaborative efforts and the strategies that they employ to alleviate poverty.

In this chapter, the following socio-demographic factors are taken into consideration: (1) the nature of the CSE, (2) their age group, (3) marital status, (4) educational backgrounds, (5) religion, (6) years of operation, (7) size, (8) capital, (9) income and (10) opinions on how their collaborative strategy impacts on poverty. What is more, a cross-tabulation of the respondents in relation to these socio-demographic characteristics are analyzed, in order to provide a better insight into the general profile of Nigerian CSEs.

Lastly, the chapter reports on the nature of the collaborations and strategies employed by collective social entrepreneurs in order to address poverty in Nigeria and suggest the best poverty reduction collaborative strategy for CSE in Nigeria. It identifies the different forms
of collaboration and the associated strategies that can address the problems of poverty in Nigeria. Therefore, the following forms of collaborations and strategies are taken into account: cooperatives, licensing agreements, joint ventures, alliances, multivocality, framing, convening and product development.

5.1 Multiple regression analysis and interpretation.

5.2 Impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation variables

In determining the impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation, the results demonstrated a correlation coefficient of .495. As the model summary table shows, there is a linear relationship between CSE collaboration and poverty alleviation. The model summary table shows a coefficient of determination value of .245. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.2 shows that having a licensing agreement has a correlation value of .127 and a t-value of .958, joint venture has a correlation value of .437 and a t-value of 4.280, cooperative has a correlation value of .398 and a t-value of 4.153 and, finally, an alliance has a correlation value of -.647 and a t-value of -.209.

The results in Table 5.2 therefore suggest that both cooperatives and joint venture collaborations were statistically significant at t = 4.280 and 4.153 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration positively impact on poverty alleviation. Collaboration through CSE cooperatives and joint ventures have a positive correlation value of .398 and .437 with a 0.5 t-value. This therefore implies that the more collaborations that there are, through deliberate cooperatives and joint ventures of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, the results indicate that CSE collaboration through a licensing agreement, though not statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, has a rather positive correlation value of .127. This simply implies that reliance on a licensing agreement as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would exacerbate poverty in Nigeria rather than alleviate it. The reason for this may be attributed to different factors that are internal within CSEs or externally motivated. More so, a coefficient of determination of .245 also indicates that there is a linear relationship between the CSE collaborations and poverty alleviation. That is, a 24.5% increase in income is determined by the CSE collaborations. The F-test table shows a value of .000, which indicates a high correlation between the variables in the model.
The coefficient table (5.2) shows multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, .094, .407, .287 and -.209, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing arrangement, joint venture, cooperatives and alliances) in standardized terms. The findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing arrangements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances, are significant predictors (although joint ventures and alliances are highly significant (p < .01), while alliances are particularly significant at (p<.05)). Additionally, only joint ventures have a relatively high impact in comparison to cooperatives (Beta = .407 and Beta = .287). In other words, the CSE collaborations (joint ventures) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than other variables. Similarly, the alliance Beta coefficient of -.209 demonstrates that the variable is correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, however it is less important with regards to poverty alleviation within Nigeria.

### 5.2a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.495a</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, CSE Collaborations (Independent Variables)

### 5.2b ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>9.972</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.493</td>
<td>15.927</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30.680</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.652</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Poverty Alleviation Variables (Dependent Variables)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, Licensing Agreements (Independent Variables)
Table 5.2. Impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Collaborations</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Licensing Agreement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>4.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>4.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>-.647</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>-2.813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Poverty Alleviation Variables (Increase Income) Correlation Coefficient (R) .495 , R-Square .245

5.3 Impact of CSE collaborations on employment creation and business opportunity

In determining the impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation, a correlation coefficient .443 in the model summary table shows a linear relationship between CSE collaboration and employment creation. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .196. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.3 shows that a licensing agreement collaboration has a correlation value of .127 and a t- value of .958. A joint venture collaboration has a correlation value of .437 and a t- value of 4.280, a cooperative has a correlation value of .398 and a t- value of 4.153 and, finally, an alliance collaboration has a correlation value of -.647 and a t- value of -.209.

The results in Table 5.3 therefore suggest that both CSE cooperative and licensing agreement collaborations were statistically significant at t= 3.712 and 5.663 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation. Collaborations through CSE cooperatives and joint ventures have a positive correlation value of .862 and .409 with a 0.5 t-value. This therefore implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and licensing agreements of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaboration through joint ventures and alliances, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have rather negative correlation
values of -0.374 and -0.507. This simply implies that reliance on joint ventures and alliances as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would rather exacerbate poverty in Nigeria, rather than alleviate it. More importantly, a coefficient correlation of 0.443 also indicates that there is a strong linear relationship between CSE collaborations and employment creation. That is, a 19.6% increase in employment and business opportunities is determined by the CSE collaborations. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of 0.000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE collaboration and employment creation.

Looking at the coefficient value from Table 5.3, the Beta weights show values of -0.575, -0.313, 0.265 and -0.147, representing licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances in standardized terms. These values show the relative importance of each independent variable. This indicates that the variables are significant predictors to poverty alleviation. Licensing agreements and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01), while joint ventures and alliances are significant (p < .05). The analysis in Table 5.3, looking at the Beta values, indicates that licensing agreements and cooperatives will impact more on poverty alleviation than joint ventures and alliances, even though they are correlated.

### 5.3a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.443a</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, CSE Collaborations (Independent Variables)

### 5.3b ANOVAa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>9.954</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.489</td>
<td>11.977</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>40.726</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.680</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employment Creation and Business Opportunity
b. Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, CSE Collaborations (Independent Variables)
Table 5.3. Impact of CSE collaborations on employment creation and business opportunity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficientsa</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.617</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>2.371</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Collaborations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>5.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.374</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.313</td>
<td>-3.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td></td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>3.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.507</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>-1.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employment Creation and Business Opportunity  Correlation Coefficient (R) .443, R-Square .196

5.4 Impact of CSE collaborations on education and training

Section 5.4 shows a correlation coefficient of .655 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE collaborations and education and training. The model summary table also shows a coefficient correlation of determination value of .180. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.4 shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.173 and a t- value of -1.350. Joint venture has a correlation value of -.597 and t- value of -6.030. Cooperative has a correlation value of .418 and a t- value of 4.493 and, finally, alliance has a correlation value of .559 and a t- value of 2.505.

The results in Table 5.4 therefore suggest that both CSE cooperative and alliance collaborations were statistically significant at t= 4.493 and 2.505 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation. Collaborations through CSE cooperative and alliance have positive correlation values of .418 and .559 at 0.5 t-value. This therefore implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and alliances of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaborations through joint ventures and licensing agreements, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have rather negative correlation values of -.173 and -.597. This simply implies that reliance on joint ventures and licensing agreements as a form of
collaboration by CSE organizations would exacerbate poverty in Nigeria rather than alleviate it through education and training. More so, a coefficient correlation of .655 also indicates that there is a relationship among the variables explained. That is, a 42.8 % increase in education and training is determined by the CSE collaborations. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, therefore indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE collaboration and education and training.

The coefficient table (5.4) shows a multiple linear regression estimate, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.116, -.500, .270 and .162, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing arrangement, joint venture, cooperatives and alliances) in standardized terms. Again, the findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing arrangements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances, are significant predictors (although joint ventures and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01), while alliances are particularly significant at (p<.05)). Additionally, cooperatives have a relatively high impact in comparison to alliances (Beta = .270 and Beta = .162). In other words, the CSE collaborations (cooperative and alliances) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than other variables. Similarly, although joint ventures demonstrate a Beta coefficient of -.500, which shows that the variable is correlated with the CSE collaboration variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation.

5.4a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.655&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, CSE Collaborations (Independent Variables)

5.4b ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>21.671</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.418</td>
<td>36.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>28.905</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.576</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Education and Training
b. Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, CSE Collaborations (Independent Variables)
Table 5.4. Impact of CSE collaborations on education and training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSE Collaborations</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.317</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>3.568</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Collaborations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td>-.597</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.500</td>
<td>-6.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>4.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>2.505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Education and Training. Correlation Coefficient (R) .655 , R-Square .428

5.5 Impact of CSE collaborations on skills development

Section 5.5 shows a correlation coefficient of .515 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE collaboration and skills development. The model summary table also shows a coefficient of determination value of .265. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.5 shows that licensing agreements have a correlation value of -.120 and a t-value of -3.850, joint ventures have a correlation value of -.414 and a t-value of -3.797, cooperatives have a correlation value of .393 and a t-value of 3.840 and, finally, alliances have a correlation value of .514 and a t-value of 2.095.

The results in Table 5.5 therefore indicate that both CSE cooperative and alliance collaborations were statistically significant at t= 3.840 and 2.095 respectively. This implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Collaborations through CSE cooperatives and alliances have positive correlation values of .393 and .514 at 0.5 t-value, which therefore implies that the more collaborations that there are through the deliberate cooperatives and alliances of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaborations through joint ventures and licensing agreements, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have rather negative correlation values of -.120 and -.414. This simply implies that reliance on joint ventures and licensing agreements as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through skills development. More so, a
coefficient correlation of .515 also indicates that there is a strong linear relationship among the variables explained. That is, a 26.5% increase in skills development is determined by the CSE collaborations. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE collaboration and skills development.

Looking at the coefficient value from Table 5.5, the Beta weights show values of -.083, -.357, .262 and .154, representing licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances in standardized terms. These values show the relative importance of each independent variable. This indicates that the variables are significant predictors to poverty alleviation. Joint ventures and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01), while licensing agreements and alliances are significant (p < .05). The analysis in Table 5.5, looking at the Beta values, indicates that alliances and cooperatives will contribute more to poverty alleviation than joint ventures and licensing agreements, even though they are correlated.

### 5.5a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.515&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a. Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, CSE Collaborations ( Independent Variables)*

### 5.5b ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>12.628</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>17.699</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>34.962</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.591</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a. Dependent Variable: Skills Development
* b. Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, Licensing Agreements ( Independent Variables)
Table 5.5. Impact of CSE collaborations on skills development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients⁴</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.681</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Collaborations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td>-.414</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.357</td>
<td>-3.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>3.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>2.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a. Dependent Variable: Skills Development. Correlation Coefficient (R) .515 , R-Square .265

5.6 Impact of CSE collaborations on standard of living and welfare

Section 5.6 shows a correlation coefficient of .482 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE collaborations and standard of living. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .265. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.6 shows that licensing agreements have a correlation value of .229 and a t- value of 1.551, whereas joint ventures have a negative correlation value of -.659 and a t- value of -5.788. However, cooperatives have a correlation value of .212 and t- values of 1.981 and, finally, alliances have a correlation value of .411 and a t- value of 1.603.

The results in Table 5.6 therefore indicate that CSE cooperatives are statistically significant at t = 1.981, which implies that this form of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare. Collaborations through CSE cooperatives have a positive correlation value of .212 at 0.5 t-value, which implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation within Nigeria. Alliances have a positive correlation value of .411, but have a t-value of .1.603. On the other hand, CSE collaborations through joint ventures, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have a negative correlation value of -.659. This implies that reliance on joint ventures as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations...
would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through standard of living and welfare. Furthermore, a coefficient correlation of .482 also indicates that there is a relationship among the variables explained. That is, a 23.2% increase in the standard of living and welfare is determined by the CSE collaborations. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE collaboration and standard of living.

The coefficient table (5.6) shows a multiple linear regression estimate, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, .154, -.556, .138 and .120, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreement, joint venture, cooperatives and alliances) in standardized terms. Again, the findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing agreement, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances, are significant predictors (although joint ventures are highly significant (p < .01), while licensing agreements, cooperatives and alliances are significant (p<.05)). Additionally, licensing agreements have a relatively high impact in comparison to cooperatives and alliances (Beta = .154, Beta = .138 and Beta = .120). In other words, the CSE collaborations (licensing agreements) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation in comparison to other variables, such as cooperative, alliance and joint venture. Similarly, although the joint ventures Beta coefficient of -.556 shows that the variable is correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation.

### 5.6a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.482a</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, Licensing Agreements (Independent Variables)

### 5.6b ANOVAa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11.556</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>14.834</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>38.169</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.725</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Standard of Living and Welfare
b. Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, CSE Collaborations (Independent Variables)

Table 5.6. Impact of CSE collaborations on standard of living and welfare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a. Dependent Variable: Standard of Living and Welfare. Correlation Coefficient (R) .482, R-Square .232

5.7 Impact of CSE collaborations on savings and investments

Section 5.7 shows a correlation coefficient of .515 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE collaboration and savings and investment. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .265. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.7 shows that licensing agreements have a correlation value of -.120 and a t-value of -.850. Joint ventures have a negative correlation value of -.414 and a t-value of -3.797, cooperatives have a correlation value of .393 and a t-value of 3.840 and, finally, alliances have a correlation value of .514 and a t-value of 2.095.

The results in Table 5.7 therefore indicate that both CSE cooperative and alliance collaborations were statistically significant at t= 3.840 and 2.095 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Collaboration through CSE cooperatives and alliances have positive correlation values of .393 and .514 at 0.5 t-value, which thus implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and alliances of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, with regards to CSE collaborations through joint ventures, although they are statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation, the variables as measured in this study
demonstrate that they had a rather negative correlation value of -.414. This simply implies that reliance on joint ventures and licensing agreements as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through savings and investments. More so, a coefficient correlation of .515 also indicates that there is a strong linear relationship among the variables explained. That is, a 26.5% increase in savings and investment is explained by the CSE collaborations. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE collaboration and savings and investments.

Looking at the coefficient value from Table 5.7, the Beta weights show values of -.083, -.357, .262 and .154, representing licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances in standardized terms. These values show the relative importance of each independent variable. This indicates that the variables are significant predictors to poverty alleviation. Joint ventures and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01), in comparison to alliances (p < .05). The analysis in Table 5.7, looking at the Beta values, indicates that alliances and cooperatives will contribute more to poverty alleviation than joint ventures and licensing agreements, even though they are correlated.

**5.7a Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.515(^a)</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\). Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, Licensing Agreements (Independent Variables)

**5.7b ANOVA\(^a\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>12.628</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>17.699</td>
<td>.000(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>34.962</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.591</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\). Dependent Variable: Savings and Investment

\(c\). Predictors: (Constant), Alliances, Joint Ventures, Cooperatives, CSE Collaborations (Independent Variables)
Table 5.7. Impact of CSE collaborations on savings and investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficienta</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.681</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td>-.414</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Savings and Investment. Correlation Coefficient (R) .671, R-Square .450

5.8 Impact of CSE strategies on poverty alleviation variables

Section 5.8 shows a correlation coefficient of .671 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies and increased income. The model summary table also shows a coefficient of determination value of .450. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.8 shows that framing has a correlation value of .109 and a t-value of 1.115, whereas convening has a negative correlation value of -.163 and a t-value of -2.169. Multivocality has a correlation value of .102 and a t-value of 2.456 and product development has a correlation value of -.514 and a t-value of 6.538.

The results in Table 5.8 therefore indicate that both CSE framing and multivocality strategies were statistically significant at t= 1.115 and 2.456 respectively, which implies that these forms of strategies will positively impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Strategies through CSE framing and multivocality have positive correlation values of .109 and .102 at 0.5 t-value, which thus implies that the more collaborations that there are through the deliberate framing and multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE strategies through convening and product development, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have negative correlation values of -.163 and -.541 respectively. This simply implies that reliance on convening and product development strategies by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria.
through increased income. More so, a coefficient correlation of .671 also indicates that there is a strong linear relationship among the variables explained. That is, a 45% increase in income is explained by the CSE strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE strategies and increased income.

The coefficient table (5.8) shows a multiple linear regression estimate, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, .073, -.167, .136 and -.596, express the relative importance of each independent variable (framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although product development is highly significant (p < .01), while convening and multivocality are significant (p<.05)). Additionally, multivocality has a relatively high impact in comparison to framing, convening and product development (Beta = .073, Beta = .167, .136 and Beta = -.596). In other words, the CSE strategy of multivocality functions more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Similarly, although the product development Beta coefficient of -.596 shows that the variable is correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation.

5.8a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.671a</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Multivocality, CSE Strategies (Independent Variables), Convening

5.8b ANOVAa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>18.313</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.578</td>
<td>40.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>22.340</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.652</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Poverty Alleviation Variables (Dependent Variables)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Multivocality, Framing ,Convening, (Independent Variables)
Table 5.8. Impact of CSE strategies on poverty alleviation variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>6.638</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>13.931</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Strategies</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-2.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>2.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>-.541</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.596</td>
<td>-6.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td>-.541</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.596</td>
<td>-6.538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Poverty Alleviation Variables. Correlation Coefficient (R) .671, R-Square .450

5.9 Impact of CSE strategies on employment creation and business opportunity

Section 5.9 shows a correlation coefficient of .411 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies and employment creation. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .169. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.9 shows that framing has a correlation value of .136 and a t-value of .322, whereas convening has a positive correlation value of .054 and a t-value of .625, multivocality has a correlation value of -.129 and a t-value of -.217 and product development has a correlation value of -.410 and a t-value of -3.962.

The results in Table 5.9 therefore indicate that none of the CSE strategies are statistically significant to employment creation and business opportunities. This implies that these forms of strategies will not impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation. Strategies through CSE framing and convening have positive values of .136 and .054 at 0.5 t-value, which therefore implies that the collaborations through deliberate framing and convening strategies of the various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE strategies through product development, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, had a negative correlation value of -.410. This therefore suggests that the adoption of multivocality and product development strategies by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through employment creation. More so, a coefficient correlation of .411 also indicates that there is a strong linear relationship among the variables explained. That is, 16.9% of employment creation and business opportunity is explained by the CSE
strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE strategies and employment creation. From the coefficient table in Section 5.9, the Beta weights show values of .081, .049, -.155 and -.396, representing framing, convening, multivocality and product development in standardized terms. These values show the relative importance of each independent variable to poverty alleviation. The values indicate that the variables are significant predictors to poverty alleviation. Product development is seen as being highly significant (p < .01), while multivocality is seen as being just significant (p < .05). The analysis in Table 5.9, looking at the Beta values, indicates that framing and convening will contribute more to poverty alleviation than multivocality and product development, even though they are correlated.

### 5.9a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.411(^a)</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{a. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Multivocality, Convening, Framing} \) (Independent Variables)

### 5.9b ANOVA\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>8.572</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>9.974</td>
<td>.000(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>42.109</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.680</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{a. Dependent Variable: Employment Creation and Business Opportunity} \)

\(\text{b. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Multivocality, Convening, Framing} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>6.121</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>9.570</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-2.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.396</td>
<td>-3.962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{a. Dependent Variable: Employment Creation and Business Opportunity} \)

---
5.10 Impact of CSE strategies on education and training

Section 5.10 shows a correlation coefficient of .526 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies and education and training. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .277. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.10 shows that framing has a correlation value of -0.46 and a t-value of -.361, convening has a negative correlation value of -.193 and a t-value of -2.391, multivocality has a correlation value of -.337 and a t-value of -6.205 and product development has a correlation value of .620 and a t-value of 6.425.

The results in Table 5.10 therefore indicate that only a product development strategy is statistically significant at .620, which suggests that this form of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Strategies through CSE framing, convening and multivocality have negative correlation values of -.046, -.193 and -.337 with a 0.5 t-value. This in turn implies that collaborations through deliberate framing, convening and multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation within Nigeria. On the other hand, CSE strategies through product development, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, also have a positive correlation value of .620. This means that a reliance on product development strategies by CSE organizations would impact positively on poverty in Nigeria through education and training. Furthermore, a coefficient correlation of .526 also indicates that there is a strong linear relationship among the variables explained. That is, a 27% increase in education and training is explained by the CSE strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE strategies and education and training.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.10, the Beta weights shows values of -.027, -.176, -.405 and .599, representing framing, convening, multivocality and product development in standardized terms. These values show the relative importance of each independent variable to poverty alleviation. The values indicate that the variables are significant predictors to poverty alleviation. Product development is seen as being highly significant (p < .01), while multivocality and convening are seen as being just significant (p < .05). The analysis in Table 5.10, looking at the Beta values, indicates that product development will contribute more to poverty alleviation in Nigeria than the rest of the variables, even though they are correlated.
5.10a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Multivocality, Convening, Framing

5.10b ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>14.016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.504</td>
<td>18.785</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>36.560</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.576</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Education and Training
b. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Multivocality, Convening, Framing

Table 5.10. Impact of CSE strategies on education and training.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSE Strategies</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.205</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>7.056</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Strategies Framing</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.405</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Education and Training. Correlation Coefficient (R) .526, R-Square .277

5.11 Impact of CSE strategies on skills development

Section 5.11 shows a correlation coefficient of .355 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies and skills development. The model summary table also shows a coefficient of determination value of .126. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.11 shows that framing has a correlation value of -.142 and a t-value of -.952, convening has a positive correlation value of .100 and a
t-value of .953, multivocality has a correlation value of -.298 and a t-value of -4.748 and, finally, product development has a correlation value of .102 and a t-value of .745.

The results in Table 5.11 therefore indicate that only convening and product development as CSE strategies are statistically significant at .100 and .102, which implies that these forms of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Strategies through CSE framing and multivocality had negative correlation values of -.142 and -.298 at 0.5 t-value, which implies that undertaking more collaborations through the deliberate framing and multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. CSE strategies through product development and convening were statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study. They also have positive correlation values of .102 and .100. This suggests that a reliance on product development and convening strategies by CSE organizations will positively impact on poverty in Nigeria through skill development. More so, a coefficient correlation of .355 also indicates that there is a weak linear relationship among the variables explained. A coefficient of determination of 126 connotes that there is a 12.6% increase in skills development through the adoption of CSE strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE strategies and skills development.

The coefficient table in Section 5.11 shows a multiple linear regression estimate, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.087, .076, -.323 and .077, express the relative importance of each independent variable (framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. Again, the findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors, although multivocality is seen as being highly significant (p < .01). Additionally, convening has a relatively high impact compared to product development (Beta = .076 and Beta = .077). In other words, the CSE strategies (framing and product development) and variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than multivocality and convening. Similarly, although the multivocality Beta coefficient of -.323 shows that the variable is correlated with the CSE strategy variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation.
5.11a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.355&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Multivocality, Convening, CSE Strategies (Independent Variables)

5.11b ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.984</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.496</td>
<td>7.048</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>41.606</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.591</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Skills Development
b. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Multivocality, Convening, CSE Strategies (Independent Variables)

Table 5.11. Impact of CSE strategies on skills development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Strategies Framing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Skills Development. Correlation Coefficient (R) .526 , R-Square .277

5.12 Impact of CSE strategies on standard of living and welfare

Section 5.12 shows a correlation coefficient of .221 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies and standard of living and welfare. The model summary table also shows a coefficient of determination value of .049. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .043 at p<.05. Table 5.12 shows that framing has a correlation value of -.468 and a t- value of -2.412, convening has a positive correlation value of .139 and a t- value of .205, multivocality has a correlation value of .770 and a t- value of .029 and product development has a correlation value of -.044 and a t- value of -.291.
The results in Table 5.12 therefore indicate that convening and multivocality, as CSE strategies, have a positive correlation of .139 and .770 respectively, and also have t-values of 1.272 and 2.203. This indicates that these forms of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare within Nigeria. CSE strategies through convening and product development have negative correlation values of -.468, and -.044 with a 0.5 t-value. This suggests that the more collaborations that there are through convening and product development strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the less of an impact that there will be on poverty alleviation within Nigeria. Furthermore, a coefficient correlation of .221 indicates that there is a weak linear relationship among the variables explained. A coefficient of determination of .049 indicates a 4% increase in standard of living and welfare through the adoption of these CSE strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .043 at p<.05, indicating that there is no significant relationship between CSE strategies and the standard of living and welfare.

The coefficient table in Section 5.12 shows a multiple linear regression estimate, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.287, .106, .279 and -.033, express the relative importance of each independent variable (framing, convening, multivocality and product developments) in standardized terms. Multivocality has a relatively high impact in comparison to convening (Beta = .279 and Beta = .106). In other words, the CSE strategies (convening and multivocality) and their variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than framing and product development. Similarly, although the framing Beta coefficient of -.287 shows that the variable is correlated with the CSE strategy variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation.

5.12a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.221a</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Convening, CSE Strategies (Independent Variables), Multivocality

5.12b ANOVAa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.320</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>2.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>45.270</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.591</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Convening, CSE Strategies (Independent Variables), Multivocality

b. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Convening, CSE Strategies (Independent Variables), Framing
a. Dependent Variable: Standard of Living & Welfare  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Convening, CSE Strategies and Framing

Table 5.12. Impact of CSE strategies on standard of living and welfare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSE Strategies</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>2.485</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Strategies Framing</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.468</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>-2.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td></td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td></td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>2.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation Coefficient (R) .221 , R-Square .049

5.13 Impact of CSE strategies on savings and investments

Section 5.13 shows a correlation coefficient of .252 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies and savings and investments. The model summary table also shows a coefficient of determination value of .064. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .012 at p<.05. Table 5.13 shows that framing has a negative correlation value of -.617 and a t-value of -3.137, convening has a negative correlation value of -.080 and a t-value of -.723, multivocality has a positive correlation value of .985 and a t-value of 2.778 and, finally, product development has a correlation value of -.100 and a t-value of -.656.

The results in Table 5.12 therefore indicate that only multivocality as a CSE strategy has a positive correlation of .985 with a t-value of 2.778, which implies that this form of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investments. The CSE strategies of framing, convening and product development have negative correlation values of -.617, -.080 and -.100, with negative t-values of -3.137, -.723 and -.656. This therefore suggests that if organizations in Nigeria adopt collaborative CSE strategies such as framing, convening and product development, then they will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation within Nigeria. Furthermore, a coefficient correlation of .252 indicates that there
is a weak linear relationship among the variables explained. A coefficient of determination of .064 indicates that a 6% increase in savings and investment is explained through the CSE strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .012 at p<.05, indicating that there is no significant relationship between CSE strategies and savings and investments.

The coefficient table in Section 5.13 shows a multiple linear regression estimate, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.370, -.060, .349 and -.075, express the relative importance of each independent variable (framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. Again, the findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although framing is significant at (p<.05)). Additionally, multivocality has a relatively higher impact than framing, convening and product development (Beta = -.370, -.060, .349, and -.075). In other words, the CSE strategies (multivocality) and variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Similarly, although the framing Beta coefficient of -.370 shows that the variables are correlated with the CSE strategy variables, they are less important for poverty alleviation.

5.13a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.252(^a)</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Convening, Framing and Multivocality

5.13b ANOVA\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.164</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>3.329</td>
<td>.012(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>46.561</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.725</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: Savings & Investment
\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Product Development, Convening, Framing and Multivocality
Table 5.13. Impact of CSE strategies on savings and investments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSE Strategies</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.457</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>3.201</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSE Strategies</td>
<td>- .617</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>- .370</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>- .080</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Savings & Investment Correlation Coefficient (R) .064 , R-Square .045

5.14 Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on poverty alleviation variables – increase income

Section 5.14 shows a correlation coefficient of .642 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and an increase in income. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .412. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.14 shows that licensing agreements have a correlation value of .060 and a t-value of .562, joint ventures have a correlation of .208 with a t-value of 2.469, cooperatives have a correlation of .189 with a t-value of 2.398, alliances have a negative correlation of -.038 with a t-value of -.094, while a framing strategy has a correlation of -.436 with a t-value of -3.055. Convening has a negative correlation of -.206 with a t-value of -2.599, multivocality has a positive correlation of .760 with a t-value of 1.549 and, finally, product development has a correlation of -.432 with a t-value of -3.413.

The results in Table 5.14 therefore suggest that the interaction effect of licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances all have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation within Nigeria. Furthermore, the CSE strategy of multivocality has a positive correlation, indicating that this will have a positive impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Other strategies, such as framing, convening and product development, all have negative correlations, which would indicate that these
strategies would have no impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Also, a coefficient correlation of .642 indicates that there is a strong linear relationship between the CSE collaborative strategies and poverty alleviation. A coefficient of determination of .412 indicates that a 41.2% increase in income is explained by the CSE collaboration and strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and an increase in income.

The coefficient table (5.14) shows the multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, .049, .213, .150, -.013, -.319, -.187, .327 and -.391, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, alliances, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here are twofold: firstly, all of the variables, licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although framing, convening and product development are highly significant (p < .01), while joint ventures and cooperatives are significant (p<.05)). Additionally, multivocality, joint ventures, cooperatives and licensing agreements have a relatively higher impact than other variables (Beta=.049, Beta=.213, Beta=.150, Beta=-.013, Beta=-.319, Beta=-.187, Beta=.327 and Beta = -.391). In other words, the CSE collaborative strategies (joint ventures, cooperatives and multivocality) and variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than other variables. Similarly, product development, framing and convening have Beta coefficients of -.319, -.319 and -.187 and show that these variables are correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, but they are less important for poverty alleviation within Nigeria. Additionally, cooperatives, product development and licensing agreements have a relatively higher impact compared to other variables (Beta = -.552, -.434, .183, -.061, -.197, -.025, .227 and -.295). In other words, the CSE collaborative strategies (licensing agreement, cooperative and multivocality) and variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than other variables. Similarly, joint ventures and product development have a Beta coefficient of -.434 and-.295 and this shows that the variables are correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, but are less important for poverty alleviation.
### 5.14a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.642&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Licensing Agreements, Cooperatives, Convening, Alliances, Framing, Joint Ventures, Multivocality, Product Development

### 5.14b ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>13.847</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.731</td>
<td>16.785</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>19.800</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.647</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Poverty Alleviation Variables (Dependent Variables)

b. Predictors: (Constant), Licensing Agreements, Cooperatives, Convening, Alliances, Framing, Joint Ventures, Multivocality, Product Development

### Table 5.14 Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on poverty alleviation variables – increase income.

#### Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Collaborations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Strategies -Framing</td>
<td>-.436</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td>-.432</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Poverty Alleviation Variables (Dependent Variables)
### 5.15b ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>13.034</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.629</td>
<td>8.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>36.950</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.984</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employment Creation and Business Opportunity  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Licensing Agreements, Cooperatives, Convening, Alliances, Framing, Joint Ventures, Multivocality, Product Development

### 5.15a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.511a</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15. Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on employment creation and business opportunity.

**Coefficients**a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.106</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>5.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td>-.516</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>-.434</td>
<td>-4.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>2.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>-.328</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-1.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td>-.397</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.295</td>
<td>-2.296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employment Creation and Business Opportunity
5.15 Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on employment creation and business opportunity

Section 5.15 shows a correlation coefficient of .261 in the model summary table, which indicates a weak linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and employment creation. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .230. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.15 shows that licensing agreements have a correlation value of .821 and a t-value of 5.600, joint ventures have a correlation of -.516 with a t-value of -4.478, cooperatives have a positive correlation of .281 with a t-value of 2.602, alliances have a negative correlation of -.209 with a t-value of -.382, while the framing strategy has a correlation of -.328 with a t-value of -.197, convening has a negative correlation of -.034 with a t-value of -.312, multivocality has a positive correlation of .643 with a t-value of .959 and, finally, product development has a correlation of -.397 with a t-value of -2.296. The results in Table 5.15 therefore suggest that the interaction effects of licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation within Nigeria, through employment creation. Other collaborative strategies, such as joint ventures, alliances, framing, convening and product development all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact at all on poverty alleviation through employment creation. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation. Also, a coefficient correlation of .261 indicates that there is a weak linear relationship between the CSE collaborative strategies and poverty alleviation. A coefficient of determination of .230 indicates that there is only a 23% increase in employment creation as result of these CSE collaborations and strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and employment creation within Nigeria.

The coefficient table in Section 5.15 shows the multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, .552, -.434, .183, -.061, -.197, -.025, .227 and -.295, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, alliances, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms.
5.16 Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on education and training

Section 5.16 shows a correlation coefficient of .679 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and education and training. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .461. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.16 shows that licensing agreements have a correlation value of -.171 and a t-value of -1.361, joint ventures have a correlation of -.591 with a t-value of -5.980, cooperatives have a positive correlation of .423 with a t-value of 4.563, alliances have a correlation of .146 with a t-value of .310, while a framing strategy has a correlation of .179 with a t-value of 1.069, convening has a negative correlation of -.127 with a t-value of -1.366, multivocality has a positive correlation of .293 with a t-value of .509 and, finally, product development has a correlation of .060 with a t-value of .405.

The results in Table 5.16 indicates that the interaction effect of cooperatives and alliances as a form of collaboration, as well as multivocality and product development strategies, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through education and training within Nigeria. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, framing and convening, all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation. Also, a coefficient correlation of .679 indicates that there is a strong linear relationship between the CSE collaborative strategies and poverty alleviation. A coefficient of determination value of .461 indicates that there is a 46.1% increase in education and training through the CSE collaboration and strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and education and training.

5.16a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.679a</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Licensing Agreements, Cooperatives, Convening, Alliances, Framing, Joint Ventures, Multivocality, Product Development
5.16b ANOVA\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>23.304</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.913</td>
<td>20.509</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>27.271</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.576</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Education and Training  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Licensing Agreements, Cooperatives, Convening, Alliances, Framing, Joint Ventures, Multivocality, Product Development

Table 5.16. Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on education and training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients\textsuperscript{a}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Collaborations and Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Education and Training

The coefficient table in Section 5.16 shows the multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.115, -.495, .274, .042, .107, -.094, .103 and .044, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings show that all the variables, licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, alliances, framing, convening,
multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although cooperatives and joint ventures are highly significant (p < .01)). Additionally, cooperatives, product development and licensing agreements have a relatively higher impact than other variables (Beta = -.552, -.434, .183, -.061, -.197, -.025, .227 and -.295). In other words, the CSE collaborative strategies of licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality, function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Similarly, joint ventures and product development have Beta coefficients of -.434 and -.295 and this shows that these variables are correlated with the CSE collaborative variables, but that they are less important for poverty alleviation within Nigeria.

5.17 Effects of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on skills development

Section 5.17 shows a correlation coefficient of .302 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and skills development. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .273. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.17 shows that licensing agreements have a correlation value of -.126 and a t-value of -.907, joint ventures have a correlation of -.435 with a t-value of -.375, cooperatives have a positive correlation of .373 with a t-value of 3.642, alliances have a correlation of .519 with a t-value of .997, while a framing strategy has a correlation of -.486 with a t-value of -2.627. Convening had a correlation of .016 with a t-value of .157, multivocality had a positive correlation of .498 with a t-value of .783 and, finally, product development had a correlation of -.005 with a t-value of -.028.

The results in Table 5.17 therefore suggest that the interaction effects of cooperatives and alliances as a form of collaboration, as well as multivocality and convening strategies, have a positive correlation value and they will impact positively on poverty alleviation through skills development within Nigeria. Other forms of collaboration and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, framing and convening, all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Also, a coefficient correlation of .302 indicates that there is a linear relationship between the CSE collaborative strategies and poverty alleviation through skills development within Nigeria. A coefficient of determination
value of .273 indicates that there is only a 27.3% increase in skills development as a result of these CSE collaborations and strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and skills development.

The coefficient table in Section 5.17 shows the multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.087, -.375, .249, .155, -.299, .012, .180 and -.003, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, alliances, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here are also twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although joint ventures and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01), while framing is just seen as being significant (p<.05)). Additionally, cooperatives, alliances and multivocality have a relatively higher impact than other variables (Beta = .249, .155 and .180). In other words, the CSE collaborative strategies, such as cooperatives, alliances and multivocality and their variables, function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Similarly, joint ventures and framing have Beta coefficients of -.375 and-.299 and this shows that the variables are correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, but they are less important for poverty alleviation.

### 5.17a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.549a</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Licensing Agreements, Cooperatives, Convening, Alliances, Framing, Joint Ventures, Multivocality, Product Development

### 5.17b ANOVAa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>14.359</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>10.370</td>
<td>.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>33.232</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.591</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

165
Dependent Variable: Skills Development
Predictors: (Constant), Licensing Agreements, Cooperatives, Convening, Alliances, Framing, Joint Ventures, Multivocality, Product Development

Table 5.17. Effects of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on skills development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSE Collaborations and Strategies</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.435</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.486</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.18 Effects of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on standard of living and welfare
Section 5.18 shows a correlation coefficient of .343 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and the standard of living and welfare. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .316. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.18 shows that licensing agreements have a correlation value of .201 and a t-value of 1.455, joint ventures have a correlation of -.755 with a t-value of -6.975, cooperatives have a positive correlation of .124 with a t-value of 1.222 and alliances have a correlation of .829 with a t-value of 1.607. Furthermore, a framing strategy has a correlation of -.660 with a t-value of -3.596,
convening has a correlation of -.260 with a t-value of -2.548, multivocality has a positive correlation of .686 with a t-value of 1.088 and, finally, product development has a correlation of -.060 with a t-value of -.372.

The results in Table 5.18 therefore suggest that the interaction effects of licensing agreements, cooperatives and alliances as forms of collaboration, as well as multivocality as a collaborative strategy, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare within Nigeria. Other forms of collaboration and strategies, such as joint ventures, framing, convening and product development, all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living. Therefore, looking at the ANOVA result value of .000 at p<.05, it can be said that the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare. Also, a coefficient correlation of .343 indicates that there is a linear relationship between the CSE collaborative strategies and poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare. A coefficient of determination value of .316 indicates that there is a 31.6% increase or decrease in the standard of living and welfare as a result of the CSE collaborations and strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and the standard of living and welfare.

The coefficient table in Section 5.18 shows multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, .135, -.637, .081, .243, -.396, -.193, .243 and -.045, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, alliances, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here are also twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although joint ventures and framing are highly significant (p < .01), while convening is seen as being significant (p<.05)). Additionally, licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality have a relatively higher impact than other variables (Beta = .135, .081 and .243). In other words, the CSE collaborative strategies of licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality and their variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables.
### 5.18a Model Summary

#### E Collaborations and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.702</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td>-.755</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>-.660</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Standard of Living and Welfare

#### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.051</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>12.525</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>32.673</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.725</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Standard of Living and Welfare

b. Predictors: (Constant), Licensing Agreements, Cooperatives, Convening, Alliances, Framing, Joint Ventures, Multivocality, Product Development
5.19 Effects of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on savings and investments

Section 5.19 shows a correlation coefficient of .302 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and savings and investments. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .273. The ANOVA table shows a significant value of .000 at p<.05. Table 5.19 shows that licensing agreements have a correlation value of -.126 and a t-value of -.907, joint ventures have a correlation of -.435 with a t-value of -3.988, cooperatives have a positive correlation of .373 with a t-value of 3.642 and alliances have a correlation of .519 with a t-value of .997. Furthermore, a framing strategy has a correlation of -.486 with a t-value of -2.627, convening has a correlation of .016 with a t-value of .157, multivocality has a positive correlation of .498 with a t-value of .783 and, finally, product development has a correlation of -.005 with a t-value of -.028.

The results in Table 5.19 therefore suggest that the interaction effects of cooperatives and alliances as a form of collaboration, as well as multivocality and convening strategies, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through an improvement in savings and investment. Other forms of collaboration and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, framing and product development, all have negative correlation values, which suggest that these strategies would have no impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Therefore, looking at the ANOVA result value of .000 at p<.05, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Also, a coefficient correlation of .302 indicates that there is a weak linear relationship between the CSE collaborative strategies and poverty alleviation through savings and investment. A coefficient of determination value of .273 indicates that there is a 27.3% increase in savings and investment as a result of these CSE collaborative strategies. The ANOVA table figure shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and savings and investment.

The coefficient table in Section 5.19 shows the multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.087, -.375, .249,
.155, -.299, .012, .180 and -.003, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, alliances, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here are also twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although joint ventures and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01)). Additionally, cooperatives, alliances, convening and multivocality have a relatively higher impact compared to other variables (Beta = .249, .155, .012 and .180). In other words, the CSE collaborative strategies, such as cooperatives, alliances, convening and multivocality and their variables, function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than other variables. Similarly, joint ventures and framing have Beta coefficients of -.375 and -.299 and this shows that the variables are correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, but that they are less important for poverty alleviation.

### 5.19a Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.549&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Licensing Agreements, Cooperatives, Convening, Alliances, Framing, Joint Ventures, Multivocality, Product Development

### 5.19b ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>14.359</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>10.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>33.232</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.591</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Dependent Variable: Savings and Investment

<sup>b</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Licensing Agreements, Cooperatives, Convening, Alliances, Framing, Joint Ventures, Multivocality, Product Development
Table 5.19. Effects of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on savings and investments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Collaborations Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Strategies Framing</td>
<td>-.486</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Savings and Investment

5.20 The collective social entrepreneurship (CSEs) profile of Nigeria

5.20.1 Year of establishment of your organization
The CSE participants selected in this study were requested to indicate the year in which their organization was established from five different age ranges (less than 5 years, 5-10 years, 10-15 years, 15-20 years and 20 years and above). Their responses are detailed in Table 5.20.1. From the table it can be seen that 41 respondents said that their organization had existed for less than 5 years, representing 20.4% of the responses, 61 said that their organization had existed for between 5-10 years, representing 30.3% of the responses, 75 respondents said that their organization had existed for between 10-15 years, representing 37.3% of the responses, 21 said that their organization had existed for between 15-20 years and, finally, 3 of the respondents said that their organization had existed for over 20 years, which represented 1.5% of the respondents.

The results from Table 5.20.1 show that CSE is not a new phenomenon within Nigeria, as 75 respondents said that their organization had existed for between 10-15 years, which
represented 37.3% of the respondents. Most of the CSEs have only been in existence for less than 5 years, according to 41 of the respondents, and are therefore still focusing on growing. Furthermore, only 1.5% or 3 of the respondents said that their organization had been in existence for over 20 years.

Table 5. 20.1. Year of establishment of your organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 5 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 yrs</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 yrs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 yrs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 yrs and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data

5.20.2 The sector to which the underlying organization belongs

Participants in this study were requested to identify the sector to which their organization belongs (social enterprise, public, non-profit/non-government, mixed). The responses are shown in Table 5.20.2 below.

Table 5.20.2. Sector to which the underlying organization belongs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social enterprise</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit/Non-government</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data
Table 5.20.2 shows that the majority of the respondents are from social enterprise organizations. This is a total of 134 respondents, therefore representing 66.7% of the whole cohort. Out of the cohort, 15 respondents said mixed organizations, which represented 7.5%, and 52 of the respondents said that their organization is non-profit/non-governmental, which represented 25.9% of the whole cohort. None of the respondents said that their organization was public. This result suggests that the majority of the organizations under investigation are social enterprise ventures, whose mission is a social mission.

5.20.3 *Size of the organization in terms of numbers*

The CSEs respondents were asked to state the size of their organizations in terms of numbers, with the following options (1-10 employees, 10-20 employees, 20-30 employees and 30 employees and above). The responses are shown in Table 5.20.3 below.

From Table 5.20.3 it can be seen that 75 respondents said that their organizations have between 10-20 employees, which represents 37.3%. Some of the CSEs have between 20-30 employees, representing 34.8% of the responses, and others have over 30 employees, which represents 27.9% of the responses. This result suggests that CSEs have the capacity to create employment, as some of the CSEs have over 20 employees and others have over 30 employees. Looking at Nigerian industry, companies have an average of 15 employees, according to Hassan (2015). This shows that CSEs employ above the industry average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10- 20</th>
<th>20- 30</th>
<th>30 and above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Per Cent</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Per Cent</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data
5.20.4 Size of the organization in terms of capital

This section focuses on the size of the CSE organizations in terms of capital. Respondents were asked for the size of their organization in terms of capital. The range of options given were as follows: less than 1 million, 1-5 million, 5-10 million and 10 million and above. Their responses are detailed in Table 5.20.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Capital</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 million</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 million</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 million</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 million and above</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data

Table 5.20.4 indicates that the majority of the organizations have between 5-10 million Naira capital, according to 136 respondents, which represents 67.7% of the overall cohort. Furthermore, 46 respondents said their capital was above 10 million Naira, which represents 22.9% of the cohort, 1 respondent said the capital of their organization was less than 1 million Naira, which represents 0.5% of the cohort and, finally, 18 respondents said that their organization had capital of between 1-5 million Naira and this represents 9% of the respondents. These findings therefore suggest that the CSEs under investigation are of different sizes in terms of capital.
5.20.5 The gender distribution of CSE workforce in Nigeria

The CSE respondents were asked to specify their gender from two options (male and female). The responses are as outlined below. Table 5.20.5 represents the gender distribution of the CSE respondents surveyed. This shows that 110 respondents were female, representing 54.7% of the informants, while 91 were male, representing 45.3%. The results suggest that CSEs observe equality in their recruitment and selection processes. Other factors may account for the variation in the gender distribution.

The result from table 5.20.5 has not reflected the female statistics in Nigeria. According to the National Bureau of Statistics (2016), there are about 77,599,973 young people under 15 years old (39,663,430 males / 37,938,439 females), 106,043,377 persons between 15 and 64 years old (54,098,386 males / 51,946,886 females), 5,916,152 persons above 64 years old (2,858,557 males / 3,055,699 females). The above figure shows that there are more men in the workforce than women in Nigeria. Finding from this study reveals that CSEs have more women in employment than men. The reason maybe that more women put in application than men and the nature of the job. Studies have shown that the number of female in the workforce has increased over the past three decades and is still on the increase (Friday, 2016). This situation found in developed countries of female in employment is equally true for developing nations as noted by Benneth (2012). The increase in the number of female in employment has been related to a number of factors such as increase in the numbers of educated women and the opportunities for earning income outside the home (Friday, 2016). Women are also working to be economically independent and to be able to support their families (Parpart & Stichter, 2016). Some of these women work for psychological reasons, for instance, to have a sense of fulfilment. In addition, the nature of the job will determine the number of female on employment. The concept of working wife is not new to the traditional Nigerian or even West African societies, where every woman is expected to be engaged in one form of economic activity or the other, or at least, in farm work (Friday, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.20.8 *Marital status of respondents*

This section of the questionnaire asked the respondents to specify their marital status, i.e. are they single, married, married with children or married without children. The below table (Table 5.7) depicts the marital status of the respondents of these CSE organizations. As can be seen from the responses of the cohort, 34 respondents said that they were single, representing 16.9% of the overall cohort. Meanwhile, 35.8% of the respondents identified themselves as being married. Furthermore, 33.3% are married with children and, finally, 13.9% are single with children. This result suggests that there is marital diversity of the workforce within CSE organizations in terms of gender.

Table 5.20.8. Marital status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married with children</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with children</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data
5.20.9 Monthly income in Naira

In this section of the survey, respondents were asked to state their monthly income. The ranges provided were as follows: 20,000-50,000, 51,000-80,000, 81,000-120,000 and 120,000 and above. The responses are recorded in Table 5.20.9 below. From the statistics in Table 5.20.9, it can clearly be seen that the majority of the respondents are within the income band of 51,000-80,000, as this is the response from 112 of the respondents, which represents 55.7% of the overall cohort. However, 9 respondents said that they earned 20,000-50,000, representing 4.5% of the overall cohort and 45 respondents said that they earned between 81,000-120,000, representing 17.4% of the overall cohort. Finally, 35 respondents said that they earned over 120,000 per month, representing 17.4% of the overall cohort. This result suggests that CSEs pay reasonable salaries to their employees, considering that the federal government minimum wage is only 18,500.

Table 5.20.9. Monthly income in Naira.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,000-50,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51,000-80,000</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81,000-120,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,000 and above</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data

5.20.10 Duration of employment

Participants in this study were asked to state the duration of their employment, with options of 1-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-14 years and, finally, 15 years and above. From the table (Table 5.20.10) it can be seen that 40.8% of the respondents have worked at their organization for up to 9 years, as stated by 82 employees. Furthermore, 73 of the respondents said they have worked there for up to 14 years, representing 36.3% of the overall cohort. Meanwhile, 40 respondents said they have worked there for up to 4 years, representing 19.9% and, finally, 6 of the respondents said they have worked there for over 15 years, representing 3% of the overall cohort. These findings suggest that some of the respondents have worked for CSE organizations for quite a period of time.
Table 5.20.10. Duration of employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4yrs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9yrs</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14yrs</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15yrs and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data

5.20.11 Change in income

Employees of the CSE organizations were asked whether their income had increased since they joined the organization and the options given were as follows: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree. The responses are shown below in Table 5.20.11.

It can be seen from Table 5.20.11 that 109 respondents said that their income had increased since they joined the CSE organization and this represents 54.2% of the overall cohort. However, 41 respondents strongly agreed that their income had increased, representing 20.4% of the overall cohort. Meanwhile, 42 neither agreed nor disagreed that their income had increased, 8 respondents said that their income had not increased, which represents 4%, and, finally, 1 person strongly disagreed and this represents 5% of the overall cohort. These results suggest that the majority of the respondents agreed that their income had increased tremendously since they joined the organization.
Table 5.20.11. Change in income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data

5.20.12 Opinion on whether the organization creates employment opportunities

In this section of the survey, the opinions of the respondents were sorted to find out whether or not they think that CSEs do generate employment, asking them for a yes or a no answer. According to Table 5.20.12, 183 of the respondents, out of the 201 respondents that participated in the survey, said that CSEs helped to create employment opportunities, which represents 91% of the overall respondent cohort. However, 18 respondents said that CSE organizations do not create employment opportunities, which represented 9% of the overall cohort. This result suggests that CSE organizations do help to create employment opportunities, as the majority of the respondents said yes, as can be seen from the table below.

Table 5.20.12. Opinion on whether the organization creates employment opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data
5.20.13 Opinion on whether the organization provides the necessary training when the need arises

Participants in the survey were asked whether they felt that CSE organizations provide appropriate training for their employees when the need arises. They were asked to choose from the following options: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly disagree. The table (Table 5.20.13) below shows their responses. From Table 5.20.13, it can be seen that 37 respondents disagree that CSEs provide the necessary training, which represents 18.4% of the overall cohort. From the cohort, 33 respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, and this represented 16.4% of the overall cohort. However, 63 respondents did agree with the fact that CSEs provide training when the need arises, which represents 31.3% of the overall cohort, while 68 of the respondents strongly agree that CSEs do provide training when the need arises. None of the respondents strongly disagreed that the organizations provide necessary training when the need arises. This result shows that CSE organizations do provide training to their employees.

Table 5.20.13. Opinion on whether the organization provides the necessary training when the need arises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data
5.20.14 Opinion as to whether the CSE organization has improved their personal standard of living

Participants were asked whether the CSE that they work for has improved their personal standard of living. They were given the following options: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly disagree. The responses are shown below in Table 5.20.14. From Table 5.20.14, it can be seen that 74 participants strongly agree that the CSE organization has helped to improve their standard of living, representing 36.8% of the respondents, while 56 participants in the survey agreed that their standard of living had improved since they joined the CSE organization, representing 36.8% of the respondents. However, 44 respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the CSE organization had added value to their standard of living, which represented 21.9% of the overall cohort. However, interestingly, 16 respondents in the survey disagreed with the fact that CSE organizations had improved their standard of living and 11 respondents strongly disagreed that CSEs had changed their standard of living, which represented 8% and 5.5% of the overall cohort respectively.

The findings here suggest that CSE organizations do, in fact, improve the personal standard of living of the individuals working for them, as can be seen from the statistics. A total of 120 respondents agreed and strongly agreed that CSEs have improved their standard of living, which represents more than 50% of the respondents.

Table 5.20.14. Opinion as to whether the CSE organization has improved their personal standard of living.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data
5.20.15 Opinion on whether skills development is a major consideration for the organization

Participants were asked whether the CSE organization that they work for considers the skills development of their employees. They were given the following options: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree. The responses are shown in Table 5.20.15 below. It can be seen from the responses in Table 5.20.15 that 69 of the participants strongly agreed that the CSE organization that they worked for considers skills development. They represented 34.3% of the overall respondents, whereas 28 of the participants in the survey just simply agreed that CSE organizations considered their skills development as employees, representing 13.9% of the overall cohort. However, 65 respondents were neutral and neither agreed nor disagreed that the organization did consider the employees skill development and this represented 32.3% of the overall cohort. Out of the total cohort, 27 respondents in the survey disagreed with the fact that CSE organizations considered skills development, while 11 respondents strongly disagreed and felt that CSE organizations did not really consider skills development, which represented 13.4% (disagree) and 6% (strongly disagree) respectively. These findings suggest that some CSE organizations clearly do consider skills development and some clearly do not.

Table 5.20.15. Opinion on whether skills development is a major consideration for the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data
5.20.16 Savings and investments
In this section, participants were asked whether they had any savings and investments. They were asked to provide a yes or no answer. From Table 5.20.16 it can be seen that 151 of the respondents said they had savings and investments, representing 75% of the overall respondents, while 50 of the respondents said they do not have savings or investments, which represented 24.9% of the respondents. This result suggests that the majority of the respondents have savings and, at the same time, have been able to invest a part of their savings.

Table 5.20.16. Savings and investments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data

5.20.17 Opinion of staff on the form of CSE collaboration that suitably addresses poverty reduction in Nigeria
As CSEs engage in collaborations, participants in the survey were asked about the form of CSE collaboration that they think will suitably address poverty reduction in Nigeria. The different options outlined to them were: joint ventures, alliances, cooperatives and licensing agreements. Their responses are presented below in Table 5.20.17. The results show that 28.4% of the respondents said that joint ventures were a form of collaboration that would improve poverty within Nigeria; this was suggested by 57 of the respondents. Meanwhile, 7 respondents said that alliances would be a useful way of addressing the problem of poverty, representing 3.5% of the overall cohort. However, 73 of the respondents confirmed that cooperatives were the best collaborative strategy, representing 36.3% of the cohort, while 64 respondents said that licensing agreements are the best strategy to alleviate poverty within Nigeria. These findings suggest that cooperatives are the best form of collaboration to alleviate the problem of poverty within Nigeria, followed by licensing agreements and then joint ventures.
Table 5.20.17. Opinion on the form of SEs collaboration that suitably addresses poverty reduction in Nigeria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint venture</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data

5.20.18 Opinion of CSE employees as to whether the collaboration is sustainable in order to address poverty in Nigeria

A further step was taken to find out the respondents opinion as to whether the collaboration is sustainable enough to address poverty in Nigeria. The respondents were asked this question, where they were able to provide answers in the form of yes or no. The responses are presented in Table 5.20.18. From Table 5.20.18, it can be seen that 94 of the respondents that participated in the survey said that the collaborative options in Table 5.20.17 were not sustainable, representing 46.8% of the overall respondents. Meanwhile, 107 of the respondents said that the collaboration is sustainable, representing 53.2% of the respondents. These findings suggest that CSE collaborations are sustainable according to the survey.
Table 5.20.18. Opinion of CSE employees as to whether the collaboration is sustainable in order to address poverty in Nigeria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data

5.20.19 Opinion on the form of CSEs strategy that suitably addresses poverty reduction in Nigeria

With reference to the CSE strategies, participants were asked about the form of CSE strategy that they thought would suitably address poverty reduction in Nigeria. The different options provided were as follows: framing, multivocality, product development and convening. Their responses are presented in Table 5.20.19 below. It can be seen from Table 5.20.19 that 73 of the informants thought that a framing strategy would be better able address poverty than other CSE methods, representing 36.3% of the overall informants. Meanwhile, 56 of the respondents said that multivocality would better address the problem of poverty in Nigeria, representing 27.9% of the informants. However, 40 of the respondents said that they felt that product development was a better strategy, representing 19.9% of the overall cohort of informants and, finally, 32 of the respondents suggested that convening was the best strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. These results would suggest that framing, multivocality and convening strategies are seen as being the more positive strategies for addressing the problem of poverty in Nigeria.

Table 5.20.19. Opinion on the form of CSEs strategy that suitably addresses poverty reduction in Nigeria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product dev</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data
5.20.20 Opinion as to whether a framing strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria
Delving further into the responses shown in Table 5.20.19, the researcher thought it was important to establish exactly what all the informants thought of the framing strategy. The opinions were arranged based on whether the strategy stated is sustainable to address poverty in Nigeria, based on the answers in Table 5.20.19. The various options for responses were: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree. Based on the findings in Table 5.20.20, it can be seen that 131 of the respondents out of the total cohort strongly agreed that the framing strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria, and they represented 65.2% of the whole cohort. Meanwhile, 45 of the informants just agreed, representing 22.4% of the informants. However, only 25 of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, which represented 12.4% of the cohorts. None of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the fact that framing as a collaborative strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria. The results in Table 5.20.20, therefore, clearly suggest that framing as a strategy can alleviate the problem of poverty in Nigeria.

Table 5.20.20. Opinion as to whether a framing strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data

5.20.21 Opinion as to whether a convening strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria
Participants in the survey were asked whether they felt that different strategies can reduce poverty in Nigeria. In this section, their opinions on a convening strategy were considered. They were given a range of different options to choose from, which were: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree. Table 5.20.21 below explains their opinions.

From Table 5.20.21, it can be seen that the majority of the participants surveyed strongly agreed with the statement that a convening strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria. There were 172 respondents, representing 85.6%, that strongly agreed with the statement, while 29
participants only agreed that a convening strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria, representing 14.4% of the overall cohort. According to this survey, a convening strategy will possibly reduce poverty in Nigeria. Again, based on the findings above, none of the respondents strongly disagreed nor disagreed with the fact that a convening collaborative strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria.

Table 5.20.21. Opinion as to whether a convening strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author, from SPSS data*
5.20.22 Opinion on whether a multivocality strategy can help CSE organizations to achieve a poverty alleviation mission in Nigeria

With regards to whether multivocality as a strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria, participants were given a different range of options (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly disagree). Table 5.20.22 below explains their opinions. The result shows that 11 respondents were not sure that multivocality could reduce poverty in Nigeria and they represented 5.5% of the informants. Meanwhile, 23 of the respondents agreed that multivocality could reduce poverty in Nigeria, representing 11.4% of the informants. However, 167 respondents strongly agreed that multivocality is a poverty reduction strategy. None of the respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the fact that multivocality as a collaborative strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria. These results suggest that CSEs can successfully use multivocality as a poverty alleviation strategy in Nigeria.

Table 5.20.22. Opinion on whether multivocality as a strategy can help CSE organizations to achieve a poverty alleviation mission in Nigeria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data

5.20.23 Opinion on whether a product development strategy will impact greatly on poverty reduction in Nigeria

Still looking at CSEs strategies, participants in the survey were asked about the different strategies that can reduce poverty in Nigeria. In this section, their opinion on the product development strategy was sought. They were given a range of different options (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree). Table 5.20.23 below explains their opinions.
From Table 5.20.23 it can be seen that some of the participants surveyed strongly agreed with the statement that a product development strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria. In fact, 28 of the respondents strongly agreed, representing 13.9% of the cohort. Meanwhile, 121 respondents just simply agreed that product development can reduce poverty within Nigeria, representing 60.2% of the informants. However, 28 of the respondents were not sure, these participants neither agreed nor disagreed, which represents 13.9% of the respondents, while 24 participants disagreed that product development strategy could reduce poverty in Nigeria, representing 11.9% of the informants. These responses therefore suggest that a product development strategy will reduce poverty in Nigeria, as a majority of the responses agreed that product development is a poverty reduction strategy.

Table 5.20.23. Opinion of CSE employees on whether a product development strategy will impact greatly on poverty reduction in Nigeria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Valid Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, from SPSS data
5.21 Qualitative analysis

This section explains the responses from the interview analysis.

5.21.1 Emerged themes for CSEs

Figure 5.1 Emerged themes for CSEs- the diagram below explains the theme and emerging themes for the qualitative analysis.

Source: Author
### Table 5.21. Thematic categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label / Theme</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Summary definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensing agreement</td>
<td>Accredit, permit, entitle, allow, empower, certify, commission, authorized</td>
<td>A legal contract between two or more parties where an agreement (licence) is made between them to produce, sell, apply a brand name, trademark or use a patented technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Collective, collaborative, combined, common, communal, joint, mutual, allied, pooled, cross-party, unanimous</td>
<td>Mutual assistance in working towards a common goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint venture</td>
<td>Partnership, collaboration, cooperation, joint business agreement, alliance</td>
<td>An arrangement in which two or more parties agree to pool resources together to achieve a common purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>Association, relationship, connection, collaboration, partnership, cooperation, coalition, cartel</td>
<td>A state of being joined or associated as a result of similar interests, natures or qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>Multivocal, equivocal, open-mouthed, loudmouthed, solicit, appeal</td>
<td>Harnessing numerous stakeholders’ voices in a broad array of support. Speaking with different or multiple voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>Organize, coordinate, create, arrange, plan, map out, compose, formulate, devise, form</td>
<td>Influencing the perception of the people through the interpretation of ideal communication. Use of stories to change mindset and pass information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>Assemble, gather, summon, congregate, convene, unite, come together, mobilized</td>
<td>Coming together of actors to form synergy for social missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product development</td>
<td>Create, update, develop, innovate an existing or a new product or service</td>
<td>The conceptualization or design of a new brand of goods or services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Sparsity, restrictedness, limitedness, deficit, insufficient, shortage, scarcity, dearth, inadequate, meagre</td>
<td>Condition where people’s basic needs are not met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

### Interview Analysis

5.21.2 Please tell me something about the mission of your organizations and how it has impacted on the life of the employees?

Interviewees were asked about the mission of their organizations and how the mission had impacted on poverty alleviation. Most of the respondents said that their mission was a social mission and that it was important for them to reduce poverty. CSEs have different missions but, in this case, respondents were specific about their objectives. It was also stated that the reason for the social mission and objective is the fact that the government has not been able to address the problems of poverty alleviation within Nigeria. In fact, one of the respondents (Johnson) said, “Our corporate mission is about poverty alleviation, which is why we exist, that is our purpose, all our goals are directed towards poverty alleviation”, and Thomas added, “our mission is to reduce poverty since the government cannot do everything, I think we are doing our best as an organization”.

Respondents said that they have been able to address the problem of poverty alleviation using different strategies, such as employment creation, training and creating business opportunities for individuals. Some of the interviewees said that they regularly train their staff to be self-reliant. Evidence from the respondents’ shows that the CSE organizations understand what they are doing in terms of the corporate mission. Responses from the interviewees’ show that CSEs are social mission organizations and their goals and objectives are to address poverty alleviation, as indicated by the majority of the interviewees.
5.21.3 Alliances: What impact has your alliance made on poverty alleviation?

As a form of collaboration, alliances have made a positive impact on poverty alleviation within Nigeria and this view was supported by the respondents. Most of the individuals from the CSE organizations felt that alliances were convenient and cheap to form and organize, especially when organizations with the same mission collaborate. Respondents said that alliance collaborations have made a significant contribution to their poverty alleviation objectives within Nigeria. In fact, many of the respondents felt that alliances were a successful collaboration strategy. One respondent (Daniel) said, “well, I can say our various form of collaborations are effective, Alliance to be very specific has impacted on our project especially working with vision focused partners”. The success of alliance collaboration depends on the level of the cooperation amongst the CSEs. Since the CSEs are driven by the same goals, it makes it easier to achieve their social mission through alliance collaborations. From the general response of the interviewees, it can be seen that they feel that alliances as a form of collaboration impact positively on poverty alleviation and that it has been very effective for them to date.

5.21.4 Cooperative: Does your cooperative help you achieve your corporate mission?

The concept of a cooperative and its contribution in helping CSE organizations to achieve their objectives is not new. Respondents were asked how they felt about cooperation as a form of collaboration and whether they have helped with regards to poverty alleviation missions. The responses show that cooperatives have helped in solving poverty alleviation problems. Cooperatives are one of the commonest forms of CSE within Nigeria and they have become very popular due to their contribution to employment creation and national development within Nigeria, as well as their ease of formation. Among other forms of collaboration, cooperatives have also impacted greatly on poverty alleviation. In fact, one of the informants (Jonathan) was very positive when they spoke about cooperatives, as he said, “Cooperative has been a very good approach to address poverty problem in our country and we are helping government and individuals to combat the problem”. The majority of the respondents agreed that cooperatives have, to a large extent, been able to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria. The responses of the interviewees connotes that cooperatives are making a positive impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria, as confirmed by the majority of the respondents.
5.21.5 Joint ventures: How has your joint venture impacted on poverty alleviation?
Respondents were asked how joint ventures as a form of collaboration will impact on poverty alleviation within Nigeria. It was noted from the informant responses that, in order to establish joint ventures, there were rigorous requirements and processes in place that needed to be adhered to before a joint venture could be formed. Therefore, although this form of collaboration is effective, it can be very challenging to bring the collaborators together under this platform. It was noted that for joint ventures to be successful, they must be aligned with the right strategy. Some CSE organizations agreed that joint ventures have always been a very successful tool to fight poverty. In fact, Aziz said, “Joint venture is a collaborative strategy and it has to align with the ongoing projects and strategy to achieve poverty alleviation objectives”. Another respondent (Emmanuel) said, “Joint venture has always worked for us as a collective organization and we have always adopted it to fight poverty”. In most cases, the nature of collaboration will depend on the project that is being executed. Although joint ventures do impact on poverty alleviation, respondents may prefer other forms of collaboration, such as cooperatives and alliances, as they are less complicated.

5.21.6 Licensing arrangements: What is the effect of a licensing arrangement on poverty alleviation within Nigeria?
Licensing arrangements are another collaborative tool for poverty alleviation. Respondents were very familiar with this form of collaboration and they said that it was an effective collaborative strategy. Achieving the objective of poverty alleviation through licensing arrangements takes time. This is as a result of the process involving licensing formation, between the licensor and the licensee. However, informants suggested that they prefer other forms of collaboration to licensing arrangements. In any case, the use of licensing as a collaborative strategy depends on the nature of the project that the CSE organization wants to carry out. It was, however, noted that licensing arrangements have a long-term effect on poverty alleviation in most cases. Kate said, “our licensing arrangement sometimes may not have immediate effect on poverty but it has a long term effect on alleviating poverty, We have prefer cooperatives form of collaboration because it requires less formality and more effective”. From the response, it can be seen that this informant believes that a licensing arrangement will alleviate poverty in the long run. However, there are more effective forms of collaboration, such as cooperatives, which CSEs will prefer.

5.21.7 Multivocality: How has multivocality helped in achieving your social mission?
Combining multiple voices and coming from a wide range of audiences helps to connect diverse communities and bring them together. Furthermore, it also helps to build a universal
appeal. Interestingly, informants highlighted the fact that they felt that the right benefits of multivocality can be obtained if CSE collaborations and interactions are used to address social issues, such as poverty, at both a local level as well as a global level. They added that the ability to combine numerous voices, as well as the ability to speak to stakeholders, in an accessible manner and to straddle audiences, is key to addressing social issues and poverty alleviation. This strategy is important within CSE campaigns and awareness creation. Interestingly, one informant felt that multivocality has made a great impact on poverty alleviation within Nigeria. In fact, Josh said, “As an organization of collectives, we have strategies and we have different strategies. Multivocality or collective vocality is one of our strategies that is very reliable. This has helped us to overcome lots of limitations to achieve our objective especially in our campaign and awareness creation”. Olivia added that, “We keep emphasizing the ideal of working together and speaking collectively for our ideal to be accepted”. Interviewees added that alliances between various organizations in social movements can bring out how diverse skills can be utilized in order to draw out the desired change through a multivocality strategy.

5.21.8 Convening: What is the effect of convening on your social mission project?
Convening can be used as an important strategic practice, where institutional entrepreneurs or strategic actors tend to identify a social problem that is too complex in nature to be solved at an individual level, according to respondents. Such a practice would be required when there is a need for change, or no single entity has the knowledge or know-how to handle the situation. The likelihood of solving the complex issue is quite slim when the task is managed unilaterally. Interviewees suggested that convenors act as the agents, who convince others to jointly address complex problems and combine their efforts. This has been a very powerful tool to fight poverty. By bringing parties together (conveners), the shared resources are put to the best use to fill individual gaps and reduce deficiencies. It allows the partners to view the problems from different perspectives. They can come together to constructively explore the possible solutions beyond their own vision. This strategy is about working together and pulling resources together. Kathy said, “CSE as a concept is a collaborative strategy, CSE in itself is convening and our mission is poverty alleviation. It is therefore obvious that coming together as collectives can address the problem of poverty alleviation in Nigeria”. Jennifer added that, “Coming together as collectives has help us in the fight against poverty; this is about pulling resources together and working together”. The responses of the interviewees suggest that convening will impact positively on poverty alleviation within Nigeria.
5.21.9 Framing: How has framing impacted on your corporate goal?
When responding to this question, respondents indicated that framing can help in the mobilization of the collected resources, which will ultimately result in collective action and poverty alleviation. This strategy also helps to organize the beliefs of the organization and, in turn, helps in the process of working towards a common objective. Framing helps individual CSE organizations to identify their objectives and thereby identify their goals, which will ultimately allow them to unite to work against the greater strategic objective of poverty alleviation. Respondents added that framing is more effective when combined with other collaborative strategies. Thus framing plays an important role in collaborating and bringing both the internal and external stakeholders to a common platform, and thereby impacting the perceptions of the common people. This helps to build the underlying objective clearly, so that it can be communicated to the related stakeholders effectively and with ease. Osayande said, “our framing strategy has really helped in achieving our social mission when combined with other strategies”, also, “Let me start by saying that our goal is social mission and framing alone cannot do the magic, other factors has to be put into consideration for it to be effective”. When interviewees were asked the impact of a framing strategy on poverty alleviation, the majority of the respondents said that framing has been a successful strategy on many occasions and helped to achieve their corporate goals, one of which is poverty alleviation. From the responses it is apparent that a framing strategy will alleviate poverty.

5.21.10 Product development: How has your product development strategy translated into poverty alleviation?
Respondents indicated that they have different programmes aimed at poverty alleviation. This, however, changes from time to time. The ability to develop new programmes is what helps to sustain CSEs. There is a need to tailor programmes to the needs of the people, according to interviewees. When asked about product development, Adeyinka said, “What sustain our organization is continuous improvement in what we do and delivering services that help address the problem of poverty. Doing so will impact positively on poverty alleviation. At the moment we are not focusing of new product development per se, we are expanding our existing services”. Fola added that, “What we do is to keep looking for needs and meeting the needs. Once this is done, our mission is accomplished and we are proud to have done so”. When interviewees were asked how product development has translated into poverty alleviation, the majority of the informants agreed that they have been able to achieve many of their poverty alleviation goals through product development, but, at the same time, they have been able to combine other strategies to achieve their organizational mission. This
connotes that the poverty alleviation mission can be achieved by CSEs through product development in combination with other strategies.

5.21.11 As an organization, what form of collaboration and strategy would they prefer to adopt in order to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria?

CSEs adopt different collaborative strategies when addressing poverty alleviation. Responses indicate that a joint venture or cooperative strategies are very powerful strategies for CSEs. Most of the collaborative strategies have been very effective according to Bayo, “Our strategies are numerous and we do jointly implement some of these strategies sometimes”. When interviewees were asked what form of collaboration and strategy they would prefer to adopt in order to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria, Olakunle said, “Our cooperative collaboration has been sustainable over the years and we intend to continue in it. Another thing we do here is to speak in a single voice so that we can be heard and achieve our purpose”. This statement connotes that cooperatives are, in fact, an effective tool to address poverty and that this has been a sustainable strategy. The responses from the respondents in this section indicate that government policy can also influence the nature of collaborative strategy. Respondents said that they adopt different forms of collaborations and strategies, especially joint ventures, cooperatives and multivocality. Responses also showed that CSEs do employ joint strategies and collaborations in order to achieve their social mission.

5.21.12 Have your collaborations made any impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria?

CSE collaborations have impacted so much on poverty alleviation in Nigeria, especially in our locality, in terms of employment creation, income generation, improvement of local economies and general social transformation of livelihoods, within different contexts. Respondents also noted that CSEs play a prominent role in reducing poverty by providing job opportunities. These efforts brought high impact to the social and economic development, by decreasing the rate of poverty. Respondents also said that CSE programmes have enabled changes to take place through skills development. In responding to the questions, Akpotobore said that, “Yes it has in different ways. Collaboration means synergy to us, it means expansion. The expansions translate into more employment, Skills development, standard of living, Savings and then investment for the people. The purpose of the collaboration is to achieve our mission in wider dimension so that we can impact on poverty and I this we have achieve that looking at where we started and where we are today, yes we have”. Another respondent (Muhammed) said, “We have benefited from this
collaboration and the people we serve have also been impacted through this collaboration”. The responses from the informants indicate that CSE collaboration has impacted on poverty alleviation within Nigeria.

5.21.13 Do you adopt any strategy as a collective organization?
The interviewees confirmed that they adopt different strategies as a collective organization. Respondents were very confident that their poverty alleviation mechanism is very positive and they added that they have different strategies for achieving this. No organization can survive without adopting any strategy and this is also the case for CSE organizations, as stated by respondents. The following quote also confirms the statement of the respondents. According to Dave, “We are cooperatives and we decided to come together to pull resources to overcome resource constraints and I think this is a strategy. We are proud to say that we are improving the quality of life. We train and educate our employees, which is the best assets any human can get”. Magaret added that, “No organization survives without adopting a strategy. To answer your question, yes we do”. From this section of the interview, it can be seen that respondents clearly felt that it was helpful to adopt different strategies as a collective organization.

5.21.14 If yes, how does your strategy help in alleviating poverty in Nigeria?
Respondents were asked how their strategies have helped in alleviating poverty in Nigeria. From the responses, CSEs have been able to impact on poverty in different capacities, through employment generation, skills development and improving the standard of living. The statement below confirms the responses of interviewees. “Our collaborations help us pull resources together to carry out more social project. This means we need more workforce to work in different capacity, these individuals are paid salaries to help meet personal needs thereby improving their standard of living”, said Duroyaji.

5.21.15 Does CSE have any impact on poverty and how is the impact measured?
The objective of CSEs to alleviate poverty has been very popular among the collaborators. The collaborator embarks on different poverty alleviation projects, such as skills development and training, among the local community. Respondents confirmed that they have achieved so much in their poverty alleviation initiatives, by creating employment and improving lives. The impact of the CSE collaboration on poverty alleviation is quantifiable in terms of the number of people that have benefited from such collaborative strategies. When respondents were asked whether CSE have any impact on poverty alleviation and how is the impact measured, Battah said: “We are fulfilling purpose, we are doing so much with the little
resources we have. Since we started operation for over ten years, we have changed lives through employment, training and capacity building. We have employed so many people since we started operation and I believe that we have remove a lot from the poverty circle”.

Uzuh added that: “CSE has so much impact on poverty alleviation. That is our goal and it can be seen in our various project and initiatives and also reflect on the employees. Some of these guys you see here have never worked before but we have change their lives through employment and special skills development”. The responses from this section suggest that CSEs, through their collaborations and strategies, do in fact impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria, through CSE activities and programmes.

5.21.16 Summary of findings and implications of the interview analysis

The purpose of this section was to find out, through the interviews, whether CSE collaborations and strategies have any impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Furthermore, the aim was to determine the extent to which CSEs can impact on poverty alleviation within Nigeria, as well as determining the best collaborative strategy to adopt in Nigeria in order to alleviate the problem of poverty. These results are to be compared to the earlier results gathered through the questionnaire item analysis. Results from the interview analysis show that cooperatives, as a form of collaboration, and a multivocality strategy, amongst other strategies such as framing, convening and product development, can alleviate poverty in Nigeria. The results corroborated the findings from the questionnaire item analysis in Tables 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.14 and 5.15.

Again, looking at the impact of CSE collaboration on poverty alleviation, the majority of the interviewees said that they prefer to adopt other forms of collaboration, such as cooperatives. Most of the respondents disagreed that alliances are sustainable enough to alleviate poverty. With regards to licensing agreements, there was a divide over its effect on poverty alleviation. Some of the interviewees said that a licensing agreement strategy may not have an immediate effect on poverty, but it has the long-term effect of alleviating poverty. With regards to joint ventures, respondents said that a joint venture will alleviate poverty, if aligned with existing projects and the right strategy. The result here is partially in sync with the questionnaire analysis in Table 5.20.1. From the table, it can be seen that 28.4% of the respondents think that a joint venture as a form of collaboration will address poverty; this was represented by 57 respondents. However, 7 respondents said that an alliance will better address the
problem of poverty, representing 3.5% of the informants. Meanwhile, 73 respondents confirmed that a cooperative is the best collaborative strategy, representing 36.3% of the informants, and 64 respondents said that licensing agreements are the best strategy to alleviate poverty. The findings here confirm the position of Kasmir (2016), that rural cooperatives are the remedy for poverty alleviation.

With regards to the impact of CSE strategies (multivocality, framing, convening and product development) on poverty alleviation within Nigeria, respondents think that multivocality is a reliable strategy and will address the problem of poverty in Nigeria. The majority of the interviewees said that framing and convening also have a positive effect on poverty alleviation. In addition, respondents confirmed that framing strategy has been a very successful poverty alleviation strategy. Interestingly, however, when speaking of a product development strategy, the majority of the respondents said that they have not been able to achieve many of their poverty alleviation goals through product development. This connotes that product development as a strategy may not impact so much on poverty alleviation.

Reconciling the results of the questionnaire responses with the interview responses regarding CSE strategies, the results in Table 5.20.19 show that 36.3% of the respondents think that a framing strategy will better address poverty. This was represented by 73 respondents, while 56 respondents said that a multivocality strategy will better address the problem of poverty in Nigeria, representing 27.9% of the informants. What is more, 40 respondents confirmed that product development is the best strategy, representing 19.9% of the overall cohort, while 32 respondents said convening is the best strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. The findings here confirm the position of Montgomery et al. (2012) on collaboratively shaping social good, as it was suggested that framing, multivocality and convening are strategies for community development to address the menace of poverty (Fox, 2015).
5.22 Test for hypothesis

H1 = Cooperative form of collaboration will not contribute to poverty alleviation in Nigeria through increase income

Table 5.22 Impact of CSE cooperative on poverty alleviation variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model CSE Collaborations</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Poverty Alleviation Variables (Increase Income)

Correlation Coefficient (R) .495 , R-Square .245

Table 5.22 shows that cooperative have a beta value of .398 and a t-value of 4.153. The results therefore suggest that, cooperatives collaboration is statistically significant at t = 4.280 which implies that this forms of collaboration positively impact on poverty alleviation. Collaboration through CSE cooperatives has a positive Beta value of .398 with a 0.5 t-value. Which therefore implies that the more collaborations, through deliberate cooperatives organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. Therefore, this hypothesis is not accepted.
**H2 = Licensing agreement form of collaboration will not alleviate poverty in Nigeria through employment creation and business opportunities**

Table 5.23 Impact of CSE licensing agreement on employment creation and business opportunity.

| Coefficientsa |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Model- CSE Collaboration | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| Licensing Agreement | .862 | .152 | .575 | 5.663 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Employment Creation and Business Opportunity

Correlation Coefficient (R) .443 , R-Square .196

Table 5.23 shows that licensing agreement collaboration has a beta value of .127 and a t-value of .958. The results in table 5.23 suggests that licensing agreement collaborations is statistically significant at t= 5.663 which implies that this forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation. Which therefore suggest that the more collaborations through deliberate licensing agreements in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation.

This study reveals that licensing agreement is a significant predator to poverty alleviation (Licensing agreement (p < .01). **Therefore, this hypothesis is not accepted.**
H3 = Multivocality form of CSE strategy will not alleviate poverty through skill development

Table 5.24 Impact of CSE multivocality on skills development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model CSE Strategies</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>-4.748</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Skills Development. Correlation Coefficient (R) .526 , R-Square .277

Table 5.24 shows that Multivocality has a beta value of -.298 and a t- value of -4.748. The results indicate that collaborations through deliberate multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will impact on poverty alleviation.

This implies that the more collaboration through deliberate Multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will impact on poverty alleviation. The findings suggest that CSEs should engage more in Multivocality strategy as it has impact on skill development. In a nutshell, the level of poverty will be reduced through skills development if CSEs engage more on multivocality. Therefore, this hypothesis is not accepted.
**H4= Product development form of strategy will not alleviate poverty in Nigeria through education and training**

Table 5.25. Impact of CSE product strategies on education and training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model CSE Strategies</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Development</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Education and Training. Correlation Coefficient (R) .526, R-Square .277*

Table 5.25 shows that product development has a beta value of .620 and a t-value of 6.425. The results indicate that product development strategy is statistically significant at .620, which suggests that this form of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. **Therefore, this hypothesis is not accepted.**
5.23 Conclusion

This chapter covers the analysis of data findings in relations to the research objectives and hypothesis stated in chapter 4 and it should be noted here that the research methodology was presented and briefly discussed and the justification of the statistical tool for analysis employed (Multiple Regression Analysis) was mention in chapter 4. The output was then interpreted and discussed in detail in this chapter. The chapter also reported the form of CSE collaborations and strategy and the best collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria was discussed. In the following chapter, the conclusion of the findings in chapter 5 will be discussed and implications of the finding will be assessed.
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

6.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings and presents the data analysis in relation to the research objectives stated in Chapter 1. This will be followed by an in-depth discussion on an investigation into CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Within this context, the chapter discusses whether CSE collaborations and strategies have any impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. This is followed by a discussion of the CSEs impact on poverty and the best collaborative strategy to adopt in Nigeria in order to alleviate the problem of poverty. The chapter concludes by suggesting that the cooperative form of collaboration and the multivocality strategy, amongst other strategies, can alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

6.1 Impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation variables

In determining the impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation, a correlation coefficient of .495 in the model summary table 5.2a shows a strong linear relationship between CSE collaborations and poverty alleviation through increased income. The model summary table reveals a coefficient of determination of .245, which indicates that there is a linear relationship among the variables explained. That is, a 24.5% increase in income is determined by the CSE collaborations. Furthermore, results from Table 5.2 show that licensing agreement has a correlation value of .127 and a t-value of .958, joint venture has a correlation value of .437 and a t-value of 4.280, cooperative has a correlation value of .398 and a t-value of 4.153 and alliance has a correlation value of -.647 and a t-value of -.209. This result therefore suggests that both CSE cooperative and joint venture collaborations were statistically significant at t= 4.280 and 4.153 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact more on poverty alleviation. Collaborations through CSE cooperatives and joint ventures have a positive correlation value of .398 and .437 at 0.5 t-value, which thus implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and joint ventures of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaboration through licensing agreements, though not statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this
study, has a positive correlation value of .127; this simply implies that reliance on licensing agreements as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would exacerbate poverty in Nigeria rather than alleviate it. The reason for this may be attributed to different factors that are either internal within the CSEs or externally motivated.

Findings reveal that all the variables, that is, licensing arrangements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances, are significant predictors (although joint venture and alliance are highly significant ($p < .01$), while alliance is significant ($p<.05$)). The results also show that joint ventures have a relatively higher impact on poverty alleviation than cooperatives (Beta = .407 and Beta = .287). In other words, the CSE collaborations (joint venture) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Although the alliance Beta coefficient of -.209 shows that this variable is correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, this variable (alliance) is less important for poverty alleviation.

This finding supports the work of Poledrini (2015) and Hong et al. (2015), who argue that the cooperative form of collaboration will increase networking and improve skills and resources. Mathuva (2015) argued that cooperatives are only favourable to the interests of members and not employees. On the other hand, CSE collaboration through licensing and alliance, though not statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, implies that reliance on licensing and alliances as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would exacerbate poverty in Nigeria rather than alleviate it. This finding is contrary to findings by some previous studies, as in Borgen & Aarset, (2016) and Fidelis et al. (2015) who found that cooperatives are the only collaborative arrangement to alleviate poverty. Schamel et al. (2015) are of a contrary opinion, which supports the findings of this study. Kasmir (2016) also argued that collaborative arrangements will favour poverty alleviation and economic development. Cooperative forms of CSE collaboration turn out, in this research, to be statistically significant to the poverty alleviation variables measured, along with licensing agreements. This may be as a result of the ease of formation and popularity of cooperative societies in Nigeria. The test for hypothesis on table 5.22 confirms the relevance of cooperatives in poverty alleviation in Nigeria.
6.2 Impact of CSE collaborations on employment creation and business opportunity

In relation to the impact of CSE collaborations on employment and business opportunities, a correlation coefficient .443 in the model summary table 5.3a shows a linear relationship between CSE collaboration and employment creation. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .196, which indicates a weak linear relationship between CSE collaboration and employment creation. That is, a 19.6% increase in employment and business opportunities is determined by the CSE collaborations. The findings reveal that licensing agreement has a correlation value of .127 and a t-value of .958, joint venture has a correlation value of .437 and a t-value of 4.280, cooperative has a correlation value of .398 and a t-value of 4.153 and alliance has a correlation value of -.647 and a t-value of -.209. This is an indication that both CSE cooperative and licensing agreement collaborations were statistically significant at t=3.712 and 5.663 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation. Collaborations through CSE cooperatives and joint ventures have positive correlation values of .862 and .409 at 0.5 t-value, which thus implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and licensing agreements of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaboration through joint ventures and alliances, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have negative correlation values of -.374 and -.507; this simply implies that reliance on joint ventures and alliances as forms of collaboration by CSE organizations would exacerbate poverty in Nigeria rather than alleviate it. More so, a coefficient correlation of .443 also indicates that there is a strong linear relationship between the variables explained. The ANOVA Table 5.3b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE collaboration and employment creation.

This study reveals that licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances are significant predictors to poverty alleviation (licensing agreements and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01), while joint ventures and alliances are significant (p < .05)). The analysis in Table 5.3, looking at the Beta values, indicates that licensing agreements and cooperatives will impact more on poverty alleviation than joint ventures.
and alliances, even though they are correlated. The positive impact of licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances on poverty alleviation could be as a result of the government policies that encourage their formation and operations.

Recent studies posited that cooperative collaboration will create employment opportunities (Wollni & Fischer, 2015; Herbst & Prufer, 2016; Loebbecke et al., 2016). Contrary to previous studies, the current study found that joint ventures and alliances were not statistically significant and also have negative correlation values of -.374 and -.507 respectively. This analysis implies that collaboration through joint ventures and alliances will not have much effect on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. These findings are contrary to Nathan (2015), who found that joint ventures and alliances could have a positive impact on poverty alleviation. Again, recent studies have opposed the position of Yi Wei on collaborations. Nonetheless, the findings of Yang et al. (2016); Nathan (2015); Pomponi et al. (2015) and Saha and Chattopadhyay (2015) are consistent with the results of this study in that there is a positive impact of collaboration on employment creation. The result of the test for hypothesis on table 5.23 shows that licensing agreement is important in employment creation and poverty alleviation.

6.3 Impact of CSE collaborations on education and training

As regards the CSE collaborations on education and training, a coefficient correlation of .655 indicates that there is a strong linear relationship between CSE collaborations and education and training. Also, a correlation of determination value of .428 indicates that a 42.8% increase in education and training is determined by the CSE collaborations. The ANOVA Table 5.4b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE collaborations and education and training.

Furthermore, from Table 5.4 shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.173 and a t-value of -1.350, joint venture has a correlation value of -.597 and a t-value of -6.030, cooperative has a correlation value of .418 and a t-value of 4.493 and alliance has a correlation value of .559 and a t-value of 2.505. The result in Table 5.4 therefore suggests that both CSE cooperative and alliance collaborations were statistically significant at t= 4.493 and 2.505 respectively. This implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Collaborations through CSE cooperatives and alliances have positive
correlation values of .418 and .559 at 0.5 t-values. This suggests that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and alliances of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaborations through joint ventures and licensing agreements, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as revealed by the results of this study, have negative correlation values of -.173 and -.597. This implies that reliance on joint ventures and licensing agreements as forms of collaboration by CSE organizations would exacerbate poverty in Nigeria rather than alleviate it through education and training.

From the coefficient Table 5.4 shows multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.116, -.500, .270 and .162, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing arrangements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances) in standardized terms. The findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing arrangements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances, are significant predictors. However, joint ventures and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01), while alliances are significant (p<.05). Additionally, cooperatives have a relatively higher impact than alliances (Beta = .270 and Beta = .162). In other words, the CSE collaborations (cooperatives and alliances) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. However, the Beta coefficient of joint ventures of -.500 in Table 5.4 shows that, although this variable is correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation.

These findings are in line with the work of Hickel (2016) and Fidelis et al. (2015), who in their independent studies found that cooperatives can increase economic development and reduce poverty through education and training. Despite the fact that other forms of collaboration, such as licensing agreements and joint ventures, were significant, they have negative correlations of -.173 and -.597. It is suggested that the cooperative form of collaborations should be encouraged in order to engage more in education and training and, therefore, to have more of an impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Conclusively, this study revealed that licensing agreements and joint ventures will not contribute positively to poverty alleviation through education and training but will impact on poverty through other poverty alleviation indices.
6.4 Impact of CSE collaborations on skills development

In determining the impact of CSE collaborations on skills development, a correlation coefficient of .515 in the model summary table suggests a strong linear relationship between CSE collaboration and skills development. The model summary table (Table 5.5a) shows a correlation of determination value of .265. It was also found that a 26.5% increase in skills development is determined by the CSE collaborations. The ANOVA Table from 5.5b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE collaboration and skills development.

Going further, from Table 5.5 shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.120 and a t-value of -1.850, joint venture has a correlation value of -.414 and a t-value of -3.797, cooperative has a correlation value of .393 and a t-value of 3.840 and alliance has a correlation value of .514 and a t-value of 2.095. This result shows that the cooperative and alliance forms of collaboration will have more of an impact on poverty alleviation through skills development than any other form of collaboration. In this regard, it can be said that the more collaboration that there is through deliberate cooperatives and alliances of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaborations through joint ventures and licensing agreements, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, have negative correlation values of -.120 and -.414. This implies that reliance on joint ventures and licensing agreements as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would have minimal impact on poverty in Nigeria through skills development.

In the coefficient value from Table 5.5, the Beta weights show values of -.850, -.357, .262 and .154, representing licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances in standardized terms. These values show the relative importance of each independent variable. This indicates that the variables are significant predictors to poverty alleviation. Joint ventures and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01), while licensing agreements and alliances are significant (p < .05). The analysis in Table 5.5 indicates that alliances and cooperatives will contribute more to poverty alleviation than joint ventures and licensing agreements, even though they are correlated, as indicated by the associated Beta values. The possible explanations for this variation, as
depicted in Table 5.5., are the popularity and simplicity of the operations of these forms of collaboration.

The findings reveal that skills development will help in poverty alleviation. Some scholars have earlier claimed that when collaborators engage in skills development, this will impact on poverty alleviation (Peterson, 2015; Qi D & Tang, 2015; Green et al., 2016). Although CSE through licensing agreements and joint ventures do engage in skills development, this has not translated into poverty alleviation according to the responses from the employees and employers of the CSEs. In a nutshell, CSEs collaboration through licensing agreements and joint ventures will not alleviate poverty through skills development, but cooperatives will alleviate poverty through an increase in skills development. This is consistent with the work of Gbenga et al. (2015), when he suggested that poverty can be alleviated by developing skills and increasing talents.

6.5 Impact of CSE collaborations on standard of living and welfare

In relation to the impact of CSE collaboration on standard of living and welfare, there is a correlation coefficient of .482, which indicates that there is a linear relationship between the variables of CSE collaborations and standard of living and welfare. From the model summary table 5.6a also shows a correlation of determination value of .232, indicating that a 23.2% increase or decrease in standard of living & welfare is determined by the CSE collaborations. The ANOVA Table 5.6b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, which suggests a positive and significant relationship between CSE collaboration and standard of living. Results from Table 5.6 show that licensing agreement has a correlation value of .229 and a t-value of 1.551, joint venture has a negative correlation value of -.659 and a t-value of -.5.788, cooperative has a correlation value of .212 and a t-value of 1.981 and alliance has a correlation value of .411 and a t-value of 1.603. This indicates that CSE cooperatives are statistically significant at t= 1.981, and implies that this form of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare.

The coefficient from Table 5.6 shows multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, .154, -.556, .138 and .120, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing arrangements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances) in standardized terms. Findings
here reveal that all the variables, licensing arrangements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances, are significant predictors. Joint ventures are highly significant (p < .01), while licensing agreements, cooperatives and alliances are significant (p<.05). Additionally, licensing agreements have a relatively higher impact than cooperatives and alliances (Beta = .154, Beta = .138 and Beta = .120). In other words, the CSE collaborations (licensing agreement) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. However, the joint ventures Beta coefficient of -.556 reveals that, although this variable is correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation.

Drawing from these results, it is suggested that cooperative forms of collaborations should be encouraged as a poverty alleviation measure. Alliances have a positive correlation value of .411 and a t-value of .1.603. On the other hand, CSE collaboration through joint ventures, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, has a negative correlation value of -.659; this simply implies that reliance on joint ventures as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through standard of living & welfare. Palsule-Desai (2015) and Melton et al. (2016) mentioned that cooperatives will increase welfare and alleviate poverty if considered as a measure of poverty reduction along with other poverty alleviation measures, which is in line with the findings of this research. The result of this research also indicates that joint ventures have no linear relationship with standard of living and welfare, with a negative correlation of -.659 and a t- value of -5.788. This result shows that the joint venture form of collaboration will not have a direct impact on poverty alleviation as it has a negative correlation.

6.6 Impact of CSE collaborations on savings and investments

Looking at the impact of CSE collaborations on savings and investment, analysis shows a correlation coefficient of .515 in the model summary table from Section 5.7, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE collaboration and savings and investment. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .265, which suggests that a 26.5% increase or decrease in savings and investment is explained by the CSE collaborations. The ANOVA Table 5.7b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE collaboration and savings and investment.
Results of the analysis indicate that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.120 and a t-value of -.850, joint venture has a negative correlation value of -.414 and a t-value of -3.797, cooperative has a correlation value of .393 and a t-value of 3.840 and alliance has a correlation value of .514 and a t-value of 2.095. This therefore suggests that both CSE cooperative and alliance collaborations are statistically significant at t= 3.840 and 2.095 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Collaborations through CSE cooperatives and alliances have a positive correlation value of .393 and .514 at 0.5 t-value, which thus implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and alliances of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaborations through joint ventures, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have a negative correlation value of -.414; this simply implies that reliance on joint ventures and licensing agreements as forms of collaboration by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through savings and investment.

Looking at the coefficient value from Table 5.7, the Beta weights show values of -.083, -.357, .262 and .154, representing licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances in standardized terms. These values show the relative importance of each independent variable. This indicates that the variables are significant predictors to poverty alleviation. Joint ventures and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01), while alliances are significant (p < .05). The analysis in Table 5.7, looking at the Beta values, indicates that alliances and cooperatives will contribute more to poverty alleviation than joint ventures and licensing agreements, even though they are correlated.

Drawing conclusions from these findings, licensing agreements and joint ventures will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. These findings do not support the position of Moshtari (2016) and Martin et al. (2016) that collaborations will increase income and therefore increase saving and investment. This result shows that not all forms of collaboration will alleviate poverty through savings and investment. On the contrary, when participants were asked whether they have savings and investments by providing a yes or no answer, as shown in Table 5.20.16, 151 respondents said that they have savings and investments, representing 75%, while 50 respondents said they do not have savings or investments, and this represents
24.9%. This result suggests that the majority of the respondents have savings and, at the same time, have been able to invest part of their savings. Arguably, collaboration will favour savings and investments and therefore alleviate poverty (Hofstad & Torfing 2015; Martin et al., 2016; Moshtari, 2016).

**6.7 Impact of CSE strategies on poverty alleviation variables (increase income)**

Regarding the impact of CSE strategies on poverty alleviation variables, Section 5.8 shows a correlation coefficient of .671 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies and increased income. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .450, which suggests that a 45% increase in income is explained by the CSE strategies. The ANOVA Table 5.8b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE strategies and increased income. That is, an increase in any of the CSE strategies will result in increased income, which will translate into poverty alleviation.

From Table 5.8, shows that framing has a correlation value of .109 and a t- value of 1.115, convening has a negative correlation value of -.163 and a t- value of -2.169, multivocality has a correlation value of .102 and a t- value of 2.456 and product development has a correlation value of -.514 and a t- value of -6.538. This result indicates that both CSE framing and multivocality strategies were statistically significant at t= 1.115 and 2.456 respectively. This implies that these forms of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Strategies through CSE framing and multivocality have positive correlation values of .109 and .102 at 0.5 t-value, which thus implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate framing and multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE strategies through convening and product development, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have negative correlation values of -.163 and -.541 respectively in Table 5.8. This implies that reliance on the convening and product development forms of strategy by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through increased income. The reason for this may be obvious, according to Porter (1996); Lee (2015) and Webb & Webb (2016), who argue that the product must deliver value in order for the organization to achieve its objectives.
The study found that CSEs strategies can impact on poverty alleviation. Multivocality was found to have a positive impact on poverty alleviation (Montgomery et al., 2012; Smith, 2015; Balkema & Romijn, 2015). These scholars have argued about the impact of collective actions on poverty alleviation and community development. The results of this study are in sync with the work of Montgomery et al. (2012); Hemmati and Rogers (2015) who concur that multivocality is a strategic choice for CSEs in order to enhance community development and reduce poverty.

The coefficient table (from Table 5.8) shows multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, .073, -.167, .136 and -.596, express the relative importance of each independent variable (framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors. Product development is highly significant (p < .01), while convening and multivocality are significant (p<.05). Additionally, multivocality has a relatively higher impact than framing, convening and product development (Beta = .073, Beta = .167, Beta = .136 and Beta = -.596). In other words, the CSE strategy (multivocality) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Although the product development Beta coefficient of -.596 in Table 5.8 shows that this variable is correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation.

6.8 Impact of CSE strategies on employment creation and business opportunity

The impact of CSE strategies on employment creation and business opportunity, as depicted in Section 5.9, is revealed by a correlation coefficient of .411 in the model summary table. This indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies and employment creation. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .169. That is, 16.9% of employment creation and business opportunity is explained by the CSE strategies. The ANOVA Table 5.9b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE strategies and employment creation.

From table 5.9, framing has a correlation value of .136 and a t- value of .322, convening
has a positive correlation value of .054 and a t-value of .625, multivocality has a correlation value of -.129 and a t-value of -2.217 and product development has a correlation value of -.410 and a t-value of -3.962. This result indicates that only framing and convening strategies are statistically significant to employment creation and business opportunities. This implies that these forms of strategy will impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation. Strategies through CSE framing and convening have positive values of .136 and .054 at 0.5 t-value, as shown in Table 5.9, which thus implies that the collaborations through deliberate framing and convening strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will positively impact on poverty alleviation.

On the other hand, CSE strategies through product development, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have a negative correlation value of -.410; this implies that reliance on the multivocality and product development forms of strategy by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through employment creation. Combining other CSE strategies with multivocality and product development creates an environment for employment generation. Choong (2016) has argued that social movement framing can impact on poverty alleviation. Pan (2013) has also made similar arguments in relation to the impact of convening by social enterprise. In a similar vein, Austin and Seitanidi (2014), in Creating Value in Non-profit Business Collaborations, ratified the previous scholars on the positive impact of convening on poverty alleviation. From this same result, multivocality and product development strategies will not have much impact on poverty alleviation as they have negative correlations and, at the same time, are statistically insignificant. The findings here agreed with in part by the previous work by Montgomery et al. (2012), who argues that CSE strategies such as convening, framing and multivocality do positively impact on employment creation but in this findings, only strategies have positive impact on employment creation.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.9, the Beta weights show values of .081, .049, -.155 and -.396, representing framing, convening, multivocality and product development in standardized terms. These values show the relative importance of each independent variable to poverty alleviation. The values indicate that the variables are significant predictors to poverty alleviation. Product development is highly significant (p < .01), while multivocality is significant (p < .05). The Beta values indicate that framing and convening will contribute more to poverty alleviation than multivocality and product
development, even though they are correlated. CSEs are able to generate employment through framing and convening because of the impact on the local community.

6.9 Impact of CSE strategies on education and training

Looking at the impact of CSE strategies on education and training, Section 5.10 shows a correlation coefficient of 0.526 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies and education and training. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of 0.277, which suggests that a 27% increase in education and training is explained by the CSE strategies. The ANOVA Table 5.10b shows a value of 0.000 at p<0.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE strategies and education and training.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.10, the Beta weights show values of -0.027, -0.176, -0.405 and 0.599, representing framing, convening, multivocality and product development in standardized terms. These values show the relative importance of each independent variable to poverty alleviation. The values indicate that the variables are significant predictors to poverty alleviation. Product development is highly significant (p < 0.01), while multivocality and convening are significant (p < 0.05). The analysis in Table 5.10, looking at the Beta values, indicates that product development will contribute more to poverty alleviation than the rest of the variables, even though they are correlated. CSEs will achieve their poverty alleviation mission when they channel the right product to the right people at the right time (Culler & Anderson, 2016).

From table 5.10, framing has a correlation value of -0.46 and a t- value of -3.61, convening has a negative correlation value of -0.193 and a t- value of -2.391, multivocality has a correlation value of -0.337 and a t- value of -6.205 and product development has a correlation value of 0.620 and a t- value of 6.425. This finding indicates that only a product development strategy is statistically significant at 0.620, which implies that this form of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Strategies through CSE framing, convening and multivocality have negative correlation values of -0.046, -0.193 and -0.337 at 0.5 t-value, which thus implies that more collaborations through deliberate framing, convening and multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE strategies through product
development, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, also have a positive correlation value of .620; this simply implies that reliance on the product development form of strategy by CSE organizations would impact positively on poverty in Nigeria through education and training. Austin and Seitanidi (2014) suggests that collaborators should consider the impact of education and training on poverty when making strategic decisions. Gallo-Cruz (2012) shares the view that education and training is an important factor in poverty alleviation. Cabecinhas and Abadia (2013), in Collective Mobilization and the Social Memory of Environmental Destruction, has argued in line with these findings on the impact of collectivism on social missions. This result is also confirmed by the hypothesis test on table 5.24 using a multiple regression analysis which shows that CSE product development strategy will alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

6.10 Impact of CSE strategies on skills development

Regarding the impact of CSE on skills development, Section 5.11 shows a correlation coefficient of .355 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies and skills development. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .126, which suggests that a 12.6% increase in skills development is explained by the CSE strategies. The ANOVA Table 5.11b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between CSE strategies and skills development.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.11 shows multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.087, .076, -.323 and .077, express the relative importance of each independent variable (framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. Again, the findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although multivocality is highly significant (p < .01). Additionally, convening has a relatively higher impact than product development (Beta = .076 and Beta = .077). In other words, the CSE strategies (framing and product development) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than multivocality and convening. Similarly, although a multivocality Beta coefficient of -.323 shows that this variable is correlated with the CSE strategy variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation.
The results from Table 5.11 show that framing has a correlation value of \(-0.142\) and a t-value of \(-0.952\), convening has a positive correlation value of \(0.100\) and a t-value of \(0.953\), multivocality has a correlation value of \(-0.298\) and a t-value of \(-4.748\) and product development has a correlation value of \(0.102\) and a t-value of \(0.745\). These findings indicate that convening and product development strategies are statistically significant at \(0.100\) and \(0.102\), which implies that these forms of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Strategies through CSE framing and multivocality have negative correlation values of \(-0.142\) and \(-0.298\) at 0.5 t-values. This implies that more collaboration through deliberate framing and multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. CSE strategies through product development and convening are statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study; they also have positive correlation values of \(0.102\) and \(0.100\), as shown in Table 5.11. This implies that reliance on product development and convening forms of strategy by CSE organizations would create a positive change towards poverty in Nigeria through skills development.

The findings suggest that CSEs should engage less in multivocality strategies as it has less impact on skills development. In a nutshell, the level of poverty will be reduced through skills development if CSEs engage more in convening and product development, contrary to the expectation that multivocality will be one of the strategies that can alleviate poverty through skills development. This is consistent with the works of Montgomery et al. (2012) and Peredo (2014). The works of Frynas and Stephens (2015) and De Bakker (2016) have also partially supported the findings of this research on convening strategy for poverty reduction. Lawson et al. (2015); Dayan et al. (2016) and Nasr et al. (2016) emphasized that a collaborative product development project is a strategy for achieving social mission objectives. The result of the hypothesis test using a multiple regression analysis on table 5.24 shows that multivocality will alleviate poverty through skills development.
6.11 Impact of CSE strategies on standard of living and welfare

In a further attempt to determine the impact of CSE strategies on standard of living and welfare, Section 5.12 shows a correlation coefficient of .221 in the model summary table, which indicates a weak linear relationship between CSE strategies and standard of living and welfare. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .049, suggesting that a 4% increase in standard of living and welfare is explained by the CSE strategies. The ANOVA Table 5.12b shows a value of .043 at p<.05, indicating that there is no significant relationship between CSE strategies and standard of living and welfare, even though a few of the variables have a positive correlation. The non-significant effect of these strategies on poverty may be shown by the work of Agwu et al. (2014) on strategies for poverty reduction, who argues that government policies and strategy implementation are crucial in poverty alleviation. Table 5.12 shows that framing has a correlation value of -.468 and a t- value of -2.412, convening has a positive correlation value of .139 and a t- value of .205, multivocality has a correlation value of .770 and a t- value of .029 and product development has a correlation value of -.044 and a t- value of -.291.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.12, the multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.287, .106, .279 and -.033, express the relative importance of each independent variable (framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. Multivocality has a relatively higher impact than convening (Beta = .279 and Beta = .106). In other words, the CSE strategies (convening and multivocality) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than framing and product development. Although the framing Beta coefficient of -.287 shows that this variable is correlated with the CSE strategy variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation, since there are other variables such as convening and multivocality that have more of an impact on poverty alleviation.

These findings indicate that convening and multivocality forms of CSE strategies have positive correlations of .139 and .770 respectively, and also t-values of 1.272 and 2.203,
as shown in Table 5.12, which implies that these forms of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Strategies through CSE framing and product development have negative correlation values of -.468, and -.044 at 0.5 t-values. This implies that more collaboration through framing and product development strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. These findings are consistent with the work of Haugh and Talwar (2016); Montgomery et al. (2012); Knorringa (2014); Klingebiel and Paulo (2015) and Fowler and Biekkart (2013) in community led social venture creation, which suggest that when CSEs come together (convening) and speak in one voice (multivocality), they can improve the welfare and standard of living of the community and thereby alleviate poverty.

6.12 Impact of CSE strategies on savings and investments

Looking at the impact of CSE strategies on savings and investment, Section 5.13 shows a correlation coefficient of .252 in the model summary table, which indicates a weak linear relationship between CSE strategies and savings and investment. A coefficient of determination of .064 indicates that a 6% increase in savings and investment is explained by the CSE strategies. The ANOVA Table 5.13b shows a value of .012 at p<.05, indicating that there is no significant relationship between CSE strategies and savings and investment. Table 5.13 shows that framing has a negative correlation value of -.617 and a t-value of -3.137, convening has a negative correlation value of -.080 and a t-value of -.723, multivocality has a positive correlation value of .985 and a t-value of 2.778 and product development has a correlation value of -.100 and a t-value of -.656.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.13 shows multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.370, -.060, .349 and -.075, express the relative importance of each independent variable (framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. Again, the findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although framing is significant at (p<.05)). Additionally, multivocality has a relatively higher impact than framing, convening and product development (Beta = -.370, -.060, .349 and -.075). In other words, the CSE strategies (multivocality) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Although the framing Beta coefficient of -
.370 shows that this variable is correlated with the CSE strategy variables, it is less important for poverty alleviation. This is possibly as a result of the way that information is presented to those that will benefit from the poverty alleviation.

These findings indicate that only the multivocality form of CSE strategies has a positive correlation of .985 with a t-value of 2.778, which implies that this form of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Strategies through CSE framing, convening and product development have negative correlation values of -.617, -.080 and -.100 with negative t-values of -3.137, -.723 and -.656. This implies that CSE collaborations through the framing, convening and product development strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. Looking at the contribution of the multivocality strategy on poverty alleviation through savings and investment, this form of strategy should be encouraged in order to impact more on poverty alleviation. This finding is in line with Haugh and Talwar (2007); Dahan et al. (2010) and Mcdonald et al. (2015), who argue that when CSEs come together, the result can positively impact on savings and investment, which will invariably reduce poverty. Along the same lines, the framing and product development forms of strategy have not been statistically significant, with p= -.617 and p= -.100 respectively. This shows that CSEs engagement in framing, product development and convening forms of strategy will not have much of an impact on savings and investment and therefore will have no effect on poverty alleviation.

6.13 Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on poverty alleviation variables – increase income

A further step was taken to look at the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on poverty alleviation with particular reference to increased income. Section 5.14 reveals a correlation coefficient of .642 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and increased income. A coefficient of determination of .412 indicates that a 41.2% increase in income is explained by the CSE collaborations and strategies. The ANOVA Table 5.14b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and increased income. Looking at Table 5.14, this shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of .060 and a t-value of .562, joint venture has a correlation of .208 with a t-value of 2.469, cooperatives have a correlation
of .189 with a t-value of 2.398, alliances have a negative correlation of -.038 with a t-value of -.094, while framing strategy has a correlation of -.436 with a t-value of -3.055, convening has a negative correlation of -.206 with a t-value of -2.599, multivocality has a positive correlation of .760 with a t-value of 1.549, while product development has a correlation of -.432 with a t-value of -3.413.

From the coefficient table (Table 5.14), multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, .049, .213, .150, -.013, -.319, -.187, .327 and -.391, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, Alliances, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here are twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing agreement, joint venture, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although framing, convening and product development are highly significant (p < .01), while joint venture and cooperative are significant (p<.05)). Additionally, multivocality, joint ventures, cooperatives, and licensing agreements have a relatively higher impact than the other variables (Beta=.049, Beta =.213, Beta =.150, Beta =-.013, Beta=-.319, Beta =-.187, Beta =.327 and Beta = -.391). In other words, the CSE collaborative strategy (joint venture, cooperative and multivocality) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Similarly, although the product development, framing and convening Beta coefficients of -.319, -.319, -.187 show that these variables are correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, they are less important for poverty alleviation. For these variables to impact on poverty, there should be a conscious effort by the CSEs to combine the variables with the right form of collaboration.

These findings suggest that the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies, licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation. Also, CSE multivocality strategy has a positive correlation, indicating that this will have a positive impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Other strategies, such as framing, convening and product development, all have negative correlations, which suggest that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. This finding is consistent with the
works of David et al. (2013); Fox (2015) and Ocasio and Radoynovska (2016) on the necessity of social movement to increase income through collaboration in order to achieve their social mission of poverty alleviation. Massey et al. (2015) and Dauletshina (2015) are not indifferent to these findings. Both have recommended licensing agreements to overcome the challenges of resource voids and poverty alleviation.

6.14 Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on employment creation and business opportunity

The interaction effect of CSE collaboration and strategy on employment creation and business opportunity was also tested and Section 5.15 shows a correlation coefficient of .261 in the model summary table, which indicates a weak linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and employment creation. A coefficient of determination of .230 indicates that a 23% increase in employment creation is explained by the CSE collaborations and strategies. That is, CSE collaborative strategies will affect employment creation by 23%. The ANOVA Table 5.15b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and employment creation. Figures from Table 5.15 show that licensing agreement has a correlation value of .821 and a t-value of 5.600, joint venture has a correlation of -.516 with a t-value of -4.478, cooperative has a positive correlation of .281 with a t-value of 2.602, alliance has a negative correlation of -.209 with a t-value of -.382, while framing strategy has a correlation of -.328 with a t-value of -.197, convening has a negative correlation of -.034 with a t-value of -.312, multivocality has a positive correlation of .643 with a t-value of .959, while product development has a correlation of -.397 with a t-value of -2.296.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.15, the multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.552, -.434, .183, -.061, -.197, -.025, .227 and -.295, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, alliances, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here are also twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although licensing agreements and joint ventures are highly significant (p < .01), while cooperatives and product development are significant.
Additionally, cooperatives, product development and licensing agreements have a relatively higher impact than the other variables (Beta = -0.552, -0.434, 0.183, -0.061, -0.197, -0.025, 0.227 and -0.295). In other words, the CSE collaborative strategy (licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Although the joint ventures and product development Beta coefficients of -0.434 and -0.295 show that these variables are correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, they are less important for poverty alleviation. These findings suggest that the interaction effects of licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through employment creation, therefore alleviating poverty in Nigeria. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as joint ventures, alliances, framing, convening and product development, all have negative correlation values, which suggest that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation. More recent studies are consistent with the results of this study, particularly on the importance of cooperatives in employment creation, as in Wollni and Fischer (2015); Boone and Ozcan (2015); as well as Paranque and Willmott (2016). Drawing on these findings, one can suggest that little or no consideration should be given to other collaborative strategies, such as joint ventures, alliances, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, as they have not contributed positively to employment and business opportunities through an interaction effect, as seen by looking at their p values. This is opposed by the views of Montgomery et al. (2012) and Peredo (2014) on poverty, reciprocity and community based entrepreneurship, who opined that framing, convening and multivocality will increase employment and develop the local economy to reduce poverty.

6.15 Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on education and training

This research found that the effect of CSEs collaboration and strategy on education and training will positively impact on poverty alleviation. Section 5.16 shows a correlation coefficient of 0.679 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and education and training. A coefficient of determination value of 0.461 indicates that only a 46.1% increase in
education and training is explained by the CSE collaborations and strategies. The from ANOVA Table 5.16b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and education and training. Table 5.16 shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.171 and a t-value of -1.361, joint venture has a correlation of -.591 with a t-value of -5.980, cooperative has a positive correlation of .423 with a t-value of 4.563, alliance has a correlation of .146 with a t-value of .310, while framing strategy has a correlation of .179 with a t-value of 1.069, convening has a negative correlation of -.127 with a t-value of -1.366, multivocality has a positive correlation of .293 with a t-value of .509, while product development has a correlation of .060 with a t-value of .405.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.16, the multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.115, -.495, .274, .042, .107, -.094, .103 and .044, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, alliances, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here show, firstly, that all the variables, licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors, and that cooperatives and joint ventures are highly significant (p < .01). Additionally, cooperatives, product development and licensing agreements have a relatively higher impact than the other variables (Beta = -.552, -.434, .183, -.061, -.197, -.025, .227 and -.295). In other words, the CSE collaborative strategy licensing agreement, cooperative and multivocality variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Although the joint ventures and product development Beta coefficients of -.434 and-.295 show that these variables are correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, they are less important for poverty alleviation.

These findings indicate that the interaction effects of the cooperative and alliance forms of collaboration and the multivocality and product development strategies have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through education and training. That is, when CSEs engage in these forms of collaboration, this will reduce poverty. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, framing and convening, all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on
poverty alleviation through employment creation, as revealed in this study.

In this regard, CSEs should invest more in education and training in order to have a greater impact on poverty alleviation. This result is an indication that the interaction between CSE collaboration and strategy will, to an extent, impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Again, different researchers have got different views about the findings of this work. For example, Montgomery et al. (2012) and Cheney et al. (2014) support collaboration for community development to reduce poverty. Hoftad and Torfing (2015), in Collaborative Innovation as a Tool for Environmental, Economic and Social Sustainability in Regional Governance, argued differently in this regard; the author has not considered education and training as a poverty alleviation mechanism.

6.16 Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on skills development

Regarding the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on skills development, Section 5.17 shows a correlation coefficient of .302 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and skills development. A coefficient of determination value of .273 indicates that only a 27.3% increase in skills development is explained by the CSE collaborations and strategies. The ANOVA Table 5.17b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and skills development.

Table 5.17 shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.126 and a t-value of -.907, joint venture has a correlation of -.435 with a t-value of -.375, cooperative has a positive correlation of .373 with a t-value of 3.642, alliance has a correlation of .519 with a t-value of .997, while framing strategy has a correlation of -.486 with a t-value of -2.627, convening has a correlation of .016 with a t-value of .157, multivocality has a positive correlation of .498 with a t-value of .783, while product development has a correlation of -.005 with a t-value of -.028.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.17, the multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.087, -.375, .249, .155, -.299, .012, .180 and -.003, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, alliances, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here are also twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing agreements, joint
ventures, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although joint ventures and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01), while framing is significant (p<.05)). Additionally, cooperatives, alliances and multivocality have a relatively higher impact than the other variables (Beta = .249, .155 and .180). In other words, the CSE collaborative strategy variables of cooperatives, alliances and multivocality function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Although the joint ventures and framing Beta coefficients of -.375 and -.299 shows that these variables are correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, they are less important for poverty alleviation.

These findings suggest that the interaction effects of cooperative and alliance forms of collaboration and multivocality and convening strategies have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through skills development. This result has buttressed the work of Montgomery et al. (2012) that convening and multivocality will create a social change through poverty alleviation. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, framing and convening, all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Montgomery et al. (2012) posited that CSE collaborative strategies will enhance skills development, but Veilleux and Queenton (2015) and Swain (2015) opined differently and claimed that other factors will translate to poverty alleviation, including innovation through collaboration enhancement.

6.17 Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on standard of living and welfare

Looking at the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on standard of living and welfare, Section 5.18 shows a correlation coefficient of .343 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and standard of living and welfare. A coefficient of determination value of .316 indicates that a 31.6% increase in standard of living and welfare is explained by the CSE collaborations and strategies. The ANOVA Table 5.18b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and standard of living and welfare. Table 5.18 shows that licensing agreement
has a correlation value of .201 and a t-value of 1.455, joint venture has a correlation of -.755 with a t-value of -6.975, cooperative has a positive correlation of .124 with a t-value of 1.222, alliance has a correlation of .829 with a t-value of 1.607, while framing strategy has a correlation of -.660 with a t-value of -3.596, convening has a correlation of -.260 with a t-value of -2.548, multivocality has a positive correlation of .686 with a t-value of 1.088, while product development has a correlation of -.060 with a t-value of -.372.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.18, the multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, .135, -.637, .081, .243, -.396, -.193, .243 and -.045, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, alliances, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. These findings are also twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors (although joint ventures and framing are highly significant (p < .01), while convening is significant (p<.05)). Additionally, licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality have a relatively higher impact than the other variables (Beta = .135, .081 and .243). In other words, the CSE collaborative licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Although the joint ventures and framing Beta coefficients of -.637 and -.396 show that these variables are correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, they are less important for poverty alleviation.

These findings suggest that the interaction effects of the licensing agreement, cooperative and alliance forms of collaboration, as well as the multivocality strategy, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as joint ventures, framing, convening and product development, all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare, looking at the ANOVA result value of .000 at p<.05 in Table 5.18b. In support of this finding, Cheney (2015); Long et al. (2015) and Paranque and Willmott (2016) argued on the impact of cooperatives in poverty alleviation, and also as an
alternative to capitalism. Kasmir (2016) has also carried out a critical analysis of cooperatives and global capitalism and concluded that cooperatives are a panacea to poverty and economic development. Conclusively, the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies will positively impact poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare, as explained in Table 5.18.

6.18 Effect of the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on savings and investments

Another finding of this research, looking at the interaction effects of CSE collaborations and strategies on savings and investments in Section 5.19, shows a correlation coefficient of .302 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and savings and investment. A coefficient of determination value of .273 indicates that a 27.3% increase in savings and investment is explained by the CSE collaborations and strategies. The ANOVA Table 5.19b shows a value of .000 at p<.05, indicating that there is a significant relationship between CSE collaborative strategies and savings and investment. Table 5.19 shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.126 and a t-value of -.907, joint venture has a correlation of -.435 with a t-value of -3.988, cooperative has a positive correlation of .373 with a t-value of 3.642, alliance has a correlation of .519 with a t-value of .997, while framing strategy has a correlation of -.486 with a t-value of -2.627, convening has a correlation of .016 with a t-value of .157, multivocality has a positive correlation of .498 with a t-value of .783, while product development has a correlation of -.005 with a t-value of -.028.

From the coefficient table in Section 5.19 shows multiple linear regression estimates, including the intercept (the constant) and the significant levels. The Beta weights, -.087, -.375, .249, .155, -.299, .012, .180 and -.003, express the relative importance of each independent variable (licensing agreements, joint ventures, alliances, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development) in standardized terms. The findings here are also twofold: firstly, all the variables, licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, are significant predictors. Joint ventures and cooperatives are highly significant (p < .01). Additionally, cooperatives, alliances, convening and multivocality have a relatively higher impact than the other variables (Beta = .249, .155, .012 and .180). In other words,
the CSE collaborative strategies of cooperatives, alliances, convening and multivocality variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than the other variables. Although the joint ventures and framing Beta coefficients of -.375 and -.299 show that these variables are correlated with the CSE collaborations variables, they are less important for poverty alleviation.

The findings suggest that the interaction effects of the cooperative and alliance forms of collaboration, as well as multivocality and convening strategies, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, framing and product development, all have negative correlation values, which suggest that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment, as shown by the ANOVA result value of .000 at p<.05 in Table 5.19b. More significant findings show that some forms of CSE collaboration arrangements are statistically irrelevant to poverty alleviation through CSE savings and investment whilst interacting with CSE strategies. These findings support the work of Arogundade (2011) on the impact of savings and investment on poverty alleviation. This result is not to say that CSE collaborations and strategies will not alleviate poverty, it only depicts that the interaction of CSE strategies and collaborations on savings and investment may not alleviate poverty in some circumstances. Kanbur (2015) in Poverty Alleviation Strategies and New Economic Model, argued in favour of savings as a poverty alleviation strategy, although their work was not tested on the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies.

6.19 Nigeria CSE profile

For the purpose of this study, the following socio-demographic factors were taken into consideration: the nature of the CSE, their age group, marital status, educational backgrounds, religion, years of operation, size, capital, income and opinions on how their collaborative strategy impacts on poverty. Cross-tabulation of the respondents in relation to these socio-demographic characteristics was analyzed to provide a better insight into the general profile of Nigerian CSEs. The responses were analyzed from the questionnaire items, which focused on the CSEs collaborative strategies to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.
6.20 Year of establishment of your organization

With regards to the number of years that the CSEs have been in operation, it was found that some of the CSEs have been in the industry for over a decade, as shown in Table 5.20.1. CSE is not a relatively new phenomenon in Nigeria, as 75 respondents said that their organization had existed for between 10-15 years, whilst 61 respondents said that their organization had existed for between 5-10 years. Most of the CSEs are still growing as they have only been in existence for less than 5 years, according to 41 respondents. Only about 1.5%, represented by 3 respondents, said that their organization had been in existence for over 20 years.

This finding is in tandem with Smith and Wood (2015), who claimed that some of the CSEs have been in existence for over a decade but their impact on poverty alleviation and economic development was not felt. It will be assumed that the higher the number of years of operation, the bigger the organization, the greater the number of employees and the higher the salaries and wages paid to the employees, but this is contrary to expectation as some of the CSEs that have been in operation for over ten years are still small in terms of capital and number of employees, as reported in Table 5.20.3 and Table 5.20.4.

6.20.1 CSE sectors

The findings in this study revealed that the majority of the CSEs under investigation are social enterprise organizations, as confirmed by 134 respondents, representing 66.7%. As explained in the literature review in this study, the mission of SEs is social in nature (Worrell et al., 2013; Hansen, 2014; Tan et al., 2015). From the analysis, 15 respondents said that their CSE is a mixed organization, representing 7.5% and 52 respondents said their organization is non-profit/non-governmental, representing 25.9%. From the theoretical perspective, a non-profit/non-government organization is a social enterprise. This means that the majority of these organizations are social enterprises who are collaborating for a social mission to alleviate poverty (Smith & Woods, 2015; Balkema & Romijn, 2015; Akemu et al., 2016).

6.20.2 Size of the organization in terms of numbers
This research also found that the different CSEs have different ranges of numbers of employees. Responses from the survey indicate that most of the organizations have between 10-20 employees, which represents 37.3%, some of the CSEs have between 20-30 employees, representing 34.8% and others have over 30 employees, which represents 27.9%. These statistics show that CSEs have the capacity to create employment. This also reflects the result of the SPSS multiple regression analysis in Table 5.3, with a significant value of 0.22. The result also reflects the position of Semali (2015) and Si et al. (2016), that social entrepreneurs are value and employment creation ventures. The result of this finding is also in agreement with Abubakar (2010) and De Bruin and Lewis (2015), which is that the SEs mission is value creation and employment generation.

6.20.3 Size of the organization in terms of capital
Again, an attempt was made to find out the size of the CSE organizations in terms of capital, which showed that the majority of the organizations, 136 respondents, have between 5-10 million Naira capital, which represents 67.7%. Also, 46 respondents said their capital is above 10 million Naira, which represents 22.9%. Therefore, it can be said that most of the CSEs have adequate capital to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria. However, Moshtari (2016) mentioned that the financial strength of the SE has a direct influence on strategy, therefore, the collaborative strategy of the CSEs may be influenced by the financial resources. More so, Moshtari (2016) also stressed that N10, 000 is sufficient working capital for SEs. However, this may vary according to the environment, availability of capital, projects undertaken and so on (Kasali et al., 2015; Faboyede et al., 2015).

6.20.4 The gender distribution of the CSE workforce in Nigeria
This finding shows that CSEs are open in terms of employment, as they employ both males and females. In the gender survey, 110 respondents were female, representing 54.7%, while 91 were male, representing 45.3%. This result is evidence of the fact the CSEs observe equality in their recruitment and selection processes and that there is a balance in the gender distribution (Adiyia et al., 2016).

6.20.5 The level of education
Regarding the educational qualifications of the respondents, it was found that the majority of the respondents are degree holders, with a total response of 153 respondents, representing 76.1%. In addition, 2 have a Masters degree and 1 has a PhD. To demonstrate that CSEs recruit across various levels of education, 10 respondents have a
GCE/O’level and 35 respondents have OND/HND, representing 17.4%. These findings are accurate according to Abubarkar (2012) and Alix-Garcia et al. (2015), who argue that the majority of the SEs, in an attempt to reduce poverty, recruit across various educational qualifications and backgrounds.

6.20.6 The religion
Although Nigeria is a multicultural nation with different religious beliefs, according to Tiemo and Arubayi (2012), it is interesting to note here that all the respondents surveyed in this research were either Muslims or Christians. Even though CSEs operate a fair and transparent recruitment process (Ezekiel & Edwin, 2016), and there are other religious practices in Nigeria, none of those apart from Christians and Muslims are under the employment of the CSEs. From the statistics in Table 5.20.7, the majority of the respondents are Muslims, with a figure of 112 representing 55.7%, and 89 respondents are Christians, representing 44.3%.

6.20.7 Marital status
The findings also reveal that CSEs recruit across different marital statuses, which supports Vidovic et al. (2015). This shows that their efforts to reduce poverty are not restricted to people of a particular gender or marital status. From the survey, 34 respondents were single, 72 respondents were married, 67 respondents were married with children and 28 respondents were single with children. The equality and diversity of the workforce demonstrated here by CSE organizations is in line with the position of Tiemo and Arubayi (2012), Swain (2015) and Gbenga et al. (2015), which is that the contemporary workplace is saddled with the responsibility of balancing equality and diversity.

6.20.8 Duration of employment
An attempt to find out the number of years that respondents have stayed in employment with the CSEs shows that 40.8% of the respondents have worked for up to 9 years, as stated by 82 employees, 73 respondents said they have worked for up 14 years, representing 36.3%, 40 respondents have worked for up to 4 years, representing 19.9% and 6 respondents have worked for over 15 years, which represents 3%. The implications of this finding are that CSEs as a social enterprise organization are not only employing people but have also been able to keep their employees in employment in an attempt to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.
6.20.9 Monthly income in Naira
Going further to investigate how much the employees income is increasing apart from being in employment as revealed earlier, Table 5.20.11 shows that 150 out of the 201 respondents said that their income had increased since they joined the CSE organization and 9 respondents (disagree and strongly disagree) said obviously that their income had not increased since they joined the organization. There could be factors that led to there being no increase in salaries, such as the number of years in employment, experience and other factors (Edet, 2015). Therefore, it is worth stating here that CSEs are employers of labour, sustaining the workforce and also increasing salaries when due in order to address the problem of poverty (Idris & Yusof, 2016).

6.20.10 Opinion on whether the organization creates employment opportunities
A very interesting finding of this research is that CSEs generate employment opportunities (Aye et al., 2016). Making reference to Table 5.20.12, 183 out of 201 respondents that participated in the survey said that CSEs create employment opportunities, which represents 91%. This finding is an indication that CSEs create employment opportunities. This result is in line with Abubakar (2012) and Nwajiuba et al. (2016), who argue that the CSEs mission is to alleviate poverty through employment generation. The findings here also corroborate the SPSS data analysis findings in Table 5.2, which are that the cooperative form of CSE generates employment opportunities.

6.20.11 Opinion on whether the organization provides the necessary training when the need arises
This piece of research found that, in addition to creating employment, CSEs provide training to their employees when the need arises. From the information gathered from the respondents, an aggregate of 131 respondents agreed with the fact that CSEs provide training when the need arises. This finding is in agreement with Kansikas and Murphy (2011) who said that one of the characteristics of an innovative social entrepreneur is the provision of training to update existing knowledge.

6.20.12 Opinion on whether the CSE organization has improved their standard of living
In relation to whether CSEs can improve the welfare of their employees, it was found that CSEs improve both welfare and standard of living, according to a slight majority of the respondents. Seventy-four participants strongly agreed that the CSE organization has
helped to improve their standard of living, 56 participants in the survey agreed that their standard of living has improved since they joined the CSE organization and 44 respondents were indifferent. Again, according to Abioro and Adefeso (2016) and Dauda (2016), since the CSEs mission is to address the problems of poverty, they must also be able to improve the standard of living of people in the immediate environment, which is also in tandem with this finding.

6.20.13 Opinion on whether skills development is a major consideration of the organization
This study also discovered that CSEs are engaged in skills development by looking at the aggregate responses of those that agreed and disagreed. The result of this analysis shows that 69 participants strongly agreed that the CSE organization considers skills development, 28 participants in the survey agreed that the CSE organization considers skills development, 65 respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the organization considers skills development, while 11 respondents strongly disagreed that CSEs consider skills development. Drawing from this finding, it can be concluded that some CSE organizations do consider skills development and some do not. This finding is partly supported here when considering the work of Hassan (2015) on the impact of GDP on poverty reduction in Nigeria, who claimed that skills development is an important incremental factor to GDP for economic development and poverty alleviation.

6.20.14 Savings and investment
It was observed from this study that the majority of the CSE employees have savings and investments. It was shown that 151 respondents said they have savings and investments, representing 75%, while 50 respondents said they do not have either savings or investments and this represents 24.9%. In Table 5.20.11, the majority of the respondents agreed that their income has increased and this has thereby given rise to an increase in savings and investments, which is confirmed in Table 5.20.16. According to the World Bank (2012) and World Bank (2014), to live above the poverty line an individual should live on at least $2/day. For the individuals that have saving this means that they live above the poverty line, as savings represent the excess of income over expenditure. In a nutshell, CSEs are able to break the circle of poverty by increasing income to create savings and investment.
6.20.15 Opinion on the form of SEs collaboration that suitably addresses poverty reduction in Nigeria
Another finding of this research is that the cooperative, joint venture and licensing agreement forms of collaboration are the best CSE collaborations for addressing the problem of poverty in Nigeria, but cooperatives rank first according to the results of the findings in Table 5.20.17. This might be a reason why the majority of the CSEs are in the area of cooperatives in Nigeria. The findings here confirm the positions of Wollni and Fischer (2015) and Herbst and Prufer (2016) that rural cooperative is the remedy for poverty alleviation.

6.20.16 Opinion on whether the collaboration is sustainable to address poverty in Nigeria
Findings from the research also show that there is a divide between those that said the CSE collaboration is sustainable and those that did not. From Table 5.20.18, it can be seen that 94 of the 201 respondents that participated in the survey said that CSE collaboration is not sustainable, and this represents 46.8%, while 107 respondents said that collaboration is sustainable, representing 53.2%. It is interesting to know that 37.3% in Table 5.20.1 said that their CSE organization has been in existence between 10-15 years, while 10.4% said their CSE organization had been in existence for about 20 years. Based on the responses from the survey, the research will take the position that the CSE collaboration will be sustainable. To further buttress the researcher’s position on CSE sustainability, evidence shows that many CSEs have been in the industry for over a decade, as was found in Table 5.20.1. CSE is not a relatively new phenomenon in Nigeria, as respondents said that their organization had existed for between 10-15 years and over. Smith and Woods (2015) claimed that CSE sustainability is a function of their goal congruence and the alignment of their culture and structure.

6.20.17 Opinion on the form of SEs strategy that suitably addresses poverty reduction in Nigeria
The current study probed into the best collaborative strategy to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria and it was found that different strategies can be used to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. From the respondents survey, 73 respondents think that a framing strategy wi
address the problem of poverty, 56 respondents said that multivocality will better address the problem of poverty in Nigeria, representing 27.9%, 40 respondents confirmed that product development is the best strategy, representing 19.9%, while 32 respondents said the convening is the best strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. The results of these findings show that CSEs can adopt different collaborative strategies as long as they meet the objectives of the organization (Agwu & Kadiri, 2014). The findings here confirm the position of Montgomery et al. (2012) on collaboratively shaping social good, who said that framing, multivocality and convening are strategies for community development to address the poverty menace. Tan et al. (2015) have not argued differently on this discourse, as they also stated the power of collaborative arrangement to achieve the corporate mission. Interviewees also confirmed that cooperatives, joint ventures and multivocality will be suitable to address the problem of poverty alleviation in Nigeria. When asked about the best form of SEs strategy to suitably address poverty reduction in Nigeria, various responses are seen below:

Respondent 1: “well, all the collaborations we adopt are working but we have recently adopted more of joint venture and cooperative, at the same time speaking in one voice is a very powerful strategy”.

Respondent 2: “In my experience, talking about collaboration, cooperative is good especially with those that understand what we are doing. We do also adopt the strategy of coming together as a collective to speak in one voice”.

Respondent 3: “our cooperative collaboration has been sustainable over the years and we intend to continue in it. Another thing we do here is to speak in a multiple voices so that we can be heard and achieve our purpose”.

Respondent 4: “If government policies allow us do what we are supposed to do, our joint collaboration will continue to uphold along with cooperative. The ideal of coming together as a collective organization has also helped in a great deal”.

Respondent 5: “I think our collaboration and strategy will depend on the project on ground. Maybe, I will say cooperative for now and speaking with one voice as a collective because this is basically what is working for us”.

Respondent 6: “the organization has worked with other cooperative organizations and we want to continue in it. Though we had licensing arrangement in the past and we may still adopt that in future. Our strategies are numerous and we do jointly implement these strategies”.

Therefore, in order to answer the question concerning the best CSE strategy to address the
problem of poverty in Nigeria, either an individual strategy or collective strategies can be used to tackle the problem of poverty. Respondents said that the cooperative and joint venture forms of collaborations and multivocality and convening strategies will address the problem of poverty in Nigeria.

6.20.18 Opinion on whether convening strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria
As regards the specific strategy that will best address the problem of poverty, findings revealed that 172 out of the 201 respondents that participated in the survey, which is the majority of the participants, strongly agreed with the statement that convening strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria, this was 172 respondents representing 85.6% while 29 participants only agreed that convening strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria representing 14.4%. According to this survey, a convening strategy will possibly reduce poverty in Nigeria, as can be seen by looking at the aggregate agreed response. This research has supported the work of Hahn and Gold (2014) and Rodriguez et al. (2016) who posited the positive power of convening in achieving corporate mission. The responses of the interviewees are in line with the quantitative result; in the interview, respondents were asked whether coming together (convening) as a CSE organization can help to address the problem of poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Respondents said:

“CSE as a concept is a collaborative strategy, CSE in itself is convening and our mission is poverty alleviation. We believe in the power of synergy and partnership which is the reason for our collaboration. It is therefore obvious that coming together as collectives can address the problem of poverty alleviation in Nigeria”.

From the response of the interview participants, convening will be a strategic tool for poverty alleviation in Nigeria.

6.20.19 Opinion on whether multivocality strategy can help CSE organizations to achieve poverty alleviation mission in Nigeria
Asking whether a multivocality form of strategy can reduce poverty, from the participants surveyed, 11 respondents were not sure whether multivocality can reduce poverty in Nigeria and this represents 5.5%, 23 respondents agreed that multivocality can reduce poverty in Nigeria, representing 11.4% and 167 respondents strongly agreed that multivocality is a poverty reduction strategy. Looking at the majority of the respondents that agreed and strongly agreed, it can be concluded that CSEs can use
multivocality as a poverty alleviation strategy in Nigeria (Montgomery et al., 2012; Peredo, 2014; Knorringa, 2014; Klingebiel & Paulo, 2015; Beisheim & Liese, 2016). During the interviews, respondents were asked whether multivocality is an ideal strategy for poverty alleviation. Respondents said:

“As an organization of collectives, we have strategies and we have different strategies. Combining different voices is one of our strategies that is very reliable and effective. This has helped us to overcome lots of limitations to achieve our objective”.

As defined in Table 5.21, multivocality is about speaking through multiple voices as a CSE. Respondents confirmed during the interview that multivocality is an ideal strategy and, in fact, one of the most reliable and effective strategies to help to achieve poverty alleviation objectives.

6.20.20 Opinion on whether product development as a strategy will impact greatly on poverty reduction in Nigeria

Regarding whether product development as a strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria, from Table 5.20.23 it can be seen that some of the participants surveyed strongly agreed with the statement that product development strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria and 121 respondents agreed that product development can reduce poverty, representing 60.2%. Twenty-eight respondents were not sure, these participants neither agreed nor disagreed, which represents 13.9%, while 24 participants disagreed that a product development strategy can reduce poverty in Nigeria. Literature on social entrepreneurship has claimed that innovation is the vehicle that drives entrepreneurs (Alden Rivers et al., 2015; Evers & Ewert, 2015; Van Der Have & Rubalcaba, 2016) and one of the areas of innovation is product development. It is therefore pertinent that CSEs must continuously develop new products or improve on existing ones in order to achieve their social mission (Oh et al., 2015; Kach et al., 2015; Webb, 2016). More so, when interviewees were asked how product development has translated into poverty alleviation, the majority of the respondents agreed that they have not been able to achieve many of the poverty alleviation goals through product development but, at the same time, they have been able to combine other strategies to achieve their mission. This connotes that the poverty alleviation mission can be achieved by CSEs through product development in combination with other strategies.
6.21 Relation between conceptual framework and research findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Framework Variables</th>
<th>Research Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSE collaboration variables:</strong></td>
<td>Findings reveal that all the variables, that is, licensing arrangement, joint venture, cooperative and Alliances are significant predators of poverty alleviation (although joint venture and alliance are highly significant (p &lt; .01) while alliance is significant (p&lt;.05). The results also shows that joint venture has a relatively high impact on poverty alleviation than cooperatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of CSE Collaborations on Employment Creation and Business Opportunity</strong></td>
<td>This studies reveals that licensing agreement, joint venture, cooperatives and Alliances are significant predators to poverty alleviation through employment creation and business opportunity. The analysis in table 5.3 looking at the beta values indicates that licensing agreement and cooperative will impact more on poverty alleviation than joint venture and alliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of CSE Collaborations on Education and Training</strong></td>
<td>Findings reveal that all the variables, that is, licensing arrangement, joint venture, cooperative and Alliances are significant predators (although joint venture and alliance are highly significant (p &lt; .01) while alliance is significant (p&lt;.05). The results also shows that joint venture has a relatively high impact on poverty alleviation than cooperatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of CSE Collaborations on Employment Creation and Business Opportunity</strong></td>
<td>This studies reveals that licensing agreement, joint venture, cooperatives and Alliances are significant predators to poverty alleviation (Licensing agreement and cooperative are highly significant (p &lt; .01) while joint venture and alliances are significant (p &lt; .05). The analysis in table 5.3 looking at the beta values indicates that licensing agreement and cooperative will impact more on poverty alleviation than joint venture and alliances even though they are correlated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of CSE Collaborations on Education and Training</td>
<td>The findings here are two folds: first, all the variables—licensing arrangement, joint venture, cooperative and Alliances are significant predators. However, joint venture and cooperatives are highly significant ($p &lt; .01$) while alliance is significant ($p&lt;.05$). Additionally, cooperative has a relatively high impact than alliances ($\text{Beta } = .270$ and $\text{Beta } = .162$). In other words, the CSE collaborations (cooperative and alliances) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than other variables. Although joint venture is less important for poverty alleviation through education and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of CSE Collaborations on Skills Development</td>
<td>CSE collaboration variables are significant predators to poverty alleviation through skills development. Joint venture and cooperative are highly significant ($p &lt; .01$) while licensing agreement and alliances are significant ($p &lt; .05$). The analysis in table 5.5, indicates that alliances and cooperative will contribute more to poverty alleviation than joint venture and licensing agreement. The findings reveal that skills development will help in poverty alleviation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of CSE Collaborations on Standard of Living and Welfare</td>
<td>Findings here reveal that all the variables—licensing arrangement, joint venture, cooperative and Alliances are significant predators. Joint venture is highly significant ($p &lt; .01$) while licensing agreement, cooperative and alliance are significant ($p&lt;.05$). Additionally, licensing agreement has a relatively high impact than cooperatives and alliances. In other words, the CSE collaborations (licensing agreement) variables function more as a proxy for poverty alleviation than other variables.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CSE strategies: | Findings shows that these forms of strategies (Multivocality, Framing, Convening and Product development) will positively impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Strategies through CSE Framing and Multivocality have a positive correlation value of .109 and .102 at 0.5 t-value. On the other hand, CSE strategies through convening and product development though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables as measured in this study, it has a negative correlation value of -.163 and -.541 respectively. This implies that reliance on convening and product development form of strategies by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through increased income.

The study found that CSEs Strategies can impact on poverty alleviation. Multivocality was found to have a positive impact on poverty alleviation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multivocality</td>
<td>Impact of CSE Strategies on increase income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>From the result, multivocality and product development strategies will not have much impact on poverty alleviation as they all have negative correlation and at the same time statistically insignificant. Framing, Convening, Multivocality and Product Development - The values indicate that the variables are significant predators to poverty alleviation. Product development is highly significant (p &lt; .01) while multivocality is significant (p &lt; .05). The beta value indicates that framing and convening will contribute more to poverty alleviation than multivocality and product development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening</td>
<td>Impact of CSE Strategies on Employment Creation and Business Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product development</td>
<td>This finding indicates that only product development strategy is statistically significant at .620 which implies that this form of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Strategies through CSE Framing, Convening and Multivocality have a negative correlation value of -.046, -.193 and -.337 at 0.5 t-value, which thus implies that the more collaborations through deliberate Framing, convening and Multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not impact much on poverty alleviation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of CSE Strategies on Education and Training</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact of CSE Strategies on Skills Development

Strategies through CSE Framing and Multivocality have a negative correlation value of -.142 and -.298 at 0.5 t-values. This implies that the more collaboration through deliberate Framing and Multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not impact much on poverty alleviation. CSE strategies through product development and convening are statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables as measured in this study;

Reliance on product development and convening form of strategies by CSE organizations would create a positive change towards poverty in Nigeria through skill development.

### Impact of CSE Strategies on Standard of Living and Welfare

This findings indicates that Convening and Multivocality form of CSE strategies have a positive correlation of .139 and .770 respectively, and also with a t-values of 1.272 and 2.203 which implies that this forms of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Strategies through CSE Framing and Product Development have a negative correlation value of -.468, and -.044 at 0.5 t-values

### Impact of CSE Strategies on Savings and Investments

This finding here indicates that only Multivocality form of CSE strategies have a positive correlation of .985 with a t-values of 2.778 which implies that this form of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through savings and Investment. Strategies through CSE Framing, Convening and Product Development have a negative correlation values of -.617, -.080 and -.100 with a negative t-values of -3.137, -.723 and -.656. This implies that CSE collaborations through framing, convening and Product Development strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not impact much on poverty alleviation through savings and investment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of the Interaction of CSE Collaborations and Strategies on Poverty Alleviation Variables – Increase Income</th>
<th>This finding suggests that the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies, Licensing Agreement, Joint Venture, Cooperative and Alliances have a positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation. Also, CSE multivocality strategy has a positive correlation indicating that this will have a positive impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Other strategies like framing, convening and product development all have negative correlations which suggest that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through increase income. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through increase income.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effect of the Interaction of CSE Collaborations and Strategies on Employment Creation and Business Opportunity</td>
<td>This finding suggests that the interaction effect of Licensing Agreement, Cooperative and Multivocality have a positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through employment creation and therefore alleviating poverty in Nigeria. Other form of collaborations and strategies like Joint Venture, Alliance, framing, convening and product development all have negative correlation values which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of the Interaction of CSE Collaborations and Strategies on Education and Training</td>
<td>Findings from this result indicates that the interaction effect of Cooperative and Alliance form of collaborations, Multivocality and Product development strategies have a positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through education and training. That is, when CSEs engage in these forms of collaboration, this will reduce poverty. Other form of collaborations and strategies like Licensing Agreement, Joint Venture, framing and convening all have negative correlation values which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation as revealed in this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effect of the Interaction of CSE Collaborations and Strategies on Skills Development</strong></td>
<td>This finding suggests that the interaction effect of Cooperative and Alliance form of collaborations, Multivocality and Convensing strategies have a positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through skills development. Other form of collaborations and strategies like Licensing Agreement, Joint Venture, framing and convening all have negative correlation values which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through skills development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effect of the Interaction of CSE Collaborations and Strategies on Standard of Living and Welfare</strong></td>
<td>These findings suggests that the interaction effect of Licensing Agreement, Cooperative and Alliance form of collaborations as well as Multivocality strategy have a positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare. Other form of collaborations and strategies like Joint Venture, framing, convening and product development all have negative correlation values which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effect of the Interaction of CSE Collaborations and Strategies on Savings and Investments</strong></td>
<td>The findings suggests that the interaction effect of Cooperative and Alliance form of collaborations as well as Multivocality and convening strategies have a positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Other form of collaborations and strategies like Licensing agreement, Joint Venture, framing, and product development all have negative correlation values which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through savings &amp; investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective Social Entrepreneurship</strong></td>
<td>Findings from the semi structure in-depth interview revealed that CSEs through their collaborations and strategies impacts positively on poverty alleviation in Nigeria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.22 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. It has also examined the best form of collaborations and strategies by CSEs to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria, as revealed by the results of the quantitative and qualitative analysis. The findings have revealed that the cooperative form of collaboration and multivocality, amongst others, will help to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria (see Table 5.20.19). The findings in the previous chapter and the implications of the findings in the current chapter help to proffer solutions to research objectives two, three and four, which are stated in Chapter one and Chapter four of this study. Another finding in this research is that the cooperative, joint venture and licensing agreement forms of collaboration are the best CSE collaborations that can address the problem of poverty in Nigeria, but cooperative is ranked first according to the results of the findings in Table 5.20.17. It was observed that some of the CSE collaborations and strategies measured in this study do not impact on poverty alleviation. This could be as a result of the fact that there are other variables that are not considered in this study that can alleviate poverty in Nigeria, as noted by other scholars, such as government policies, religion, perception, sex, location and mortality rate (Agwu et al., 2014; Aremu & Adeyemi, 2011; Baba et al., 2014; Arogundade, 2011). The next chapter will highlight the conclusions and recommendations based on the findings of this research.
7.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the analysis of the data and discussion of the results carried out in Chapters 5 and 6 is reviewed in relation to the empirical evidence from the literature. Conclusions will be drawn in relation to the whole study. The aim of this study was to investigate CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Within this context, the study examined the nature of SEs collaborations, their collaborative strategies and the impact of these collaborations and strategies on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Insights from this study contribute to an understanding of how CSE collaborations can be used as a poverty alleviation mechanism in Nigeria. Drawing from the findings, this chapter makes some suggestions and recommendations.

The table 7.1 in appendix I depicts the implications of the research findings, the conclusions of this research on the established conclusions in the literature for each of the study’s research objectives, as well as recommendations in relation to each objective.

7.1 Concluding Discussion

7.1.1 Impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation variables

The research concerning the impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation variables, as determined by CSE employers and employees surveyed in this research, was depicted in Table 5.2. In determining the impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation, a correlation coefficient of .495 in the model summary table shows a strong linear relationship between CSE collaborations and poverty alleviation through increased income. The model summary table reveals a coefficient of determination of .245, which indicates that there is a linear relationship among the variables explained. That is, a 24.5% increase in income is determined by the CSE collaborations. Furthermore, results from Table 5.2 show that licensing agreement has a correlation value of .127 and a t-value of .958, joint venture has a correlation value of .437 and a t-value of 4.280, cooperative has a correlation value of .398 and a t-value of 4.153 and alliance has a correlation value of -.647 and a t-value of -.209. This result suggests that both CSE cooperative and joint venture collaborations were statistically significant at t= 4.280 and 4.153 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation. Collaborations through CSE
cooperatives and joint ventures have positive correlation values of .398 and .437 at 0.5 t-value, which implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and joint ventures of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaborations through licensing agreements, though not statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables as measured, have a positive correlation value of .127. This implies that reliance on licensing agreements as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would exacerbate poverty in Nigeria rather than alleviate it. The reason for this may be attributed to different factors that are either internal within the CSEs or externally motivated. These findings suggest that CSE collaborations will impact on poverty alleviation through cooperatives and joint ventures. The opinion of Fidelis et al. (2015), that collaborations and networking will alleviate poverty, supports the findings of this study. Kasmir (2016) also stated that collaborative arrangements will favour poverty alleviation and economic development.

7.1.2 Impact of CSE collaborations on employment creation and business opportunity
The study revealed that CSE collaborations have a positive impact on employment creation and business opportunity in Nigeria through cooperatives and licensing agreements, while joint ventures and alliances will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. Evidence in the model summary table 5.3a also shows a correlation of determination value of .196, which shows a weak linear relationship between CSE collaboration and employment creation. That is, a 19.6% increase in employment and business opportunities is determined by the CSE collaborations. Results also show that licensing agreement has a correlation value of .127 and a t-value of .958, joint venture has a correlation value of .437 and a t-value of 4.280, cooperative has a correlation value of .398 and a t-value of 4.153 and alliance has a correlation value of -.647 and a t-value of -.209. This is an indication that both CSE cooperative and licensing agreement collaborations were statistically significant at t= 3.712 and 5.663 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation. Collaborations through CSE cooperatives and joint ventures have positive correlation values of .862 and .409 at 0.5 t-value, which implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and licensing agreements of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaborations through joint ventures and alliances, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have negative correlation values of -.374 and -.507. This implies that reliance on joint ventures and alliances as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would exacerbate poverty in
Nigeria rather than alleviate it.

Recent studies posited that cooperative collaboration will create employment opportunities (Wollni & Fischer, 2015; Herbst & Prufer, 2016). In this study, joint ventures and alliances were not statistically significant and also have negative correlation values of -.374 and -.507 respectively. This analysis implies that collaboration through joint ventures and alliances will not have much effect on poverty alleviation in Nigeria, probably as a result of its the lack of popularity and effectiveness of such forms of collaboration. These findings are contrary to the position of Schuler (2015) that joint ventures and alliances could have a positive impact on poverty alleviation. Again, recent studies have opposed the position of Yi Wei on collaborations. Yang et al. (2016); Nathan (2015); Pomponi et al. (2015) and Saha and Chattopadhyay (2015) have supported the findings of this research on the positive impact of collaboration on employment creation.

7.1.3 Impact of CSE collaborations on education and training

The findings revealed that CSE collaborations will impact positively on education and training, as illustrated in Table 5.4, through cooperative and alliance collaboration, while joint ventures and licensing agreements will not impact on education and training. Table 5.4 shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.173 and a t-value of -1.350, joint venture has a correlation value of -.597 and a t-value of -6.030, cooperative has a correlation value of .418 and a t-value of 4.493 and alliance has a correlation value of .559 and a t-value of 2.505. The results in Table 5.4 suggest that both CSE cooperative and alliance collaborations were statistically significant at t= 4.493 and 2.505 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Collaborations through CSE cooperatives and alliances have positive correlation values of .418 and .559 at 0.5 t-value, which implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and alliances of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaboration through joint ventures and licensing agreements, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables as measured, have negative correlation values of -.173 and -.597. This implies that reliance on joint ventures and licensing agreements as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would exacerbate poverty in Nigeria rather than alleviate it through education and training.

These findings are in line with the work of Begum and Abdin (2015); Hickel (2016) and Fidelis et al. (2015) who are of the view that cooperatives can increase economic
development and reduce poverty through education and training. This is despite the fact that other forms of collaboration, such as licensing agreements and joint ventures, were not significant and also have negative correlations of -.173 and -.597. Consequently, the cooperative form of collaboration should be encouraged in order to engage more in education and training and therefore to have more impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Conclusively, this study revealed that licensing agreements and joint ventures will not contribute positively to poverty alleviation through education and training but will impact on poverty through other poverty alleviation indices, such as increased income, skills development, employment creation and business opportunities.

7.1.4 Impact of CSE collaborations on skills development
It is the finding of this study, looking at the impact of CSE collaboration on skills development from Table 5.5 that joint ventures and licensing agreements will impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Findings reveal that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.120 and a t- value of -.850, joint venture has a correlation value of -.414 and a t- value of -3.797, cooperative has a correlation value of .393 and a t- value of 3.840 and alliance has a correlation value of .514 and a t- value of 2.095. This result shows that the cooperative and alliance forms of collaboration will have more of an impact on poverty alleviation through skills development than any other form of collaboration. This suggests that, the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and alliances of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaborations through joint ventures and licensing agreements, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables as measured, have negative correlation values of -.120 and -.414. This implies that reliance on joint ventures and licensing agreements as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would impact on poverty in Nigeria through skills development.

The findings reveal that skills development will help in poverty alleviation. Some scholars have earlier claimed that when collaborators engage in skills development, this will impact on poverty alleviation (Peterson, 2015; Qi et al., 2015; Green et al., 2016). Although CSEs do engage in skills development through licensing agreements and joint ventures, this has not translated into poverty alleviation, as indicated by the responses from the employees and employers of the CSEs. In a nutshell, CSEs collaboration through licensing agreements and joint ventures will not alleviate poverty through skills development, but cooperatives will alleviate poverty through an increase in skills development. These findings support the work
of Birchall (2003). In his work on discovering the advantage of self-help cooperatives, he argues that poverty can be alleviated by developing skills and increasing talents. Therefore, this study concludes that CSE collaboration will impact on poverty alleviation through cooperatives and alliances.

7.1.5 Impact of CSE collaborations on standard of living and welfare
The current study found out that CSE collaboration through cooperatives and alliances alleviates poverty in Nigeria. This study found that there is a correlation coefficient of .482, which indicates that there is a linear relationship among the variables between CSE collaborations and standard of living and welfare. The results presented in Table 5.6 show that licensing agreement has a correlation value of .229 and a t-value of 1.551, joint venture has a negative correlation value of -.659 and a t-value of -5.788, cooperative has a correlation value of .212 and a t-value of 1.981 and alliance has a correlation value of .411 and a t-value of 1.603. This indicates that the CSE cooperative is statistically significant at t= 1.981, which implies that this form of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare. Therefore the cooperative form of collaboration should be encouraged as a poverty alleviation measure. Alliance has a positive correlation value of .411 and also has a t-value of 1.603. On the other hand, CSE collaborations through joint ventures, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have a negative correlation value of -.659. This implies that reliance on joint ventures as a form of collaboration by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through standard of living and welfare. Palsule-Desai (2015) and Melton et al. (2016) argue that cooperatives will increase welfare and alleviate poverty if considered as a measure of poverty reduction along with other poverty alleviation measures, which is in line with the findings of this research. The result of this research also indicates that joint venture has no linear relationship with standard of living and welfare, with a negative correlation of -.659 and a t-value of -5.788 respectively. Cooperative collaborations and alliances will impact on poverty alleviation. This result shows that the joint venture form of collaboration will not have a direct impact on poverty alleviation as it has a negative correlation. Cheney (2015) mentioned that cooperatives will increase welfare and alleviate poverty if considered as a measure of poverty reduction, which is in line with the findings of this research. The finding here is another unique contribution of this study, showing that joint ventures will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria compared to cooperatives and alliances.
7.1.6 Impact of CSE collaborations on savings and investments

The findings also revealed that cooperatives and alliances will impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investments. Analysis shows a correlation coefficient of .515 in the model summary table in Section 5.7, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE collaborations and savings and investment. It was also found that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.120 and a t-value of -.850, joint venture has a negative correlation value of -.414 and a t-value of -3.797, cooperative has a correlation value of .393 and a t-value of 3.840 and alliance has a correlation value of .514 and a t-value of 2.095. This suggests that both CSE cooperative and alliance collaborations are statistically significant at t= 3.840 and 2.095 respectively, which implies that these forms of collaboration will positively impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Collaborations through CSE cooperatives and alliances have positive correlation values of .393 and .514 at 0.5 t-value, which implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate cooperatives and alliances of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE collaboration through joint ventures, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables as measured, has a negative correlation value of -.414. This implies that reliance on joint ventures and licensing agreements as forms of collaboration by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through savings and investment.

Drawing from these findings, it can be said that licensing agreements and joint ventures will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. These findings are contrary to the views of previous research, as in Moshtari (2016) and Martin et al. (2016), who argue that collaborations will increase income as well as increasing savings and investment. This result shows that not all forms of collaboration will alleviate poverty through savings and investment. On the contrary, participants were asked whether they have savings and investments, by providing a yes or no answer as shown in Table 5.20.16, and 151 respondents reported that they have savings and investments, representing 75%, while 50 respondents said they do not have savings or investments, which represents 24.9%. This result suggests that the majority of the respondents have savings and, at the same time, have been able to invest part of their savings. Arguably, collaboration will favour savings and investment and therefore alleviate poverty (Hofstad and Torfing, 2015; Martin et al., 2016; Moshtari, 2016). Another contribution of this study is that not all forms of collaboration will increase savings and investment, as opposed to previous studies such as those of Moshtari.
7.1.7 Impact of CSE strategies on poverty alleviation
The findings revealed that CSEs strategies can impact on poverty alleviation through framing and multivocality. Section 5.8 shows a correlation coefficient of .671 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies and increased income. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .450, which suggests that a 45% increase in income is explained by the CSE strategies. Results also reveal that framing has a correlation value of .109 and a t-value of 1.115, convening has a negative correlation value of -.163 and a t-value of -2.169, multivocality has a correlation value of .102 and a t-value of 2.456 and product development has a correlation value of -.514 and a t-value of -6.538. This result indicates that both CSE framing and multivocality strategies are statistically significant at t= 1.115 and 2.456 respectively, which implies that these forms of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Strategies through CSE framing and multivocality have positive correlation values of .109 and .102 at 0.5 t-values. This implies that the more collaborations that there are through deliberate framing and multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria, the higher the likelihood of poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE strategies through convening and product development, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables as measured, have negative correlation values of -.163 and -.541 respectively. This implies that reliance on the convening and product development forms of strategies by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through increased income. The reason for this may be obvious, according to Porter and Kramer (2006); Lee (2015) and Miemczyk et al. (2016), who argue that products must deliver value in order for the organization to achieve its objectives. It was also found that CSEs strategies can impact on poverty alleviation. Multivocality was found to have a positive impact on poverty alleviation (Montgomery et al, 2012; Smith, 2015; Balkema & Romijn, 2015). These scholars have argued on the impact of collective actions on poverty alleviation and community development. These results are consistent with the work of Montgomery et al. (2012) and Hemmati and Rogers (2015) in that multivocality is a strategic choice for CSEs to enhance community development and reduce poverty. Therefore CSE collaborative strategies will impact on poverty alleviation.

7.1.8 Impact of CSE strategies on employment creation and business opportunity
It was found that CSE strategies will impact on employment creation and business
opportunity. Section 5.9 illustrates a correlation coefficient of .411 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies and employment creation. Table 5.9 illustrates that framing has a correlation value of .136 and a t-value of .322, convening has a positive correlation value of .054 and a t-value of .625, multivocality has a correlation value of -.129 and a t-value of -2.217 and product development has a correlation value of - .410 and a t-value of -3.962. This result indicates that framing and convening strategies are statistically significant to employment creation and business opportunities. This implies that these forms of strategy will impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation. Strategies through CSE framing and convening have positive values of .136 and .054 at 0.5 t-value, which thus implies that the collaborations through deliberate framing and convening strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will positively impact on poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE strategies through product development, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables, as measured in this study, have a negative correlation value of -.410. This implies that reliance on the multivocality and product development forms of strategies by CSE organizations would have no impact on poverty in Nigeria through employment creation. Choong (2016) has argued that social movement framing can impact on poverty alleviation and Pan (2013) has also argued along the same lines on the impact of convening by social enterprise. Austin and Seitanidi (2014), in Creating Value in Non-profit Business Collaborations, ratified the previous scholars on the positive impact of convening on poverty alleviation. From this same result, multivocality and product development strategies will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation, as they have negative correlations and, at the same time, are statistically insignificant. The findings here partly agree with the previous work by Montgomery et al. (2012) that CSE strategies such as convening, framing and multivocality do positively impact on employment creation, however, in these findings, only convening and framing strategies have a positive impact on employment creation. In conclusion, framing and convening strategies will alleviate poverty in Nigeria through employment creation.

7.1.9 Impact of CSE strategies on education and training
Educational and training is important in changing the mindset of individuals. It was found that CSE strategies can impact on education and training. The responses of the employers and employees of the collaborators surveyed show that only product development was found to be statistically significant. Section 5.10 illustrates a correlation coefficient of .526 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies and education and training. Table 5.10 illustrates that framing has a correlation value of -0.46
and a t-value of -0.361, convening has a negative correlation value of -0.193 and a t-value of -2.391, multivocality has a correlation value of -0.337 and a t-value of -6.205 and product development has a correlation value of 0.620 and a t-value of 6.425. These findings indicate that only a product development strategy is statistically significant at 0.620, which implies that this form of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Strategies through CSE framing, convening and multivocality have negative correlation values of -0.046, -0.193 and -0.337 at 0.5 t-value, which implies that more collaborations through deliberate framing, convening and multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. On the other hand, CSE strategies through product development, though statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables as measured, have a positive correlation value of 0.620. This implies that reliance on a product development form of strategy by CSE organizations would impact positively on poverty in Nigeria through education and training. Austin (2006) suggests that collaborators should consider the impact of education and training on poverty when making strategic decisions. Gallo-Cruz (2012) also opined that education and training is an important factor in poverty alleviation. Cabecinhas and Abadia (2013), in Collective Mobilization and the Social Memory of Environmental Destruction, argued in line with the findings of this study on the impact of collectivism on social mission. Therefore CSE product development strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through education and training.

7.1.10 Impact of CSE strategies on skills development
Skills development is another measure of poverty, as stated in the literature. The findings of the research also revealed that convening and product development strategies can reduce poverty through skills development. Section 5.11 shows a correlation coefficient of 0.355 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies and skills development. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of 0.126, which suggests that a 12.6% increase in skills development is explained by the CSE strategies. Results from Table 5.11 show that framing has a correlation value of -0.142 and a t-value of -0.952, convening has a positive correlation value of 0.100 and a t-value of 0.953, multivocality has a correlation value of -0.298 and a t-value of -4.748 and product development has a correlation value of 0.102 and a t-value of 0.745. These findings indicate that convening and product development strategies are statistically significant at 0.100 and 0.102, which implies that these forms of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Strategies through CSE framing and multivocality have negative correlation values of -0.142 and -0.298 at 0.5 t-values. This implies that more collaboration
through deliberate framing and multivocality strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. CSE strategies through product development and convening are statistically significant with regards to poverty alleviation variables as measured, and they have positive correlation values of .102 and .100. This implies that reliance on product development and convening forms of strategies by CSE organizations would create a positive change towards poverty in Nigeria through skills development.

This indicates that CSEs should engage less in a multivocality strategy, as it has less impact on skills development. In a nutshell, the level of poverty will be reduced through skills development if CSEs engage more in convening and product development. This is contrary to the expectation that multivocality will be one of the strategies that can alleviate poverty through skills development, according to Montgomery et al. (2012) and Peredo (2014). The works of Frynas and Stephens (2015) and De Bakker (2016) have partly supported the findings of this research on convening strategy for poverty reduction. Lawson et al. (2015); Dayan et al. (2016) and Nasr et al. (2016) emphasized that a collaborative product development project is a strategy for achieving social mission objectives. Conclusively, CSE product development strategies can help to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

7.1.11 Impact of CSE strategies on standard of living and welfare

Findings from the study reveal that convening and multivocality strategies will alleviate poverty in Nigeria through standard of living and welfare. Section 5.12 shows a correlation coefficient of .221 in the model summary table, which indicates a weak linear relationship between CSE strategies and standard of living and welfare. The model summary table also shows a correlation of determination value of .049, suggesting that a 4% increase in standard of living is explained by the CSE strategies. Table 5.12 illustrates that framing has a correlation value of -.468 and a t-value of -2.412, convening has a positive correlation value of .139 and a t-value of .205, multivocality has a correlation value of .770 and a t-value of .029 and product development has a correlation value of -.044 and a t-value of -.291. These findings therefore indicate that convening and multivocality forms of CSE strategies have positive correlations of .139 and .770 respectively and also have t-values of 1.272 and 2.203, which implies that these forms of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living. Strategies through CSE framing and product development have negative correlation values of -.468, and -.044 at 0.5 t-values. This implies that more collaboration through convening and product development strategies of various CSE
organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. The non-significant effect of these strategies (framing and product development) on poverty are consistent with the work of Agwu et al. (2014), who suggest that strategies for poverty reduction, government policies and strategy implementation are crucial to help to alleviate poverty. These findings tally with the work of Montgomery et al. (2012); Knorringa (2014); Klingebiel and Paulo (2015) and Biekkart and Fowler (2012) in community led social venture creation, who argue that when CSEs come together (convening) and speak in one voice (multivocality), they can improve the welfare and standard of living of the community and thereby alleviate poverty.

7.1.12 Impact of CSE strategies on savings and investments
Looking at the vicious circle of poverty which says that savings is a function of investment and investment can determine poverty. Again, the findings of this research reveal that only multivocality can impact positively on savings and investment. Section 5.13 shows a correlation coefficient of .252 in the model summary table, which indicates a weak linear relationship between CSE strategies and savings and investment. A coefficient of determination of .064 indicates that a 6% increase in savings and investment is explained by the CSE strategies. Table 5.13 shows that framing has a negative correlation value of -.617 and a t- value of -3.137, convening has a negative correlation value of -.080 and a t- value of -.723, multivocality has a positive correlation value of .985 and a t- value of 2.778 and product development has a correlation value of -.100 and a t- value of -.656.

These findings suggest that only the multivocality form of CSE strategy has a positive correlation of .985 with a t-value of 2.778, which implies that this form of strategy will positively impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Strategies through CSE framing, convening and product development have negative correlation values of -.617, -.080 and -.100 with negative t-values of -3.137, -.723 and -.656. This implies that CSE collaborations through framing, convening and product development strategies of various CSE organizations in Nigeria will not have much of an impact on poverty alleviation. Looking at the contribution of the multivocality strategy on poverty alleviation through savings and investment, this form of strategy should be encouraged in order to impact more on poverty alleviation. These findings are in line with Dahan et al. (2010) and McDonald et al. (2015), as they take the view that when SEs come together the result can positively impact on savings and investment, which will invariably reduce poverty. Along the same lines, the framing and product development forms of strategy have not been statistically significant,
with p= -.617 and p= -.100 respectively. In conclusion, CSEs engagement in framing, product development and convening forms of strategy will not have much of an impact on savings and investment and therefore have no effect on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Multivocality will positively impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria through savings and investment.

7.1.13 The interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on poverty alleviation variables – increase income
CSE collaborations and strategies will alleviate poverty through an increase in income. The findings reveal the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies on poverty alleviation. Looking at the effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on poverty alleviation with particular reference to increased income, Section 5.14 reveals a correlation coefficient of .642 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and increased income. A coefficient of determination of .412 indicates that a 41.2% increase in income is explained by the CSE collaborations and strategies. Looking at Table 5.14, this shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of .060 and a t-value of .562, joint venture has a correlation of .208 with a t-value of 2.469, cooperative has a correlation of .189 with a t-value of 2.398, alliance has a negative correlation of -.038 with a t-value of -.094, while framing strategy has a correlation of -.436 with a t-value of -3.055, convening has a negative correlation of -.206 with a t-value of -2.599, multivocality has a positive correlation of .760 with a t-value of 1.549, while product development has a correlation of -.432 with a t-value of -3.413.

These findings suggest that the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, cooperatives and alliances, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation. Also, the CSE multivocality strategy has a positive correlation, indicating that this will have a positive impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Other strategies, such as framing, convening and product development, all have negative correlations, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through increased income. These findings are consistent with the position of David et al. (2013); Fox (2015) and Ocasio and Radovynovska (2016) on the necessity of social movement to increase income through collaboration in order to achieve their social mission of poverty alleviation. Massey et al. (2015) and Dauletshina (2015) are not indifferent to these findings. Both have recommended the use of licensing agreements to overcome the challenges of resource voids
and poverty alleviation. To conclude, these results suggest that the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies, such as the licensing agreement and multivocality forms of collaborative strategy, will greatly reduce poverty through increased income. Going further, other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as joint ventures, cooperatives, alliances, framing and convening, will not have any impact on poverty alleviation.

7.1.14 The interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on employment creation

Licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality will alleviate poverty when CSE collaborations and strategies interact. The interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on employment creation and business opportunity was also tested and Section 5.15 shows a correlation coefficient of .261 in the model summary table, which indicates a weak linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and employment creation. Figures from Table 5.15 show that licensing agreement has a correlation value of .821 and a t-value of 5.600, joint venture has a correlation of -.516 with a t-value of -4.478, cooperative has a positive correlation of .281 with a t-value of 2.602, alliance has a negative correlation of -.209 with a t-value of -.382, while framing strategy has a correlation of -.328 with a t-value of -.197, convening has a negative correlation of -.034 with a t-value of -.312, multivocality has a positive correlation of .643 with a t-value of .959, while product development has a correlation of -.397 with a t-value of -2.296.

These findings suggest that the interaction effects of licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through employment creation, therefore alleviating poverty in Nigeria. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as joint ventures, alliances, framing, convening and product development, all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation. Recent literature has supported the position of the researcher on the importance of cooperatives in employment creation, such as Wollni and Fischer (2015); Boone and Ozcan (2015) and Paranque and Willmott (2016). Drawing on these findings, little or no consideration should be given to other collaborative strategies, such as joint ventures, alliances, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, as they have not contributed positively to employment and business opportunities through an interaction effect, as can be seen by looking at their t-values of -4.478, -.382, -1.681, -.312, and -2.296. This opposes the views of Montgomery et al. (2012) and Peredo (2014) on
collaboratively shaping social good, who opined that framing, convening and multivocality will increase employment and develop the local economy to reduce poverty. This study concludes that joint ventures, alliances, framing, convening and product development will not alleviate poverty with the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies, while licensing agreements, cooperatives and multivocality will alleviate poverty when CSE collaborations and strategies interact.

7.1.15 The interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on education and training

From the research findings, cooperative and alliance forms of collaboration and multivocality and product development strategies will alleviate poverty through education and training in Nigeria when CSE collaborations interact with the strategies. This research found that CSEs collaborations and strategies on education and training will positively impact on poverty alleviation. Section 5.16 shows a correlation coefficient of .679 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and education and training. A coefficient of determination value of .461 indicates that a 46.1% increase in education and training is explained by the CSE collaborations and strategies. Table 5.16 shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.171 and a t-value of -1.361, joint venture has a correlation of -.591 with a t-value of -5.980, cooperative has a positive correlation of .423 with a t-value of 4.563, alliance has a correlation of .146 with a t-value of .310, while framing strategy has a correlation of .179 with a t-value of 1.069, convening has a negative correlation of -.127 with a t-value of -1.366, multivocality has a positive correlation of .293 with a t-value of .509, while product development has a correlation of .060 with a t-value of .405.

The findings indicate that the interaction effects of CSE collaborations and strategies, such as the cooperative and alliance forms of collaborations and the multivocality and product development strategies, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through education and training. That is, when CSEs engage in these forms of collaboration, this will reduce poverty. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, framing and convening, all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through employment creation, as revealed in this study. In this regard, CSEs should invest more in education and training in order to have a greater impact on poverty alleviation. This result is an indication that the interaction between CSE
collaboration and strategy will, to an extent, impact on poverty alleviation through education and training. Again, different researchers have got different views about the findings of this work, for example, Montgomery et al. (2012) and Peredo (2014) support collaboration for community development to reduce poverty. Hoftad and Torfing (2015), in Collaborative Innovation as a Tool for Environmental, Economic and Social Sustainability in Regional Governance, argued differently in this regard, as the author has not considered education and training as a poverty alleviation mechanism.

7.1.16 The interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on skills development

Findings from the interaction effects of CSE collaborations and strategies on skills development in Section 5.17 show a correlation coefficient of .302 in the model summary table, which indicates a strong linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and skills development. A coefficient of determination value of .273 indicates that a 27.3% increase in skills development is explained by the CSE collaborations and strategies. Table 5.17 shows that licensing agreement has a correlation value of -.126 and a t-value of -.907, joint venture has a correlation of -.435 with a t-value of -.375, cooperative has a positive correlation of .373 with a t-value of 3.642, alliance has a correlation of .519 with a t-value of .997, while framing strategy has a correlation of -.486 with a t-value of -2.627, convening has a correlation of .016 with a t-value of .157, multivocality has a positive correlation of .498 with a t-value of .783, while product development has a correlation of -.005 with a t-value of -.028.
These findings suggest that the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies, such as the cooperative and alliance form of collaborations and multivocality and convening strategies, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through skills development. This result has buttressed the work of Montgomery et al. (2012) that convening and multivocality will create a social change through poverty alleviation. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, framing and convening, all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through skills development. Montgomery et al. (2012) posited that CSE collaborative strategies will enhance skills development, but Veilleux and Queenton (2015) and Obamuyi and Fapetu (2016) opined differently and claimed that other factors will translate to poverty alleviation, including innovation through collaboration enhancement. This study was the first to test the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on skills development and found that cooperative and alliance forms of collaborations and multivocality and convening strategies have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through skills development.

7.1.17 The interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on standard of living
Based on the findings of this study, it will be concluded that licensing agreement, cooperative and alliance forms of collaborations, as well as multivocality strategy, will alleviate poverty when there is an increase in the standard of living. Looking at the interaction effects of CSE collaborations and strategies on standard of living and welfare, Section 5.18 shows a correlation coefficient of .343 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and standard of living and welfare. Results from the findings therefore suggest that the interaction effects of licensing agreement, cooperative and alliance forms of collaborations, as well as multivocality strategy, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as joint ventures, framing, convening and product development, all have negative correlation values, which suggests that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare, as can be seen by looking at the ANOVA result value of .000 at p<.05. In support of these findings, Cheney (2015); Long et al. (2015)
and Paranque and Willmott (2016) argued, in line with these findings, of the impact of cooperatives in poverty alleviation and also as an alternative to capitalism. Kasmir (2016) has also carried out a critical analysis of cooperatives and global capitalism and concluded that cooperatives are a panacea to poverty and economic development. Conclusively, the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies will positively impact poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare, as explained in Table 5.18. In conclusion, joint ventures, framing, convening and product development will not alleviate poverty through standard of living and welfare with the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies. Again, this study makes a significant contribution regarding the interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on the standard of living and found that CSE collaborations and strategies will positively impact poverty alleviation through standard of living and welfare.

7.1.18 The interaction effect of CSE collaborations and strategies on savings and investments

Another finding of this research, looking at the interaction effects of CSE collaborations and strategies on savings and investments in Section 5.19, shows a correlation coefficient of .302 in the model summary table, which indicates a linear relationship between CSE strategies, collaborations and savings and investment. A coefficient of determination value of .273 indicates that a 27.3% increase in savings and investment is explained by the CSE collaborations and strategies. The findings therefore suggest that the interaction effects of the cooperative and alliance forms of collaboration, as well as multivocality and convening strategies, have positive correlation values and will impact positively on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, framing and product development, all have negative correlation values, which suggest that these would have no impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment. Therefore, the interaction between CSE collaborations and strategies will impact on poverty alleviation through savings and investment, as can be seen by looking at the ANOVA result value of .000 at p<.05. A more significant finding is that some forms of CSE collaboration arrangement are statistically irrelevant to poverty alleviation through CSE savings and investment whilst interacting with CSE strategies. This finding supports the work of Arogundade (2011) on the impact of savings and investment on poverty alleviation. This result is not to say that CSE collaborations and strategies will not alleviate poverty, it only depicts that the interaction of CSE strategies and collaborations on savings and investment may not alleviate poverty in some circumstances. Kanbur (2015), in Poverty Alleviation Strategies and New Economic Model, argued for savings as a poverty alleviation strategy, although their work was not tested on the interaction of CSE
collaborations and strategies. Drawing a conclusion, cooperative and alliance forms of collaboration, as well as multivocality and convening strategies, can be used to alleviate poverty through savings and investment with the interaction of CSE collaborations and strategies. Other forms of collaborations and strategies, such as licensing agreements, joint ventures, framing and product development, will not alleviate poverty under the same circumstances. Another dimension to the contribution of this study is that the alliance form of collaboration, as well as multivocality and convening strategies, can be used to alleviate poverty through savings and investment, as shown by looking at the interaction effects of CSE collaborations and strategies on savings and investments.

7.2 Contribution Vis a Vis previous research / studies.

Existing literatures such as (Montgomery et al., 2012; Okon & Edet, 2016 & Agbin, 2015) recognizes the various forms of CSE collaborations and strategies as tools for economic development. Previous studies such as (Kasali et al., 2015; Yusof, 2016 & Oyediran et al., 2015) also proposed that employment can reduce poverty. There is no conceptualization in literature on how these collaborations and strategies can alleviate poverty, which the current research has provided. The research original contribution to knowledge is the identification and conceptualization of the form of collaborations and strategies that can be used to alleviate poverty in Nigeria as well the best collaborative strategies that can effectively alleviate poverty. The current research has been able to established that beyond employment, other variables like increase income, skills development, training and development, welfare will alleviate poverty. That is, employment does not mean poverty alleviation. Other variables should be considered for effective poverty alleviation.

Idris & Yusof (2016), researched the proliferation of intervention programs and poverty reduction and concluded that poverty is a major problem in Nigeria and requires a multi-dimensional approach. A new approach has been developed through this study to investigate how CSE collaborations and strategies can alleviate poverty in Nigeria. For Example, using cooperative, alliance, multivocality, framing and convening to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Additionally, Abubakar (2012), developed a framework for economic development but this was not empirically tested; thus making this research the first to conceptualised and test the impact of CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

This research is the first, to the knowledge of the researcher, to adopt a mixed methodology approach to carry out an empirical investigation into poverty alleviation in Nigeria through CSE collaboration.
Previous studies focused on economic development and poverty alleviation through entrepreneurship but this study focuses on collective social entrepreneurship as a poverty alleviation mechanism. Collectivism helps entrepreneurs to overcome resource constraints and make it easier to address social problems. Also, by sharing knowledge and expertise, social entrepreneurs are able to identify poverty alleviation projects and address them accordingly.

Another contribution of this research is that it integrates strategy and collaboration as CSE tool for poverty alleviation. As noted in the findings, CSEs need to align the right strategies with collaboration to achieve their poverty alleviation mission. Evidence in the literature shows that one of the major causes of the failure in poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria is implementation (Ogunniyi & Sanni, 2012). Previous studies have not identified the right strategies with the right collaborations for poverty alleviation but the current research does.

Accordingly, the present study made a unique contribution by establishing that cooperatives form of collaboration and multivocality strategy is mostly used by Nigerian CSEs for poverty alleviation mission.

Previous studies asserted that cooperative organisation contribute to economic development but the level of contribution has never been examined until now through this research.

To the best knowledge of the researcher, this study represents the first attempt to examine moderating effect of CSE strategy on poverty alleviation. It is noted that multivocality will function more as a proxy than other variables like framing, convening and product development. The diagrammatic conceptual framework of this study shown in chapter three of this thesis reflects the argument of this research that literature has not recognized; that collective social entrepreneurship can be used as a poverty reduction strategy in Nigeria which is a major contribution of this research work.

This study unveils the best collaborative strategy for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. To be more specific, cooperatives, product development and multivocality will act more of a proxy for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. This research has contributed to the body of knowledge in the methodology approach which was applied in this research. The author has used a mixed method (Qualitative & Quantitative methods) to investigate the impact of CSE in alleviating poverty in Nigeria. Other researches carried out in other part of the world used a qualitative approach.
7.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions made above, the following recommendations will be made in relation to the CSEs as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria. It is the sincere hope of the researcher that if these recommendations are implemented, they will produce further improvements in CSE collaborations in order to address the problems of poverty in Nigeria:

1. CSEs should be seen as an instrument for poverty alleviation and addressing the problems of social impact. Findings from this study show that CSEs can alleviate poverty through their various collaborations and strategies, such as cooperatives, alliances, joint ventures, licensing agreements, multivocality, framing, convening and product development.

2. CSE collaborations should be encouraged in order to alleviate the problem of poverty in Nigeria and, more specifically, to engage more in education and training so as to have a greater impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Evidence from this research also reveals that poverty can be alleviated through employment generation, increased income, skills development and standard of living.

3. To successfully address the problem of poverty in Nigeria, CSEs must address all aspects of the poverty indices, such as increased income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living / welfare and the savings and investments of employees. According to the findings of this study, a poverty alleviation mission will be more effective if the variables of poverty are considered in whole.

4. CSEs should formulate strategies around poverty alleviation in Nigeria. For effective poverty alleviation programmes to take place, CSEs need to develop and implement realistic strategies and collaborations.
5. CSEs should match their collaborations with the right strategy in order to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria, such as combining cooperatives, alliances, joint ventures and licensing agreements with multivocality, framing, convening and product development.

6. CSEs should focus on collaborations and strategies that can impact on poverty alleviation. This is to avoid those situations where previous poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria have failed. Focusing on the various collaborations and strategies highlighted in this study will positively impact on poverty alleviation.

7. Government should provide an enabling environment for CSEs development in Nigeria in the areas of policies and infrastructures. CSEs require an enabling environment in terms of infrastructure and policies regarding the formation and operations of CSE organizations. Ease of formation of CSE organizations will increase the number of CSEs.

8. SEs should collaborate in the direction of cooperative organization, as this has been found to be a useful poverty alleviation mechanism. The cooperative form of collaboration should be encouraged in order to engage more in education and training and to have more impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria.

9. At the moment, CSEs practices are within the same sector. Therefore, collaborators are encouraged to diversify and work across different sectors in Nigeria in order to have a more positive impact on poverty alleviation.

7.4 Research contribution to theory

The original contribution to knowledge of this research is the identification and conceptualization of the forms of collaborations and strategies that can be used to alleviate poverty in Nigeria, as well the best collaborative strategies that can effectively alleviate poverty. This study is on the edge of different research traditions. Firstly, this doctoral research contributes to the social entrepreneurship literature. The research also offers a conceptualization of CSEs and an empirical study on an investigation into collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty. Existing literature attempted to
identify some variables for community and economic development, such as cooperatives, alliances, joint ventures, framing, convening, multivocality and product development, through the creation of employment (Montgomery et al., 2012), while the process of poverty alleviation has been largely ignored. Social entrepreneurship and collective social entrepreneurship is not a new phenomenon, it has existed for decades, but the variables that translate into poverty alleviation and how these variables can alleviate poverty have been conceptualized in this research. This research takes a step further to look at how employment creation alleviates poverty through the application of the vicious circle of poverty theory. The current research has been able to establish that, beyond employment, other variables, such as increased income, skills development, training and development and welfare, will alleviate poverty. That is, employment does not mean poverty alleviation. Other variables should be considered for effective poverty alleviation.

Montgomery et al. (2012) highlighted CSE strategies, such as framing, convening and multivocality, which enhance community development. Kasali et al. (2015) asserted that, among other factors, micro financing will help to alleviate poverty in Nigeria through entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurship and social mission will eradicate poverty in Nigeria (Aigbokhan, 2000; Arogundade, 2011; Olayinka et al., 2013). Also, cooperatives play a major role in economic development and poverty alleviation (Maria, 2015). How these variables will translate into poverty alleviation was not explained and this research has filled this gap by conceptualizing CSE collaborations and strategies to alleviate poverty. Idris and Yusof, (2016) researched the proliferation of intervention programmes and poverty reduction and concluded that poverty is a major problem in Nigeria and requires a multidimensional approach. A new approach has been developed through this study to investigate how CSE collaborations and strategies can alleviate poverty in Nigeria.

According to the research conducted by Kayode (2015) on poverty and poverty eradication in Nigeria, the work provides some insight for further discussion on the issue of strategies for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Kayode (2015) posited that it is important to shift the emphasis to target poverty reduction in Nigeria. Considering the fact that research on poverty alleviation has generated so much interest in the last few years, there is a need to maintain such momentum and, at the same time, it should be used as a vehicle for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Kayode (2015) did not specify any strategy for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. However, to date, existing research has not considered collective social entrepreneurship as a
collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria, as this study does.

Additionally, Abubakar (2012) developed a framework for economic development but this was not empirically tested; thus making this research the first to conceptualize and test the impact of CSE as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Furthermore, previous research, such as Peredo (2014); Montgomery et al. (2012) and Akemu et al. (2016), used secondary research methodology to arrive at a conclusion that employment creation can help in economic development. This research is the first to adopt a mixed methodology approach to carry out an empirical investigation into poverty alleviation in Nigeria through CSE collaboration. Previous studies focused on economic development and poverty alleviation through entrepreneurship, but this study focuses on collective social entrepreneurship as a poverty alleviation mechanism.

According to a study conducted by Peterson (2015), two major proxies have played a significant role in eradicating poverty in the 58 countries that were chosen for his research. These two proxies were innovation and entrepreneurship. The scatter plots in the research emphasized the important role of innovation and entrepreneurship in the eradication of poverty in the chosen nations. The result of the study shows that these two variables can alleviate poverty significantly. Moreover, poverty was reduced drastically when innovation interacted with entrepreneurship. Arguably, the findings of Peterson (2015) cannot be true in all cases, as Nigeria was not one of the nations under investigation. To fill this gap, the current research has examined the Nigerian context.

Another contribution of this research is that it integrates strategy and collaboration as a CSE tool for poverty alleviation. As noted in the findings, CSEs need to align the right strategies with collaboration in order to achieve their poverty alleviation mission. Evidence in the literature shows that one of the major causes of the failure of poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria is implementation (Arogundade, 2011). Previous studies have not identified the right strategies with the right collaborations for poverty alleviation, but the current research does this.

Accordingly, the present study made a unique contribution by establishing that the cooperative form of collaboration and the multivocality strategy are mostly used by Nigerian CSEs for their poverty alleviation mission. This contribution will guide policymakers and CSE operators to direct their efforts towards the right venture and to encourage the development of more cooperatives in the fight against poverty alleviation in Nigeria.
Previous studies asserted that cooperative organizations contribute to economic development, but the level of contribution that has been examined in this study was previously unknown. To the best knowledge of the researcher, this study represents the first attempt to examine the moderating effect of CSE strategy on poverty alleviation. It is noted that multivocality will function more as a proxy than other variables, such as framing, convening and product development.

Another contribution of the present study relates to academic literature. The study found that CSE collaborations and strategies contribute positively to poverty alleviation through employment creation, increased income, skills development and standard of living and welfare, thus supporting the vicious circle of poverty. The diagrammatic conceptual framework of this study, shown in Chapter three of this thesis, reflects the argument of this research that has not been recognized in the literature and which is a major contribution of this research work; that collective social entrepreneurship can be used as a poverty reduction strategy in Nigeria.

7.4.1 Contributions to knowledge

The aim of this thesis is to contribute to the theory and practice of social entrepreneurship by investigating collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria. Whilst studies have considered collective social entrepreneurship in the context of western countries, research relating to less developed countries, such as Nigeria, is rare. Therefore, this study is to stimulate further research into other less developed countries such as Nigeria. This research also serves as a comparison with the research done in other parts of the world, such as Asia and Europe, in the area of social entrepreneurship as a poverty reduction strategy. There is a cultural difference between western countries and developing countries such as Nigeria, and the research identifies the factors that favour collective social entrepreneurship practice. The research advance knowledge on CSEs and the reduction of poverty will be achieved through collaboration by collectives.

In the course of this research, to add to the body of knowledge in the social entrepreneurship literature, the researcher had a publication in a peer review journal titled “A literature review on collective social entrepreneurship”, which is a major contribution to the body of knowledge. This research was presented in Berlin, Germany on June 23, 2016 at an International Conference on Knowledge, Innovation and Enterprise, which received acceptance from other scholars.
The research provides a new dimension in the research world, which brings entrepreneurship development to the fore in the fight against poverty alleviation.

This research has revealed the level of impact of the various forms of collaboration for poverty alleviation. The study shows that cooperatives and multivocality will have more of an impact on poverty alleviation than other forms of collaborations and strategies.

This study unveils the best collaborative strategy for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. To be more specific, cooperatives, product development and multivocality will act as more of a proxy for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. In addition to identifying the forms of collaborations and strategies to alleviate poverty, it was noted that the cooperative form of collaboration and the multivocality strategy are mostly used by Nigerian CSEs for their poverty alleviation mission.

Another contribution of this research is that the nature of this research is the first of its kind to be carried out in Nigeria. In addition to identifying the most important variables for poverty alleviation, the research also found that CSEs need to combine the right form of collaboration with the right strategy for an effective poverty alleviation outcome.

This research has contributed to the body of knowledge by the methodology approach that was applied. The author has used a mixed method (qualitative and quantitative methods) to investigate the impact of CSE in alleviating poverty in Nigeria. Other researches carried out in other parts of the world used a qualitative approach.

Also, this research has value for strategic management science. The proposed conceptual model integrates collaboration. This work helps practitioners to better understand the nature of collaboration among social entrepreneurs in order to achieve their social mission.

Moreover, the study examines the institutional framework that sustains CSEs. Organizational fostering policies have been identified and recommendations will be made to the appropriate authorities of the best policies that promote CSEs.

7.4.2 Contribution to society

Within the academic literature and practice, there has been an increase in the growth of Social entrepreneurship globally over the last decade (Nicholls, 2006). Social entrepreneurship is becoming a powerful player in the national and international economy according to Ezekiel and Edwin (2016). Social entrepreneurs is becoming to have a strong link with the society (Chen et al., 2015), two phenomena affect its growing interest and importance.
Firstly, the concept of social entrepreneurship did not emerge from the corporate context focusing on managing social issues but rather it originated from the non-profit (Dees, 1998; Johnson et al., 2011; Mort et al., 2003; Fowler, 2016; Emerson, 2003; Chen et al., 2015). Secondly, many scholars (e.g. Sharir and Lerner, 2006; Perrini and Vurro, 2006; Den Hond and De Bakker, 2007; Nicholls, 2006; McKague et al., 2015) identified the diminishing trend in government involvement in the society and economy. This has made it more challenging for welfare states to answer the questions relating to social issues.

Dees (1998) argues that we have reached a point where we have to accept the impact of social entrepreneurship in addressing social problems. Social entrepreneurs have an overarching desire (Austin et al., 2006; Roberts and Woods, 2005; Peredo and McLean, 2006; Peredo and Chrisman, 2006; Green et al., 2016) and have the desire to benefit society or to contribute to the welfare or well-being in society in common (Mort et al., 2003; Peredo and Mclean, 2006; Clyde and Karnani, 2015). Mair and Marti (2009) researched on implications of social entrepreneurship in the society. Therefore, research on social entrepreneurship also has the potential to benefit society. We hope that by advancing the knowledge on CSEs and the creation of social value by firms, this doctoral dissertation advances the real creation of social value for society.

Another major contribution of this research is that it investigates collective social entrepreneurship in a developing country context, Nigeria. Nigeria was selected for this study as it is associated with high levels of social entrepreneurial activity (Abubarkar, 2012) and high levels of poverty (World Bank, 2014). However, the majority of existing studies on social innovation have been conducted in Anglo Saxon countries, for example: the USA (McDonald et al., 2015); New Zealand (Semali 2015; Sharpley, 2016); Australia (Mort et al., 2003; Faridi et al., 2015) or the UK (Morgan, 2015; Iqbal et al., 2015). This thesis suggests that research in developing countries could provide further insights into how collective social entrepreneurship can serve as a poverty alleviation strategy.

7.5 Suggestions for future research

The results of this study may have raised more questions than it has provided answers. It has been observed that CSEs are subject to very limited empirical research, especially with regards to developing countries. Therefore, more research is needed, both to increase knowledge and to provide a basis for improvement in practice in the field of CSE.
following areas seem to be worthy of further investigation:

Further study is needed to understand the nature of CSE in developing countries. It is important to further look at the factors that favour CSE and how these organizations can be developed in order to achieve their poverty alleviation mission.

In the course of this research, it was noted that there are other variables, such as death rate and mortality rate, which were not discussed in this study and need to be addressed by future research.

This research only considered a few CSE strategies and collaborations; further research may bring to light other strategies that can be adopted by CSEs to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. Apart from the CSE strategies and collaborations, other factors and variables that can be used to alleviate poverty also need to be researched.

The current study investigated collaboration within the same sectors. It is also worth studying cross sector collaboration and its challenges. CSE, like other organizations, is considered to be a system that does not operate in isolation. Collaborations are at different levels, as noted in the literature. The nature of such collaborations across different sectors is worth investigating.

Comparative analysis is insightful; studies should investigate CSEs in developing nations and developed nations. As there are cultural differences between developed and developing countries, it will be interesting to analyze the operations of CSEs in both developed and developing nations.

This study only investigated the SEs in the education and finance sector. Future research might complete the picture by studying other sectors in Nigeria. Similar studies should be carried out in other sectors within Nigeria, as the current study only investigated the education and finance subsectors. Apart from Lagos state, it is worth researching how CSEs operate across Nigeria as a whole.

Nigeria is one developing country in Africa. Further studies should look at other developing countries and how CSE can be used as a collaborative strategy to alleviate poverty in other developing nations.
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Appendix A: Interview Schedule

Interview questions

1. Please tell me something about the mission of your organisation and how it has impacted on the life of the employees?
2. Alliances: What impact has your Alliance made on poverty alleviation?
3. Cooperative: Does your cooperative helping you achieve your corporate mission?
4. Joint Ventures: What is the impact of your joint venture on poverty alleviation?
5. Licensing arrangements: What is the effect of licensing arrangement on poverty alleviation?
6. Multivocality: How has multivocality helped in achieving your social mission?
7. Convening: What is the effect of convening on your social mission project?
8. Framing: How has framing impacted on your corporate goal?
9. Product development: How has your product development translated into poverty alleviation?
10. As an organisation, what is the nature of your collaboration? What form of collaboration and strategy would you prefer to adopt in order to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria?
11. Has your collaborations made any impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria?
12. Do you adopt any strategy as a collective organisation?
13. If yes, how does your strategy help in alleviating poverty in Nigeria?
14. Does collective social entrepreneurship have any impact on poverty and how is the impact measured?
Appendix B: Questionnaire google link

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1_qFpQ-hgcjBnlt1-
RPUETDV_Vq7cXAs0r_GoBWWr4/viewform?c=0&w=1&usp=mail_form_link,

Questionnaire

Section A- COLLABORATION: Licensing Arrangements - This section focuses on finding out how licensing arrangements, as a collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty, through increasing income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living /welfare, savings and investments of employees. (Please tick (v) as appropriate)

1. Do you think licensing arrangements between several social entrepreneurs, contributes to an increase in income for organisations involved in the arrangement?
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

2. Does the income of individual employees increase as a result of licensing arrangements as a form of collaboration?
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

3. Do you think licensing agreements as a form of collaboration, help to generate more employment and improve business opportunities?
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

4. Are employment opportunities enhanced when social entrepreneurs collaborate on a Licensing arrangement?
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree
5. Do you agree that education and training activities of individuals will increase, as the level of licensing agreement collaborations, between CSEs increases?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

6. Do licensing agreement collaborations, contribute greatly to the skills development of individual employees?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

7. Do you think employees’ skills levels within CSE organisations, will increase as a result of licensing agreement collaborations?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

8. Do licensing agreements amongst CSE firms impact positively on the quality of the standard of living/welfare of their employees?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

9. Do the savings and investments of employees increase, with the level of licensing agreement collaborations?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

10. Does a licensing agreement between several social entrepreneurs, contribute to income for the organisations involved?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
11. Do you think that licensing agreements as a form of collaboration, between social entrepreneurs, positively impacts and enhances employment opportunities and leads to poverty reduction?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

12. The savings and investments of employees will increase, with the level of licensing agreement collaborations?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Section B - COLLABORATION: Joint ventures - This section focuses on finding out how joint ventures, as a form of collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty, through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living/welfare, savings and investment of employees. (Please tick √ as appropriate)

13. Joint Venture collaborations between social entrepreneurs, positively impact and enhance employment opportunities and leads to poverty reduction.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

14. Does the quality of education and training of employees within CSE organisations, influence the joint venture collaboration arrangements that the firm is engaged in?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
15. Do you think education and training activities and programmes of CSE organisations will increase, as the level of joint venture collaborations between CSEs increases?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

16. Do employees’ skills levels in CSE organisations increase solely as a result of joint venture arrangements?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

17. Does the quality of standard of living/welfare of CSE employees, increase as a result of successful joint venture collaborations with another CSE firm(s)?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

18. Do the savings and investments of employees increase, with the level of joint venture collaborations?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

Section C - COLLABORATION: Cooperatives - This section focuses on finding out how a cooperative, as a form of collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty, through increase in income,
employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living/welfare and savings and investment of employees. (Please tick (v) as appropriate)

20. Does employment creation and business opportunities improve/increase, as a result of cooperative arrangements among CSEs?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

21. Do cooperatives, as a form of collaboration have a positive impact on the education and training of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

22. Do you think the level of education and training of employees, is a function of cooperative arrangements, as a form of collaboration between CSEs?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

23. Do cooperatives as a form of collaboration, between CSE organisations contribute greatly to skills development and increase productivity for the organisations?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

24. Do employees’ skills levels within CSE organisations, increase solely as a result of cooperative arrangements?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree
25. Do you think cooperative collaborations amongst CSEs will increase the standard of living/welfare of its employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

26. Do savings and investments of employees increase, with the level of Cooperation between CSEs?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

27. Employment creation and business opportunities increase, as a result of cooperative arrangements among CSEs?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

Section D- COLLABORATION: Alliance -This section focuses on finding out how alliances as a form of collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty, through increased income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living/welfare and savings and investments of employees. (Please tick (√) as appropriate)

28. Do alliances as a form of collaboration, between social entrepreneurs, positively impact and enhance employment opportunities and lead to poverty reduction?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

29. Do you think the quality of education and training within individual CSE organisations is determined, by alliance collaboration arrangements, that are engaged in by firms?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree
30. Do alliances as a form of collaboration between CSEs, contribute greatly to skills development and increase productivity for the organisations?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

31. Do employees’ skills levels within CSE organisations, increase solely as a result of alliance arrangements?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

32. Savings and investment of employees, will increase with the level of alliance between CSEs?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

33. Standard of living/welfare of CSE employees, will surely increase as a result of successful Alliance with other CSE firm(s)?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

Section E- STRATEGY: Framing- This section focuses on finding out how a framing strategy, can be used to alleviate poverty through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living/welfare and savings and investments of employees? (Please tick (v) as appropriate).

34. Do you think sharing information as an SE organisation, has a direct impact on the income of the employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree
35. Does employment creation and the business opportunities of CSEs increase as they intensify information sharing?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

36. Influencing the perception of people has an implication on the education and training of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

37. Do the skills development of CSE employees, increase, when SEs begin to interpret their ideas and social mission?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

38. Does information sharing amongst CSEs, improve the standard of living and welfare of their employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

39. Savings and investment of employees will increase, as CSEs engage more in sharing information?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

Section F - STRATEGY: Convening - This section focuses on finding out how convening as a form of strategy, can be used to alleviate poverty through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living/welfare and savings and investments of employees. (Please tick (v) as appropriate).
40. Do you think the creation of employment and business opportunities by CSEs will increase, as they increase their synergy?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

41. Do you think there will be a lack of creation of employment and business opportunities for CSEs as they intensify their synergy?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

42. Does the synergy of the CSEs, have any implication on the education and training of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

43. Does skills development amongst employees increase, when SEs come together for social venture?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

44. Within CSE arrangements, do you think the synergy of SEs will improve the standard of living and welfare of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

45. Savings and investments of employees will increase, as CSEs begin to engage more in synergy?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Section G - STRATEGY: Multivocality - This section focuses on finding out how multivocality as a form of SE strategy, can be used to alleviate poverty through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living / welfare and savings and investments of employees. (Please tick (✓) as appropriate).

46. When CSEs speak with one aligned voice, does it have a direct impact on the income of the employees?

   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

47. Do you think employment creation and business opportunities of CSEs, will increase when they solicit support from stakeholders?

   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

48. Does the harnessing of numerous stakeholders’ voices, have any implication on the education and training of employees?

   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

49. Do you think employees skills development, will increase, when SE organisations solicit a broad array of support from stakeholders?

   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

50. Does soliciting support by CSEs, improve the standard of living and welfare of employees?

   Strongly Agree
   Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

51. Savings and investments of employees will increase as CSEs, harness numerous stakeholders’ voices?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

Section H- STRATEGY: Product development - This section focuses on finding out how product development as a form of strategy, can be used to alleviate poverty through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living/welfare and savings and investment of employees (Please tick (v) as appropriate).

52. Does the product development strategy of the CSE organisation, have a direct impact on the income of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

53. Do you think employment creation and business opportunities of CSEs, will increase as they intensify their product development strategy?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

54. Does the product development strategy of the CSEs, have any implications on the education and training of its employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

55. Do you think the skills development of the employees will increase, when SEs engage in a product development strategy?
56. Does product development as a form of strategy, adopted by CSEs, improve the standard of living and welfare of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

57. Do the savings and investments of employees increase, as CSEs engage in more product development strategies?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

58. Do you think changing the mind-sets of the people who work or manage SE organisations, can result in reduced poverty in Nigeria?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

59. Does the coming together of SE organisations, to form synergy for social missions have an impact on poverty reduction in Nigeria?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

60. Does harnessing numerous stakeholders’ voices, help CSE organisations to achieve the poverty alleviation mission in Nigeria?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree
61. Do you think product development as a strategy for CSEs, will impact greatly on poverty reduction in Nigeria?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

62. In your opinion what form of SEs collaboration, suitably addresses poverty reduction within Nigeria?

Licensing arrangements
Joint ventures
Cooperatives
Alliances

63. Do you think this collaboration is sustainable enough, to be able to address poverty in Nigeria?

Yes
No

64. In your opinion what form of SEs strategy, suitably addresses poverty reduction in Nigeria?

Framing
Convening
Multivocality
Product development

65. A framing strategy can be used to reduce poverty in Nigeria?

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

66. A convening strategy could have an impact on poverty reduction in Nigeria?

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

67. Multivocality can help CSE organisations to achieve the poverty alleviation mission in Nigeria?
68. Product development as a strategy will impact greatly on poverty reduction in Nigeria?

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

Section I - The organisations and their employees - This section focuses on finding out the background information of the SE organisations and their employees. (Please tick (v) as appropriate).

69. The year of establishment of your organisation?

Less than 5 years
5-10 years
10-15 years
15-20 years
20 years and above

70. Which sector does the underlying organisation belong too?

   a. non-profit/ non-government
   b. government/ public
   c. mixed
   d. Social enterprise

71. What is the size of your organisation in terms of employee size?

   1-10
   10-20
   20-30
   30-40
   40 and above

72. What is the size of your organisation in terms of capital?

Less than 1 million
N1m-N5m
N5m-N10m
N10m and above
73. What is your gender?

Male/ Female

74. What is your highest level of education? Please tick one

- GCE/O Level or equivalent
- OND/HND or equivalent
- Degree or equivalent
- Masters or equivalent
- PhD
- Others, please specify

75. What is your religion?

- Christianity
- Muslim
- Hindu
- Sikh
- Others

76. What is your marital status?

- Single
- Married
- Married with children
- Single with children

77. What is your Monthly income in Naira?

- 20,000-50,000
- 51,000-80,000
- 81,000-120,000
- 120,000 and above

78. Which of the following best describes your time in this employment?

- 1-4 years
- 5-9 years
- 10-14 years
- 15 years and above

79. My income has increased tremendously since I joined this organisation?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
80. Do you think this organisation has helped to create employment opportunities?

Yes/No

81. This organisation provides the necessary training when the need arises?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

82. Joining this organisation has improved my standard of living?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

83. Skills development is a major consideration of this organisation?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

84. Do you have savings and investments since you joined your current organisation?

Yes/No
Appendix C: Interview Participant Consent Form

**PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM**

Cardiff Metropolitan University Ethics Reference Number:

**Participant name or Study ID Number:** ST20071058

**Title of Project:** Collective Social Entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria

**Name of Researcher:** Festus Osaretin Edobor

**Participant to complete this section:**

Please initial each box:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I confirm that I have read the Participant Information Sheet and the nature and purpose of the research project has been explained to me. I understand and agree to take part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I understand the purpose of the research project and my involvement in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I understand that I may withdraw from the research project at any stage and that this will not affect my status now or in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I understand that while information gained during the study may be published, I will not be identified and my personal results will remain confidential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I understand that data (including hard and electronic copies of transcripts, or any video or audiotapes used) will be password protected and accessible only by the researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I certify that I am 18 years old or older.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I agree to the interview being audio recorded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: letter to organisations

LETTER TO AN ORGANISATION

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a doctoral student at the Cardiff Metropolitan University. I am in the process of writing my doctoral thesis and am collecting data for that purpose. For my doctoral thesis, I am exploring collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria. I am particularly interested in poverty reduction and therefore exploring a new strategy to tackle poverty.

The purpose of this letter is to request your participation in this research titled “collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria”. The interviews will help me explore the nature of social entrepreneurship strategies and collaboration to reduce poverty.

Please find attached a participant information sheet that outlines the research study. I will be glad to meet/call you for an informal discussion initially in case you have any queries.

All information collected during the case study will be kept anonymous with methods advised by the university being strictly adhered to.
I look forward to your response.

Kind regards,

Festus Edobor  
Cardiff metropolitan University  
UK  
Tel: 07535241446

Email: L0146BSBS1013@student.lsclondon.co.uk

Contact Information:

Appendix E: Participants information sheet

London School of Commerce  
Chaucer House, White Hart Yard,  
London SE1 1NX, United Kingdom  

Tel: +44 207 357 0077  
Fax: +44 207 403 1163  

June, 2015
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Project Title: Collective Social Entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

This is an invitation to participate in a study conducted as part of the requirements of my doctoral dissertation. The purpose of the research is to investigate the nature of Collective Social Entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reducing poverty in Nigeria. The study will further understanding on how collective social entrepreneurship can be used as strategies and collaboration to reduce poverty.

You are being asked to take part in this research study because you fit the profile of the population being studied. Your participation is voluntary which means you can choose whether or not to participate. However, before you make a decision about whether to participate, it is important that you take time to read the information below carefully.

METHOD OF PARTICIPATION

The study will take place over a period of six months starting August, 2015. If you choose to be included, you will be asked to complete questionnaire and interview questions that will be audio recorded with your permission. I shall contact each study participant to schedule the interview for a time that is most convenient to the participant.

POSSIBLE RISKS

Apart from the time you will take to participate in the interview, there are no known risks for participating in this study. If answering some of the questions makes you uncomfortable, please let me know. We can stop the interview for a few moments, you can skip a question or furthermore, you can decide to stop participating at any time without penalty.

PRIVACY PROTECTION

All the information collected in the course of this research will be kept strictly confidential. Following collection, all data will be de-identified to ensure anonymity using codes to identify participants in place of their names. Paper records will be kept under lock and electronic files will be protected by the use of passwords throughout the research process. On completion of the study, all the documentation and recordings used to gather the data will be destroyed.
FINDINGS AND BENEFITS OF THE RESEARCH

This research will provide some useful insight into the nature of collective social entrepreneurship and how this can be used to reduce poverty. The findings will help policy makers to formulate and review policies to foster the development of collective social entrepreneurship, it will also help individual social entrepreneurs to have a better understanding on how best to run social entrepreneurship ventures.

The findings may also form the basis of articles submitted for publication in appropriate academic journals. Participants would not be referred to individually in any publication arising from this research.

It is entirely up to you to decide whether or not to take part in this research. If you do decide to take part, a consent form will be provided for you to sign. Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact:

Festus Edobor
Cardiff Metropolitan University, UK
Mobile: +447535241446
Email: L0146BSBS1013@student.lsclondon.co.uk

Thank you for taking time to read this information sheet
Appendix F: Pilot Study- Questionnaire

Questionnaire

Section A- COLLABORATION: Licensing Arrangements - This section focuses on finding out how licensing arrangements, as a collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty, through increasing income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living /welfare, savings and investments of employees. (Please tick (✓) as appropriate)

1. Do you think licensing arrangements between several social entrepreneurs, contributes to an increase in income for organisations involved in the arrangement?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

2. Does the income of individual employees increase as a result of licensing arrangements as a form of collaboration?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

3. Do you think licensing agreements as a form of collaboration, help to generate more employment and improve business opportunities?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4. Are employment opportunities enhanced when social entrepreneurs collaborate on a Licensing arrangement?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

5. Do you agree that education and training activities of individuals will increase, as the level of licensing agreement collaborations, between CSEs increases?
   - Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

Replaced with: Do you agree that education and training activities of individual will increase as the level of licensing agreement collaborations between CSEs increases?

6. Do licensing agreement collaborations, contribute greatly to the skills development of individual employees?
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

7. Do you think employees’ skills levels within CSE organisations, will increase as a result of licensing agreement collaborations?
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

8. Do licensing agreements amongst CSE firms impact positively on the quality of the standard of living/welfare of their employees?
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

9. Do the savings and investments of employees increase, with the level of licensing agreement collaborations?
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

10. Does a licensing agreement between several social entrepreneurs, contribute to income for the organisations involved?
    Strongly Agree
11. Do you think that licensing agreements as a form of collaboration, between social entrepreneurs, positively impacts and enhances employment opportunities and leads to poverty reduction?

   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

12. The savings and investments of employees will increase, with the level of licensing agreement collaborations?

   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

Replaced with: Do you think Savings and investment of employees will increase with the level of licensing agreement collaboration?

Section B- COLLABORATION: Joint ventures - This section focuses on finding out how joint ventures, as a form of collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty, through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living/welfare, savings and investment of employees. (Please tick (✓) as appropriate)

13. Joint Venture collaborations between social entrepreneurs, positively impact and enhance employment opportunities and leads to poverty reduction.

   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neither agree nor disagree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

14. Does the quality of education and training of employees within CSE organisations, influence the joint venture collaboration arrangements that the firm is engaged in?
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

15. Do you think education and training activities and programmes of CSE organisations will increase, as the level of joint venture collaborations between CSEs increases?

Yes
No

Replaced with:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

16. Do employees’ skills levels in CSE organisations increase solely as a result of joint venture arrangements?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

17. Does the quality, of standard of living/welfare of CSE employees, increase as a result of successful joint venture collaborations with another CSE firm(s)?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

18. Do the savings and investments of employees increase, with the level of joint venture collaborations?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

19. The education and training activities and programmes of CSE organisations, will increase as the level of joint venture collaborations between CSEs increases.
Section C- COLLABORATION: Cooperatives - This section focuses on finding out how a cooperative, as a form of collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty, through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living /welfare and savings and investment of employees. (Please tick (v) as appropriate)

20. Does employment creation and business opportunities improve/increase, as a result of cooperative arrangements among CSEs?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

21. Do cooperatives, as a form of collaboration have a positive impact on the education and training of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

22. Do you think the level of education and training of employees, is a function of cooperative arrangements, as a form of collaboration between CSEs?

Yes
No

Replaced with:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

23. Do cooperatives as a form of collaboration, between CSE organisations contribute greatly to skills development and increase productivity for the organisations?

Strongly Agree

350
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

24. Do employees' skills levels within CSE organisations, increase solely as a result of cooperative arrangements?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

25. Do you think cooperative collaborations amongst CSEs will increase the standard of living/welfare of its employees?

Yes
No

26. Do savings and investments of employees increase, with the level of Cooperation between CSEs?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

28. Employment creation and business opportunities increase, as a result of cooperative arrangements among CSEs?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

Section D - COLLABORATION: Alliance - This section focuses on finding out how alliances as a form of collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty, through increased income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living/welfare and savings and investments of employees. (Please tick (v) as appropriate)
28. Do alliances as a form of collaboration, between social entrepreneurs, positively impact and enhance employment opportunities and lead to poverty reduction?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

29. Do you think the quality of education and training within individual CSE organisations is determined, by alliance collaboration arrangements that are engaged in by firms?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

30. Do alliances as a form of collaboration between CSEs, contribute greatly to skills development and increase productivity for the organisations?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

31. Do employees’ skills levels within CSE organisations, increase solely as a result of alliance arrangements?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

32. Savings and investment of employees, will increase with the level of alliance between CSEs?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

33. Standard of living/welfare of CSE employees, will surely increase as a result of successful Alliance with other CSE firm(s)?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
Section E - STRATEGY: Framing- This section focuses on finding out how a framing strategy, can be used to alleviate poverty through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living /welfare and savings and investments of employees? (Please tick (v) as appropriate).

34. Do you think sharing information as an SE organisation, has a direct impact on the income of the employees?

Yes
No

35. Does employment creation and the business opportunities of CSEs increase as they intensify information sharing?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

36. Influencing the perception of people has an implication on the education and training of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

37. Do the skills development of CSE employees, increase, when SEs begin to interpret their ideas and social mission?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree
38. Does information sharing amongst CSEs, improve the standard of living and welfare of their employees?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

39. Savings and investment of employees will increase, as CSEs engage more in sharing information?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

Section F - STRATEGY: Convening - This section focuses on finding out how convening as a form of strategy, can be used to alleviate poverty through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living /welfare and savings and investments of employees. (Please tick (✓) as appropriate).

40. Do you think the creation of employment and business opportunities by CSEs will increase, as they increase their synergy?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

41. Do you think there will be a lack of creation of employment and business opportunities for CSEs as they intensify their synergy?
   - Yes
   - No

   Replaced with:
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

42. Does the synergy of the CSEs, have any implication on the education and training of employees?
   - Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

43. Does skills development amongst employees increase, when SEs come together for social venture?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

44. Licensing arrangement may not improve standard of living

Replaced with: In CSE arrangement, do you think the synergy of SEs will improve standard of living and welfare of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

45. Savings and investments of employees will increase, as CSEs begin to engage more in synergy?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

Section G - STRATEGY: Multivocality - This section focuses on finding out how multivocality as a form of SE strategy, can be used to alleviate poverty through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living /welfare and savings and investments of employees. (Please tick (v) as appropriate).

46. When CSEs speak with one aligned voice, does it have a direct impact on the income of the employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
47. Do you think employment creation and business opportunities of CSEs, will increase when they solicit support from stakeholders?

Yes
No

Replaced with:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

48. Does the harnessing of numerous stakeholders’ voices, have any implication on the education and training of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

49. Do you think employees skills development, will increase, when SE organisations solicit a broad array of support from stakeholders?

Yes
No

Replaced with:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

50. Does soliciting support by CSEs, improve the standard of living and welfare of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

51. Savings and investments of employees will increase as CSEs, harness numerous stakeholders’ voices?
Section H- STRATEGY: Product development - This section focuses on finding out how product development as a form of strategy, can be used to alleviate poverty through increase in income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living /welfare and savings and investment of employees (Please tick (v) as appropriate).

52 Product development strategy of CSE has direct impact on the income of employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Replaced with: Does product development strategy of CSE has direct impact on the income of employees?

53. Do you think employment creation and business opportunities of CSEs, will increase as they intensify their product development strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

54. Does the product development strategy of the CSEs, have any implications on the education and training of its employees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

55. Do you think the skills development of the employees will increase, when SEs engage in a product development strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
56. Product development form of strategy by CSEs improve standard of living and welfare of employees?

Replaced with: Does product development form of strategy by CSEs improve standard of living and welfare of employees?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

57. Do the savings and investments of employees increase, as CSEs engage in more product development strategies?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

58. Do you think changing the mind-sets of the people who work or manage SE organisations, can result in reduced poverty in Nigeria?

Yes
No

Replaced with:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree
59. Does the coming together of SE organisations, to form synergy for social missions have an impact on poverty reduction in Nigeria?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

60. Does harnessing numerous stakeholders’ voices, help CSE organisations to achieve the poverty alleviation mission in Nigeria?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

61. Do you think product development as a strategy for CSEs, will impact greatly on poverty reduction in Nigeria?

Yes
No

69. In your opinion what form of SEs collaboration, suitably addresses poverty reduction within Nigeria?

Licensing arrangements
Joint ventures
Cooperatives
Alliances

70. Do you think this collaboration is sustainable enough, to be able to address poverty in Nigeria?

Yes
No

Replaced with:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree
71. In your opinion what form of SEs strategy, suitably addresses poverty reduction in Nigeria?
Framing
Convening
Multivocality
Product development

72. A framing strategy can be used to reduce poverty in Nigeria?
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

73. A convening strategy could have an impact on poverty reduction in Nigeria?
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

74. Multivocality can help CSE organisations to achieve the poverty alleviation mission in Nigeria?
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

75. Product development as a strategy will impact greatly on poverty reduction in Nigeria?
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

Section I - The organisations and their employees - This section focuses on finding out the background information of the SE organisations and their employees. (Please tick (v) as appropriate).

69. The year of establishment of your organisation?
Less than 5 years
5-10 years
10-15 years
15-20 years
20 years and above

70. Which sector does the underlying organisation belong too?
   a. non-profit/ non-government
   b. government/ public
   c. mixed
   d. Social enterprise

71. What is the size of your organisation in terms of employee size?
   1-10
   10-20
   20-30
   30-40
   40 and above

72. What is the size of your organisation in terms of capital?
   Less than 1 million
   N1m-N5m
   N5m-N10m
   N10m and above

73. What is your gender?
   Male/ Female

74. What is your highest level of education? Please tick one
   GCE/O Level or equivalent
   OND/HND or equivalent
   Degree or equivalent
   Masters or equivalent
   PhD
   Others, please specify

75. What is your religion?
   Christianity
   Muslim
Hindu
Sikh
Others

76. What is your marital status?
Single
Married
Married with children
Single with children

77. What is your Monthly income in Naira?
20,000-50,000
51,000-80,000
81,000-120,000
120,000 and above

78. Which of the following best describes your time in this employment?
1-4 years
5-9 years
10-14 years
15 years and above

79. My income has increased tremendously since I joined this organisation?
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

80. Do you think this organisation has helped to create employment opportunities?
Yes/No

81. This organisation provides the necessary training when the need arises?
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

82. Joining this organisation has improved my standard of living?
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

83. Skills development is a major consideration of this organisation?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

84. Do you have savings and investments since you joined your current organisation?

Yes/No

Appendix G - Cronbach Reliability Test

Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Created</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Dataset</td>
<td>DataSet1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split File</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Rows in Working Data File</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value Handling</td>
<td>Definition of Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Used</td>
<td>Statistics are based on all cases with valid data for all variables in the procedure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Syntax

RELIABILITY
/VARIABLES=Licensingarrangement
cooperative alliance jointventure
multivocality framing convening
productdevelopment income savings
employment eduandtraining
skillsdevelopment standardofliving

/SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
/MODEL=ALPHA
/STATISTICS=SCALE
/SUMMARY=TOTAL.

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.811</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>64.57</td>
<td>2.117</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrangement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>64.57</td>
<td>2.117</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alliance</td>
<td>64.57</td>
<td>2.117</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint venture</td>
<td>64.57</td>
<td>2.117</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

364
### Scale Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.55</td>
<td>2.339</td>
<td>1.529</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix H

**PILOT STUDY**

**Collective Social Entrepreneurship as Collaborative Strategy to Reduce Poverty in Nigeria**

**Abstract**

This research investigates collective social entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria. The Nigerian government, particularly since the structural adjustment programme of mid 1980s, have put in place policies and programmes aimed at entrepreneurship development, as a means of employment generation, poverty alleviation and rapid economic development, it seems as if all the strategies applied in the past to fight poverty have proved ineffective. Collective social entrepreneurship (CSE) is useful for the part it plays in the process of capital accumulation, innovation and poverty reduction.
Literature suggest that this concept has not been prominent in Nigeria and has not been adequately investigated.

The objectives of this research therefore are fourfold. Firstly, to critically review relevant literature relating to entrepreneurship strategy and collective social entrepreneurship, with a particular focus on gaining a deeper understanding of what the dichotomies are in order to develop a conceptual framework, secondly, to study the current impact of collective social entrepreneurs collaboration on poverty alleviation in Nigeria, thirdly, to examine the extent to which CSE strategy can impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria, and lastly, to determine the best collaborative strategies employed by collective social entrepreneurs to address poverty in Nigeria and suggest best poverty reduction collaborative strategy for CSE in Nigeria. In this inductive, exploratory study, qualitative and quantitative data was collected from semi-structured interviews and questionnaire with multiple informants in Twenty Collective Social Entrepreneurship firms in Nigeria to investigate the impact of CSE on poverty. SPSS was used to analyse the quantitative data using a multiple regression analysis to test the relationship between the dependent and independent variables while NVIVO was used to analyse the qualitative data. Findings reveals that collective social entrepreneurship will positively impact on poverty alleviation and enhance economic growth and development.

Introduction

Fink (2009) suggested that one of the reasons for pilot study is to look at each question in the questionnaire and make sure they are not only answered correctly but to ensure that respondents have no problems understanding or answered the questions and has followed instructions correctly.

1.1 RESEARCH BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

This study examines Collective Social Entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to promote and alleviate poverty in Nigeria. As revealed in the literature, poverty is one of the biggest problems in the world today (Baba et al., 2014). This is demonstrated by the following statistics: three billion live on a minimum of US$2 per day (World Bank, 2012; 2014) and half a billion people live below US$2 per day (World bank, 2014); 70-90 per cent of people in the developing world are poor and Nigeria is part of the developing countries; poverty is number one of the Eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (World Bank, 2012); and 75 per cent of the world poor are women (World Bank, 2014). It seems all the
strategies applied in the past to fight poverty have proved ineffective as the strategies and programmes have not been able to alleviate the poverty objective in Nigeria (Abimbola, 2013; Peterson, 2015).

The Nigerian government, since the structural adjustment programme of the mid 1980s, have put in place policies and programmes aimed at entrepreneurship development, employment creation, rapid economic development and poverty alleviation (Abimbola, 2013, Mohamed et al., 2015). These programmes have failed as a result of lack of direction and wrong implementation (Abimbola, 2013), but there is a promising poverty alleviation strategy in the form of CSE. Collective social Entrepreneurship (CSE is the coming together of different social entrepreneurs to address social issues From the historical literature, it can be suggested that CSE strategies are making a positive impact across the countries in which they have been employed (Tan, 2015), such as Canada, Hungary and United Kingdom.

Collective Social Entrepreneurship arises when social entrepreneurs convene to address social issues (Connel, 1999:19; Smith & Wood, 2015). It is a major source of economic development (Wikken, 1999; Oly, 2012) and as a means of poverty alleviation (Connel, 1999; Worrell et al., 2013). Wilken (1990) uses the term CSE to describe the source and structure of economic development. Whereas De Sousa et al., (2016) use the term to describe the pattern of interactions among different organisations. On the other hand, Meulla et al., (2015) use the term CSE to represent the role it plays in the capital accumulation process and innovation. Other authors posited that CSE can lead to life achievement such as business success (Schoonhoven & Romaneli, 2001; De Bruin et al., 2015) and it also shows how working together can help business activities (Felin & Zenger, 2007; Buress & Cook, 2009; Morgan, 2016).

The term collective entrepreneurship is used when the choices about asset deployment are taken not by an individual, but a group of individuals (Si et al., 2016). According to Buress (2009), collective entrepreneurship is also explained and expressed according to the intention or motive of the entrepreneurship. Buress (2009) collated 240 articles and examined them and suggested that collective entrepreneurship is explained and expressed according to the intention or motive of the entrepreneurship. Literature in this field ignored how decisions are made in favour of the structural conditions that determined which strategies worked, as well as collective strategies that enhance innovation and how collectives are organised (Montgomery et al., 2012). Though Montgomery et al. (2012) suggested strategies such as
framing, convening, and multivocality as some of the strategies of CSE and also argue that the strategy that works and the circumstance is a question that is dependent on the nature of the CSE strategy and how the strategies are implemented. Montgomery et al. (2012) therefore recommended future research on how actors overcome unique challenges related to collaborations within the same sector and across-sectors in order to determine the difference between the two. Social entrepreneurs face significant resource voids (Montgomery et al., 2012; Hjorth, 2016). Resource constraint is a major challenge to social entrepreneurs. It is incumbent on them to understand that goods and services can be drummed up, and to understand the variety of different businesses and how they carry out their businesses in different markets, platforms and locations and that some of these businesses are vital and successful.

The poverty rate of Nigeria is at 61% (World Bank, 2014) and its economic growth rate is at 6.7% (Nigerian Insight, 2014). Nigeria as a nation has lots of innovative entrepreneurs (Agbalajobi, 2011) but this has not translated into poverty alleviation (Oluseyi et al., 2013). More so, research shows that entrepreneurial skills and collectivism can reduce poverty and enhance economic growth (Oladeyji & Abiola, 1998; Kayode, 2015), yet whilst many studies have been undertaken within a Western context (Abubarkar, 2012) there are no empirical studies on this phenomenon within Nigeria, hence the significance of this study to the field of CSE. Therefore, this study will fill this gap, looking into collective social entrepreneurship collaboration, and strategy formulation with a view of alleviating poverty in Nigeria.

A United Nations report (2014) on Nigeria's Common Country Analysis (CCA), has depicted the nation as one of the poorest and unequal nations on the planet, with more than 80 million of the population living below the poverty line. According to the report, Nigeria, has a population of more than 175 million and is the most crowded country in Africa and the seventh most crowded in the world. It’s estimated the population will be around 200 million by 2019 and more than 400 million by 2050 and will most likely be one of the main five populated nations on the planet. In Nigeria, 37% of children under five years of age were stunted in their growth, 18% died, 29% were underweight. The Nigerian economy has not been growing as expected and it is revealed that revenues of the government have fallen by as much as 33 percent, which has further brought about the drop in Gross Domestic Product, by 0.36 percent in the initial three months of 2016 (Ezekiel, 2016).
Poverty will no doubt, increase if steps are not taken (Kayode, 2015). While poverty is becoming apparent in the diaspora (United Nations, 2011; World Bank 2014), the inherent nature on the environment and the whole world may become very extensive (Bessant, 2012). It is therefore important to understand the fact that all humans are mutually dependent and it is necessary to act at local level to reduce poverty through value creation and collectiveness (Peterson, 1988; Ossai, 2012).

**Aim of Research**

To investigate Collective Social Entrepreneurship as a collaborative strategy to reduce poverty in Nigeria.

**Methodology**

The study was carried out within the education and finance sector in Lagos state as the area generates the highest number of social entrepreneurship in Lagos state, Nigeria (Oyelola et al., 2013).

Multiple sources of secondary data are compiled through journal, books, article, and literature review. Primary data was collected through the administration of questionnaires. Generally, survey strategy uses questions technique to gather primary data. It is because these sets of questions are asked to the participant in a predetermined order (De Vaus, 2012). The question are basically self-completed which will be employed for the research through collections and delivery methods. The reasons for self-completed questions for these kinds of studies are that it allows access to more numbers of samples, also the response rate is more as compared to others. Again the limitation for self-designed questionnaires is the open ended questions will be limited. Collecting responses from the customer could be time consuming.

The researcher has adopted a disproportionate stratified sampling approach towards shortlisting the respondents for the survey. Disproportionate stratified sampling helps get a true reflection of how the phenomenon under study occurs in its natural form, without trying to influence the outcomes by choosing a biased sample. An unduly large and poor sample may fail to meet the research validity and credibility (David & Sutton, 2004). A probability based sampling technique can help to enforce the required level of discipline and randomness in shortlisting the participants for the primary interaction (Bryman, 2011).
Questionnaires was administered to about Five (5) employees and the CEOs of the collective organisations. The researcher contacted the various CSE through Corporate Affairs Commission (CAC) Nigeria. The researcher further obtained the email addresses of the respondents through the CSE gateways and email addresses were then sent as word document of the questionnaire alongside the online link for completion.

The questionnaire instrument employed in this study comprised of a total of Eighty Four (84) questions comprising Seventy One (71) Likert scale question and Thirteen (13) others.

The instrument was divided into Nine (9) sections, namely: licensing agreement, cooperative, joint venture, alliances, multivocality, convening, framing and product development with varying number of questions in each section.

SPSS software was used to test and analyse the research questions using suitable statistical analytical tools (multiple regression analysis). Multiple regression allows the researcher to determine the relative contribution of each of the predictors to the total variance i.e. how much effect collective social entrepreneurship, innovation, strategy, organisation, income etc has on poverty reduction.

**Discussion/ Result Analysis**

Findings from the research shows that there is a divide between those that said the CSE collaboration is sustainable or not. From table 5.20.18, 94 of the 201 respondents that participated in the survey said the CSE collaboration is not sustainable and this represent 46.8% while 107 respondents said the collaboration is sustainable representing 53.2%. It is interesting to know that 37.3% on table 5.20.1 said the CSE organisation has been in existence between 10-15 years while 10.4% said the CSE organisation have been in existence for about 20 years. Based on the responses from the survey, the research will take the position that the CSE collaboration will be sustainable.
The current study probed into the best collaborative strategy to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria and it was found that different strategies such as framing, convening, multivocality and product development can be used to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. From the respondents’ survey, 73 respondents think framing strategy will address the problem of poverty, 56 respondents said Multivocality will better address the problem of poverty in Nigeria representing 27.9%, 40 respondent confirmed that product development is the best strategy representing 19.9%, while 32 respondents said convening is the best strategy to alleviate poverty in Nigeria. The result of this findings shows that CSEs can adopt different collaborative strategy as long as it meet the objective of the organisation. The findings here confirms the position of Montgomery (2012) on collaboratively shaping social good said that framing, Multivocality and convening are strategies for community development to address poverty menace.

Findings

Majority of the CSEs are just coming up as it seems to be a developing concept within Nigeria. Most of them have only existed for less than 10 years.

Literature reveals that for collaborative effort to be successful and address the problems of poverty, CSEs must address all aspect of the poverty indices like income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living /welfare, savings & investment of employees.

The CSEs are also small in terms of capital and number of employees

Some of the employees of the CSEs have no savings, this shows that they are not earning enough and still within the poverty level.

The CSEs adopts different collaborative arrangement and strategies like Alliances, Cooperative, licensing Agreement, joint venture, Multivocality, framing, convening and product development

CSEs collaborations generate employment according to the responses

Licensing arrangement and cooperative were found to be statistically significant and can positively impact on education and training of employees therefore alleviating poverty.

Looking at the impact of CSE collaboration on education and training from the SPSS analysis, cooperative form of CSE is statistically significant at .003 and also have a positive correlation value of 3.010 at 0.5 t-value, which connotes that the more collaborations through cooperatives, the higher the chance of poverty alleviation in Nigeria through education and training.

Despite the fact that other form of collaborations like Licensing Agreement, joint Venture and Alliance, were not significant but have positive correlations of .062, .135 and .052 respectively.
Licensing arrangement and Alliances have more impact on poverty than joint venture and cooperatives. Surprisingly and contrary to expectation, Cooperative form of CSE collaboration turn out, in this research, not to be statistically significant to poverty alleviation variables measured in this research work.

This, indeed, is surprising given the plethora of cooperative society operating in Nigeria. The ease of formation and popularity of cooperative societies in Nigeria gave an impression that it would has significant impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Responses from the interview revealed that the sector under consideration may not have impacted so much on poverty alleviation but other sectors put together will have much effect on poverty alleviation.

The result indicates that both licencing arrangement and joint venture have no linear relationship with standard of living and welfare with a negative correlation of -1.97 and -1.762 respectively. This result shows that neither of these form of collaboration may have direct impact on poverty alleviation as they all have negative correlation.

As regards the Impact of CSE Collaborations on Savings and Investments, all the CSE collaborations have positive impact on savings and investment

Some of the Interview questions revealed that government has a part to play in CSEs development in Nigeria in the areas of policy decision

**Conclusion**

Joint venture as a collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty through increase income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living/welfare, savings & investment of employees

Licensing arrangement form of collaboration has positive impact on poverty as it promotes skill development.

Cooperative form of collaboration has not impacted much on poverty in the sector under investigation but has contributed greatly to employment.

Alliance as a collaboration can be used to alleviate poverty through increase income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living/welfare, savings & investment of employees.

Framing is a strategic tool in conjunction with other strategies to alleviate poverty.

Convening form of CSE strategy can be used to alleviate poverty through increase income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living/welfare, savings & investment of employees.

Multivocality form of SE strategy can be used to alleviate poverty through increase income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living/welfare, savings & investment of employees. This is only possible when:
They speak in one voice

Solicit support from stakeholders

Harnessing numerous stakeholders’ voices

Product development form of strategy has not got much influence on poverty alleviation from the findings, reason may be that some CSEs are not addressing the Product development form of strategy has not translated into increase income, employment, education and training, skill development, standard of living /welfare, savings & investment of employees

Looking at the interaction effect of both CSEs collaboration and strategy on poverty alleviation, CSEs will make more impact on poverty if they match their collaboration with the right strategy the right project at the right time.
### Appendix I

Table 7.1 Research findings, conclusion and recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objective</th>
<th>Research Findings</th>
<th>Research Conclusion</th>
<th>Established Conclusions in Literatures</th>
<th>Implications of Research Findings and Conclusion</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To critically review relevant literature relating to collective social entrepreneurship and strategy with a view to gaining a deeper understanding of the phenomenon, particularly the dichotomies, of collective entrepreneurship in order to develop a conceptual framework.</td>
<td>Collaboration involves multiple actors that are addressing social impact. The mission of CSEs is to address social problems and alleviate poverty. There are different forms of CSE collaborations and strategies and these can be within or across sectors. CSEs collaborate as a result of resource</td>
<td>CSEs engage in a social mission and they deploy strategies to address social impact. The more SEs collaborate, the greater the impact on poverty alleviation, as collaboration can positively impact on poverty alleviation. At the moment, CSEs practices are within the same sector. Therefore, collaborators are encouraged to diversify and work across different</td>
<td>Montgomery et al. (2012) and Verschoore et al. (2015) stated that multiple actors and collaborations have a positive social impact. Pink and White (2016) and Moshtari (2016) suggest that social entrepreneurship can not address social challenges on a large scale if attempts to solve it alone.</td>
<td>This research corroborated the position of Montgomery et al. (2012); Smith and Woods (2015) and Chandra (2016). It also corroborated Kania &amp; Kramer (2011); Paturas et al. (2016) and Gustafsson and Wihlborg (2016).</td>
<td>CSEs should be seen as an instrument for poverty alleviation and addressing social impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
constraints. sectors in Nigeria in order to have a more positive impact on poverty alleviation.
Pies et al. (2010) stated that CSEs should act at different level of operation which implies that cooperation of different actors is able to resolve social issues.
Rivera-Santos (2015) argues that social entrepreneurs focus on creating values which operation in different level of the economy where environmental factor are uncontrollable.
Kania & Kramer (2011) suggest that there are also different forms of
Morgan (2016) stated that it is easy for CSEs to mobilize resources that can change social impact, such as poverty alleviation.

Alvord et al. (2004) analyzed the different characteristics of successful social entrepreneurs and found a common pattern among them such as background, nationalities, previous jobs etc.

Austen et al. (2006) analyzed the different between social entrepreneurs and commercial entrepreneurs.
by reflecting on the organizational models.

Montgomery et al. (2012) identified CSEs as collaboration amongst similar as well as diverse actors who apply business principles to solve social problems.

Sud et al. (2008) also suggest that social entrepreneurs will face challenges resolving social problems when they try to tackle it alone.

Kanai and Kramer (2011, 2013) and Hanleybrown et al. (2012) argued that complex problems solved by social entrepreneurs are
2. To study the current impact of CSE collaborations on poverty alleviation in Nigeria.

CSEs have different forms of collaboration and these have some impact on poverty alleviation. The collaborations have made so much impact on poverty, especially through employment and through special skills development programmes.

As a result of the high level of poverty in Nigeria, SEs are beginning to come together in the form of collaborations to address the poverty menace. CSEs collaborations have a great impact on poverty alleviation. The greater the collaboration, the greater the impact on poverty alleviation.

SEs should collaborate in the direction of cooperative organization as this has been found to easier done when addressed collectively within or across sectors while they leverage their resources.

Wanyama et al. (2009) and Fidelis et al. (2015) stated that the cooperative form of collaboration can increase income.

Wanyama et al. (2009) and Sharpley (2016) opined that cooperative societies create employment opportunities.

Long et al. (2015); Kasmir (2016) and Paranque and Willmott (2016) also posited that cooperative societies create and maintain employment in rural and urban areas.

This research contradicted Wanyama et al. (2009) and De Sousa and Docuyanan (2016).

This research corroborated Wanyama et.al (2009) and Paranque and Willmott (2016).


Corroborated Bijman et al. (2016) and Tregear and Cooper (2016).

Corroborated Olusiye et al. (2013) and

CSEs collaborations should be encouraged in order to alleviate the problem of poverty in Nigeria and, more specifically, to engage more in education and training in order to have more impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria.

To successfully address the
be a useful poverty alleviation mechanism. Cooperative forms of collaboration should be encouraged to engage more in education and training in order to have more impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria.

Bijman et al. (2016); Cheney (2015) and Paranque & Willmott (2016) also posited that for cooperative societies must address the issues of innovation enterprise and economic viability to be able to address poverty alleviation.

Agu and Kadiri (2014) and Akemu et al. (2016) argued in their studies that cooperative organizations can contribute to poverty alleviation.

Ossai and Nwalado (2012); Peterson (2015); Martin et al. (2016) and Pink and White (2016) posited that collaboration generates more employment.

Moshtari (2016) and Martin et al. (2016) argue that cooperative societies must address all aspects of the poverty indices, such as increased income, employment, education and training, skills development, standard of living / welfare and savings and investment of employees.

**Corroborated**
Ossai and Nwalado (2012); Martin et al. (2016); Pink and White (2016) and Paranque and Willmott (2016).

**Contradicted**
Moshtari (2016) and Martin et al. (2016) as findings show that not all forms of collaboration will alleviate poverty through savings and investment.
| 3. To examine CSE strategies and their impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. | CSEs have different forms of strategies and these have some impact on poverty alleviation. Not all CSE strategies have been able to impact positively on poverty alleviation. | CSEs formulate strategies on different fronts but some of the strategies, such as the product development form of strategy, do not have much influence on poverty alleviation, as shown by the findings. The reason for this may be that some CSEs are not addressing the right project at the right time. CSE strategies are more effective when used collectively. | Montgomery et al. (2012); Tan et al. (2015) and Smith and Woods (2015) stated that CSE strategies can impact on rural development and reduce poverty. Peredo (2014); Mulloth et al. (2016) and Hu et al. (2016) posited that community development and poverty alleviation can be impacted by the SE strategies. Peredo (2014); Vidovic et al. (2015) and Hu et al. (2016) said that CSE represents a promising strategy for fostering sustainable local development. | **Corroborated** Montgomery et al. (2012) and Smith and Woods (2015). **Corroborated** Peredo (2014) and Mulloth et al. (2016) **Corroborated** Chandra (2016) and Moshtari (2016). | CSEs should formulate strategies around poverty alleviation in Nigeria. CSEs should match their collaborations with the right strategy in order to address the problem of poverty in Nigeria. |
| 4. To suggest the best poverty reduction collaborative strategy for CSE in Nigeria. | There are different forms of CSE collaborations, such as cooperatives, licensing agreements, joint ventures and alliances. CSEs also use strategies, such as multivocality, convening, framing and product development. CSEs use combinations of collaborations and strategies to address the problems of poverty in Nigeria. | Not all CSE strategies can impact on poverty alleviation. It is true that CSEs adopt different collaborative strategies, but CSEs engagement in the framing and convening forms of strategy will not have much impact on savings and investment. Different CSE collaborations and strategies have different levels of impact on poverty alleviation in Nigeria. The environment, especially the government, Parmigiani and Rivera-Santos (2011) and Pink and White (2016) stated that there are many forms of collaboration, amongst which are alliances and joint ventures. Loebbecke et al. (2016) and Hofstad and Torfing (2015) posited that organizational collaboration will increase innovation capacity among member organizations which help in addressing social issues. Ofili (2014) and Verschoore et al. (2015) stated that government policies can influence the Corroborated the position of Parmigiani and Rivera-Santos (2011) and Pink and White (2016). Corroborated Loebbecke et al. (2016) and Hofstad and Torfing (2015). Corroborated Ofili (2014) and Verschoore et al. (2015). Corroborated Kolawole(2013) | CSEs should focus on collaborations and strategies that can impact on poverty alleviation. Government should provide an enabling environment for CSEs development in Nigeria in the areas of policies and...
| The cooperative form of collaboration and the multivocality strategy will work well in alleviating poverty in Nigeria. | plays a vital role in poverty alleviation. | collaborative strategies of CSEs. Cheney (2016) and Martin et al. (2016) said that collaboration is about cooperation among various actors. Kasmir (2016) and Bijman et al. (2016) recognize community cooperatives as a type of social entrepreneurial venture. | Bijman et al. (2016). | infrastructures. |
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