Noor Raihani Zainol
Muhammad Khalilur Rahman

Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation in Eco-Tourism

Springer

Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation
in Eco-Tourism

Noor Raihani Zainol ·
Muhammad Khalilur Rahman

Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation in Eco-Tourism

Noor Raihani Zainol
Universiti Malaysia Kelantan
Kota Bharu, Kelantan, Malaysia

Muhammad Khalilur Rahman
Universiti Malaysia Kelantan
Kota Bharu, Kelantan, Malaysia

Chapter 6
Business Models for Social Entrepreneurship in Tourism

Nurul Hafizah Mohd Yasin and Nur Farihin Abd Hadi Khan

Abstract Tourism in Malaysia has grown significantly. Malaysia recorded a total of 26 million tourists in 2019, ranking 22nd in the world in absolute terms. Malaysia is not only known as one of the countries with an equatorial climate which is a hot and humid climate throughout the year but is also popular for its unique nature. In Malaysia, various attractive places have their uniqueness such as Redang Island, Perhentian Island, Mount Kinabalu, Tioman Island, Langkawi Island, Poring Hot Spring, and many more that are an attraction to tourists. Most tourists from foreign countries choose Malaysia as a tourism destination for the uniqueness and beauty of nature in Malaysia. Not only that, but they are also attracted to the diversity of cultures and traditions such as customs, dance, food, and others that exist in Malaysia. This is not the case, every race in Malaysia has its dance, traditional food, and customs. For example, the Kadazan Dusun has its traditional food such as Bosou, Tuhau, and others that cannot be found anywhere except in Sabah, Malaysia. The traditional dance of this race is the Sumazau Dance. Not only that, there are many more unique cultures and traditions, not including other races in Malaysia such as the Malays, Indians, Chinese, Bidayuh, Iban, Murut and many more. Malaysia is also quite famous for its harmony. Malaysia is known for its harmony because Malaysians can live together in harmony in one country despite different races, religions and ethnicities. This is what makes Malaysia unique compared to other countries. With all these advantages, Malaysia has become one of the most famous tourist countries in the world. Due to this, the tourism industry in Malaysia is growing rapidly in a short period. The development of the tourism industry has benefited not only travelers but also the communities to which tourists travel and the organizations that directly and indirectly serve those visitors. Therefore, this chapter will discuss social entrepreneurship in tourism as a means of getting involved in the industry. This chapter also discusses a few observations on how social entrepreneurship in tourism is carried out.

6.1 How Social Entrepreneurship Influencing Business in Tourism

There are several ways to understand how social entrepreneurship influences business in tourism. This chapter will concentrate on four main characteristics that can influence business in tourism: tourism entrepreneurs, sustainability, social intrapreneurs, and destination development. These topics are essential as they are hot topics in the literature and will be influenced by the concept of social entrepreneurs. The purpose of this topic is to examine how bringing the concepts of social entrepreneurship to various fields influences how people think about these issues. Finally, this should make it easier to identify prospective future research fields and broaden interest in social entrepreneurship throughout the tourist research community as a whole.

6.2 Tourism Entrepreneurs

First, it is important to identify the key player in the tourism industry to influence business in social entrepreneurship. In the tourism industry, there are few examples of key players or entrepreneurs, which are readily identified. Different sorts of entrepreneurs are a prominent area of interest among tourism entrepreneurs and small business experts. For example, the founders of technology-related start-ups that develop swiftly have characterized growth-oriented entrepreneurs in tourism, as well as entrepreneurs who focus on crafts or the development of the culture in certain communities. A seasoned hotelier who develops a new hotel management group to take advantage of a specific market opportunity is an example of this type of entrepreneur. These sorts of entrepreneurs can be recognized in the social enterprise, even though they were developed to explain entrepreneurship for "for-profit" or "non-profit" purposes. These types of classifications lay the groundwork for more detailed social entrepreneurs, which will be examined later in the chapter. The categorization of tourism entrepreneurs, according to Koh and Hatten (Rankhumise and Masilo 2002; 2016), is dependent on the approach utilized. It is divided into original, innovative, and imitative tourist entrepreneurs using a product differentiation technique. They identify lifestyle, social, marginal, closet, serial, and nascent tourism entrepreneurs using a behavioral method. The behavioral approach has received increased attention in the tourist literature, and as previously said, particular attention has been paid to lifestyle entrepreneurs. As a result, tourism entrepreneur researchers must broaden our understanding of who these people are in the tourism industry player. As a novel addition to the typology, it is evident that the concept of social entrepreneurs fits well into this subgroup of studies on tourist entrepreneurs in influencing social entrepreneurship business. Social entrepreneurs are now included in the latest lists of entrepreneurial types, according to Koh and Hatten (2002). As a

result, it is now widely acknowledged that such entrepreneurs exist in the tourism industry, and the concept has gained widespread acceptance. As a result, the rapidly increasing interest in and research on social entrepreneurs has a distinct place.

6.3 Sustainability

After we identified the key player that can influence the business in tourism, we then focus on sustainability in tourism social entrepreneurship. According to WCED (1987) sustainable development can be defined as "development, which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". According to some academics, such as Young and Tilley (2006), entrepreneurs that focus on both the social and environmental aspects of their firm are more likely to be sustainable. This offers an alternative perspective to the research's exclusive social (Boluk 2011) or socio-environmental (Boluk and Mottiar 2014) lenses. The tourism industry operations have resulted in a mass of unsustainable consequences that have been heavily condemned. The doubts that have been raised pose a threat to the application of sustainable tourism. The most focus has been paid to the environmental component of sustainability (Lu and Nepal 2009). Some businesses that care about the environment have begun to change their business practices to limit (and report) their cumulative impacts. Tourism businesses, on the other hand, have been chastised for adopting just those sustainability initiatives that will increase earnings, offer public relations possibilities, or meet regulatory criteria (Sheldon and Parks 2011).

6.4 Social Intrapreneurs

Social intrapreneurs are employees who establish or motivate their companies to provide social value through innovation. Intrapreneurs build new enterprises within current firms, taking advantage of new chances to generate revenue (Pinchot 1985). Individuals are motivated to bring about change in the workplace, regardless of its size, by introducing new products or services (Miller 1983). Teltumbde (2006) recognizes the characteristics of intrapreneurs who contribute to organizational innovation in small and medium-sized businesses. Only a little amount of research has been done on intrapreneurship in the service industries, notably tourism. Sundbo (1997), on the other hand, investigated how organizations may manage and structure the innovation process in service enterprises. Sundbo (1997) proposed four stages for internal innovation organization:

- Idea generation
- Transformation into an innovation project
- Development

- Implementation of the innovation as a commercial product.

Supporting intrapreneurship in the tourism business presents several good opportunities and constraints. First, it is critical that employees in the tourism industry feel valued at work; motivated to examine their intrapreneurial capability in order to boost their productivity. Second, in order to stimulate ideation, an adequate support system is important in establishing tourism businesses to have an open and effective communication system.

6.5   Destination

Destinations have a wide variety of stakeholders. It is possible that the objectives of a social entrepreneur could have a negative impact for a destination. For example, a decision to open homestay could result in some local opposition. In such circumstances, the social entrepreneur's goals may collide with the ambitions of the destination management organization, resulting in stress and the need for cautious negotiation and cooperation to reach an agreement. The impact of a social entrepreneur on a tourism location or local area is undeniable. The nature and scope of this impact can vary greatly, but all stakeholders in the destination should be aware that this sort of entrepreneur is on the rise. Destinations have institutional and informal organizations that help plan, steer, and coordinate their development. Local businesses are a significant element of these groups, but they are the only ones. Tourism destinations will be impacted by social entrepreneurs, whether as part of their mission or as a side effect, and these influences may be negative or beneficial. As mentioned previously in the general literature on social entrepreneurship, the key person may already be active in a destination, but they have not been labeled as a social entrepreneur, but rather as a community leader, ambassador, or volunteer. As a result, social entrepreneurs are not always welcome addition to a destination; they have simply not been identified as such. As a result, social entrepreneurs present potential and problems for existing destination management organizations, and they must be included in their institutional and policy frameworks. Finally, the authors discussed the importance of social entrepreneurship in tourism, namely in terms of entrepreneurship, sustainability, social intrapreneurship, and destination development. Moving forward, tourism researchers have a lot of room to improve their current knowledge base and, in particular, to look into issues that are important from a tourist standpoint. The chapter asked how important it was to understand social entrepreneurs for the industry, stakeholders, and destination, and the importance is obvious from a variety of perspectives, as discussed above to influence the success of the business. Figure 6.1 shows how social entrepreneurs are relevant to a wide range of themes in the literature, preventing the formation of research silos in which social entrepreneurship experts seek out their vein of study. The convergence of common ground and interests depicted in Fig. 6.1 should help to advance social entrepreneur

Fig. 6.1 Tourism social entrepreneurs. *Source* Adapted from Mottiar and Boluk (2017)

research, thought, and understanding of the social entrepreneurship of the tourism sector as a whole.

6.6 Approaches to Eco-Tourism Effectiveness Using Social Business Models

According to Wood (2008), eco-tourism is an area where social entrepreneurs can work together. Eco-tourism social businesses are familiar with community-based organisations. The presence of local communities in natural resources is critical when building and administering an eco-tourism region. This necessitates that ecotourism initiatives benefit the local community (Asadi & Kohan 2011). The key player of eco-tourism referred to as ecopreneurs, which is individuals, who operate economically viable business while maintaining the core values that inspired them to create their business (Dixon and Clifford 2007). There has been little research on eco-tourism entrepreneurship in practice, but Boluk and Mottiar (2014) found a link between the pro-social and pro-environmental goals of many of their South African and Irish studies. The authors emphasized an environmental necessity that influenced their social focus and, as a result, their lifestyle choices. Quality of life, appreciation of the outdoors, and related activities all contributed to a desire to live in rural areas. Rural living also provided an opportunity for the informants to make a direct contribution to their community, which was of great importance to them. There are several approaches to eco-tourism effectiveness using social business models. The first is leveraging the supply chain. One of the most important approaches for optimizing tourism's economic and social benefits is to ensure that the benefits stay in the community. By sourcing products from the local community, "economic leakage" is reduced. A strong emphasis is placed on obtaining products from within the community.

This emphasis on local sourcing may also have broader cultural/heritage implications. For example, Malaysia's best eco-tourism experiences are found in places like Taman Negara, Endau Rompin, parts of Langkawi, and Sarawak and Sabah on the island of Borneo. The incorporation of local groups including tourist guides ensures money stays in the community. Second, is an eco-tourism campaign, incorporating conservation agencies and the government to run a tourism campaign with the goal of raising awareness of conservation activities, respecting local culture, and improving the lives of local people. The purpose of the campaign is to involve in tourism activity, particularly travelers. Many tourism areas experience over-exploitation and cultural shifts as a result of this tendency. Local communities will become more conscious as a result of the campaign that they are not simply an object of tourism, but also a subject of tourism, with the right to a better life and responsibilities in managing and protecting their places. The third is to conduct a nature-learning program for eco-tourism effectiveness program. This approach can be implemented within ecotourism areas in which visitors are invited to interact with nature and see the biodiversity. All activities are tightly regulated to ensure that they do not hurt the environment. Tourists are only allowed to take photographs and are not permitted to damage the plants, litter, or feed the animals, to name a few examples of control. Tourists will also learn that if nature is not preserved, some animal and plant species will become extinct, the earth's temperature will rise, and climate change will worsen.

6.7 Funding Social Entrepreneurship: For-Profit and Public Government

A social entrepreneur is a person who creates social value by combining or bringing together resources in a new or different way to address social needs, or by forming new organizations to promote and encourage social change. While social entrepreneurship is not a new phenomenon, it has seen tremendous development in years, with the general public increasingly recognizing it as an essential and unique aspect of the country's social, economic, and political environment. It also provides opportunities for multinational corporate executives, to gain information and interact with others in the corporation best interests in order to produce social value for those in need or the underprivileged (Abu Saifan 2012; Dees 1998; Seelos and Mair 2005). In Malaysia, there are around 20,000 social companies as reported by *The Star* Online (2020), including those run on a volunteer basis, with approximately 64% centered in the Klang Valley. Starting a new social business necessitates locating funding sources that are primarily concerned with social rather than commercial value creation. Thus, access to funding has been given special consideration by the financial services sector, such as business financing, invoice trading, balance sheet consumer lending, and crowdfunding.

Activities may include meetings between companies and financial institutions, as well as expanded exposure to bank lenders and venture funders where the

project leaders may present their proposals to investors (Mirvis and Googins 2018). Besides, social entrepreneurs play a significant role in the funding of social initiatives. There are cases where social entrepreneurship operational funds have been depleted, thus social entrepreneurs are looking for venture capital to support their operations (Braga & Ferreira 2014; Boschee 1995). Fortunately, a new trend toward social venture capital investment has revolutionized social entrepreneurship. For instance, there are venture capital firms that give financial resources, advice, and inter-organizational linkages to innovative social initiatives. The recent trend of venture capital investment in social enterprises has given rise to a new business model for social entrepreneurs, in which the entrepreneur can swap operational control of the firm for financial assistance. Meanwhile, several public organizations also offer business advice to social entrepreneurs; yet, monetary resources are required to realize social entrepreneurs' ambitious social ideas. Governments at all levels are required to offer social entrepreneurs the most assistance possible as they bring resources and leadership to communities that require their services to address some of their most urgent issues (Zainal Abidin and John Kaka 2014). In Malaysia for instance, the Short-Term Economic Recovery Plan (PENJANA) may provide a matching grant to social enterprises that can crowd-source contributions and donations to undertake their social projects. The matching grants can help social entrepreneurs to grow their operations and employ additional young people and graduates. More to the points, the government may also encourage both public and private sector Investments in social companies (as the third sector) with performance or outcome-based returns.

6.8   Crowdfunding for Eco-Tourism Social Project

Crowdfunding has been widely accepted as a campaign, which opens opportunities for the public to provide financial assistance to a certain project in any market. It is an innovative approach for funding a range of new establishments, allowing for-profit, cultural, and social project entrepreneurs to request investment from a large number of people in exchange for future products or stock (Mollick 2014). It is in addition to traditional financing sources such as banks, business angels, and venture capital organizations, which Is a new means to obtain money online (Beier and Wagner 2014). There is evidence that donations from socially motivated individuals could help tourism sectors boost their income. As such, the emergence of incubators and other support groups for tourism-related projects is a significant trend (Day and Mody 2016). Schwienbacher and Larralde (2010) suggest that there are two parts to the crowdsourcing definition, (i) Refers to the objective of the crowdfunding effort, and (ii) refers to the goal of the investors. Understanding the behavior of founders and funders when deciding to run a crowdsourcing campaign may help global and local establishments to develop and implement appropriate marketing strategies for their target projects. The collected funds may be treated as a loan with the expectation of a return on investment, or the funders are compensated for their support of a project or maybe treated like investors in crowdsourcing campaigns, with ownership holdings

or other benefits in exchange for their contributions (Mollick 2014). In the case of ecotourism social projects, it is believed that the attempt to develop projects should involve local communities so that they can become the subject of development, and not merely passive objects (Situmorang and Mirzanti 2012). As such, crowdfunding has been used to generate public interest in projects, especially one that is still in the early phases of development. This is especially true in businesses where programs aim to develop complementary product ecosystems (Mollick 2014).

A possible reason for doing crowdfunding is that funding is a major issue for social entrepreneurs since the funding sources accessible to regular for-profit enterprises are not the same as those available to social entrepreneurs (Day and Mody 2016). For instance, in many locations in Southeast Asia, conservation efforts are chronically underfunded, particularly for neglected ecosystems like mangrove forests (Friess 2017). Because government backing and worldwide research programs have failed to provide the needed resources to conduct the projects, researchers, therefore, have turned to crowdfunding and characterized it as their necessary response to governmental negligence (Addison and Stevens 2022). More to the point, crowdfunding for ecotourism social projects may strive to enhance environmental awareness, and appreciation for local culture, and improve the lives of residents (Situmorang and Mirzanti 2012). For instance, many ecotourism projects that are located in rural regions have limited or non-existent waste treatment services (Friess 2017).

Thus, financial assistance from crowdfunding could help in improving the services and ease the lives of local communities. At the same time, crowd-funding creators can utilize crowdsourcing to demonstrate demand for new projects, which can lead to financial assistance from more traditional sources (Mollick 2014). Starting with fundraising among the public could open up opportunities for financial assistance from conventional financial establishments. Instead of fighting for the attention, affection, and interest of a small group of specialists, by conducting crowdfunding, the researchers may compete for the attention, affection, and interest of a large, geographically dispersed audience, encouraging different assessments of creators' work and ideas (Addison and Stevens 2022). Moreover, as most crowdfunding initiatives are heavily integrated into social media, thus they can draw a large number of people, allowing not only for the formation of public opinion but also for the conduct of dialogue with society (Dzhandzhugazova et al. 2017). The crowd-funding project puts money directly in the hands of researchers, bypassing the overheads that institutions deduct from typical grants (Addison and Stevens 2022). By making these initiatives more visible through online means, publics were able to connect with and support specific projects. It also exposes such efforts to the scrutiny of a broader audience, which may have opposing viewpoints (Addison and Stevens 2022).

Furthermore, the tourism industry has found a specific emphasis on the crowd-funding approach. Among the most effective crowd-funding projects are those focused on nature preservation, learning about the sights, physical travel, and other valuable activities that elicit strong emotions (Dzhandzhugazova et al. 2017). For example, to assist environmental preservation, the crowdfunding social project sponsored a tree-planting initiative (Situmorang and Mirzanti 2012). Besides, there is also a crowdsourcing adoption project for a specific bird species, by donating a certain

amount and getting an adoption certificate, soft toy, stickers, and bookmark in return (Addison and Stevens 2022). On the other hand, the recommended crowdfunding initiatives for community empowerment are related to community development, building schools and offering scholarships, collaborating with local communities, and educating people (Situmorang and Mirzanti 2012). Henceforth, the success of crowd-funding for ecotourism social projects is affected by various factors. First, it is seen that non-profits projects have a better track record when it comes to crowdfunding (Belleflamme et al. 2013). Perhaps due to the crowdfunding founders' capacity to navigate the interests of many parties (Addison and Stevens 2022), the project might accomplish a certain financial goal for a shorter period. At the same time, projects with a lower target, a higher trip rating, and more supporters would perform better in terms of funding (Li et al. 2016). A high number of supporters could be reached by broadcasting the projects through various social networking.

The public has become borderless in this rapidly changing digital environment. Since the public may get information from across borders over the internet, large networks are believed to be correlated with successful funding (Mollick 2014) and have become critical for founders to seize the market opportunity and secure their long-term project success. It was supported by Beier and Wagner (2014) that the usage of Twitter for tourist project crowdfunding campaigns has a substantial influence. Although not all founders might not link to their social networking accounts, social network size still predicts success. It is seen previously that the performance of tourist crowdfunding is influenced by social media (Li et al. 2016). To conclude, the objective of this chapter is to highlight and discuss the importance of crowd-funding as one of the financial assistances to ecotourism social projects. As a result of globalization, ecotourism-related companies are taking advantage of the chances to reach public interests, both locally and worldwide. Simultaneously, as technology advances and information become more readily available over social networking, the public's expectations have grown in importance and have been steadily growing. As a result of this trend, global ecotourism social project founders are having to reconsider their fund-raising techniques to crowdsourcing for better funding.

6.9 The Best Practices of Social Eco-Tourism Sectors

Eco-tourism provides more than just beautiful, unspoiled scenery; it also educates people on how to protect and care for the environment, as well as how to improve the welfare of local communities in the area. While individuals continuously learn about their human nature, they will indirectly realize their obligation to enhance people's lives and preserve the environment through social responsibility. In the tourism sector, the demand for tourists and businesses to be more ecologically and socially responsible is increasing. While both the boomer and millennial generations are the two main sources of consumer spending power, they are becoming more conscious of the impact of their trips to destinations and local communities (Sheldon and Daniele 2017).

In order to ensure that the social eco-tourism sectors must run efficiently, it is essential to set criteria for assessing the actions, that is establishing the best practices. It is crucial to ascertain the best way to accomplish things, as decided through trial and error, and proven to be the most sensible path of action. For academicians, figuring out the component values of social eco-tourism and how to use it to maximum effect and returns for the many parties involved might be a difficult task. This is due to changing consumer tastes, with more experienced visitors choosing less regimented group travel and more intimate encounters with people and places (Sheldon and Daniele 2017). As a result, the social eco-tourism project founder must develop skills in reacting to project breakdowns with revolutionary and financially viable solutions. Thus, the social eco-tourism best practices are believed to be connected to the definition of social entrepreneurship by Noruzi et al. (2010), which highlighted three general components that are responding to project failure, transformational innovation, and financial sustainability of the project.

The question is, how can the project founder mitigate the negative consequences while retaining the positive outcomes of eco-tourism projects for social benefits and human community development? If these concepts are grouped into a system, the major goals of social eco-tourism may be identified (Dzhandzhugazova et al. 2019). As a result, establishing global and national guidelines to govern social eco-tourism operations based on eco-tourism principles is critical for the effective growth of social eco-tourism projects, particularly in developing regions. As such, Cobbinah (2015) concluded that there are five broad principles of eco-tourism based on similar characteristics (Donohoe and Needham 2006; Hetzer 1965; Honey 2008; Page and Dowling 2002; The International Ecotourism Society 1990), which can be used as heuristic standards for social eco-tourism projects. The principles are: (1) environmental conservation, (2) cultural preservation, (3) community engagement, (4) economic rewards, and (5) vulnerable group empowerment (Cobbinah 2015). Hence, one of society initiatives is to solve specific issues related to eco-tourism projects while also informing and contributing to a broader range of system change explorations. Pollock (2015) has highlighted the importance of acknowledging the existing system's systemic and structural weaknesses, as well as for forward-thinking industry actors to conceive and co-create new ways.

To make it possible, the social eco-tourism project founder should collect statistics on eco-tourist visits, in order to better understand present levels of engagement and to serve as a starting point for future mitigation initiatives. If the number of visitors grows fast, new mitigation measures or rules may be required (Samia et al. 2017). At the same time, a dynamic decision-making process is enabled by monitoring the wildlife and local human populations. The processes for monitoring and evaluation must be organised, new methodologies and system of measurement must be developed, and their value, utility, and effectiveness must be appraised (Mair and Marti 2006; Taplin et al. 2014). The constant monitoring of facilities and a methodical approach to social eco-tourism project development would also aid in the resolution of a number of critical challenges, such as the establishment of integrated tourist destinations and environmental tourism for various tourist groups. Besides, the project founders should promote community-based tourism as the preferred social

eco-tourism option. Integrating local society with the planning and operation of a social ecotourism project provides more socially sustainable practices. For instance, there should be a social eco-tourism project where students and volunteers are trained to create skilled work in the community. As a result, any introduction of eco-tourism-related education is likely to be led by visionary intrapreneurs from higher education institutions, or innovative start-up laboratories and incubators that work beyond the official higher education bounds (Sheldon and Daniele 2017).

Therefore, through this effort, the project founders might achieve a positive outcome since it can assist the local community economically and, more crucially, it can create revenue for the organizations involved. It may also limit the probability of local people being overly reliant on eco-tourism projects for financial support (Armadita and Day 2017; Samia et al. 2017). Bringing all these together, it is suggested that social eco-tourism founders play the role of change agents in the eco-tourism sector. By following the key competencies suggested by Sherman (2011), the project founders should take action to tackle problems, dare to pursue a daring goal despite the doubts of others, have a mix of tenacity, zeal, and dedication to achieve goals, able to rise to the worst situation, seeing fresh ideas and thinking outside the box, envisioning different points of view than their own and lastly, connecting with others to form strong bonding. In conclusion, it is important to remember that the applied recommended strategy may be used not only to diagnose the condition of social ecotourism projects in selected areas but also to develop new strategies for marketing the most successful eco-tourism destinations (Kotler et al. 2015; Dzhandzhugazova et al. 2019). Hence, the recommended suggestions are not exhaustive and other discussions of best practices are always available.

References

Abu Saifan, S. (2012). Social entrepreneurship: Definition and boundaries. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 2(*2*), 22–27. https://doi.org/10.22215/timreview/523.

Addison, C., & Stevens, H. (2022). Crowdfunding conservation science: Tracing the participatory dynamics of native parrot genome sequencing. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 47(*3*), 568–596.

Armadita, F., & Day, J. (2017). A systematic review of common definitions and emerging themes in community based tourism. Paper presented at the 22nd Annual Graduate Education and Graduate Research Conference in Hospitality and Tourism, Houston.

Asadi, A., & Kohan, M. F. Z. (2011). The role of entrepreneurship on ecotourism development. In 2011 International Conference on Sociality and Economics Development, Singapore, (pp. 38–39).

Beier, M., & Wagner, K. (2014). Crowdfunding success of tourism projects-evidence from Switzerland. Available at SSRN 2520925.

Belleflamme, P., Lambert, T., & Schwienbacher, A. (2013). Individual crowdfunding practices. *Venture Capital*, 15(*4*), 313–333.

Boluk, K. (2011). Fair trade tourism South Africa: A pragmatic poverty reduction mechanism? *Tourism Planning and Development*, 8(*3*), 237–251.

Boluk, K., & Mottiar Z. (2014). Motivations of social entrepreneurs: Blurring the social contribution and profits dichotomy. *Journal of Social Enterprise*, 10(*1*), 53–68.

Boschee, J. (1995). Some nonprofits are not only thinking about the unthinkable, they're doing it—running a profit. In Across the Board, the Conference Board Magazine (Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 20–25).

Braga, P., & Ferreira, M. R. (2014). Motivations for social entrepreneurship—Evidences from Portugal. *TÉKHNE—Review of Applied Management Studies*, 12, 11–21.

Cobbinah, P. B. (2015). Contextualising the meaning of ecotourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 16, 179–189.

Day, J., & Mody, M. (2016). Social entreprenuership typologies and tourism: Conceptual frameworks. In P. J. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.), Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice. Springer Nature, Cham.

Dees, J. G. (1998). The meaning of social entrepreneurship. Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, Stanford.

Dixon, S. E. A., & Clifford, A. (2007). Ecopreneurship—A new approach to managing the triple bottom line. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20(*3*), 326–345.

Donohoe, H. M., & Needham, R. D. (2006). Ecotourism: The evolving contemporary definition. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 5(*3*), 192–210.

Dzhandzhugazova, E. A., Ilina, E. L., Latkin, A. N., Blinova, E. A., & Romanova, M. M. (2017). Crowdfunding as a tool for promotion and development of tourism-related innovation projects. *Journal of Environmental Management & Tourism*, 8(*4* (*20*)), 896–901.

Dzhandzhugazova, E. A., Lyudmila, B., Bardakhanova, T. B., Ponomareva, I. Y., & Blinova, E. A. (2019). Ecotourism development in Russia: Analysis of best regional practices. *Ekoloji*, 28(*107*), 411–415.

Friess, D. A. (2017). JG Watson, inundation classes, and their influence on paradigms in mangrove forest ecology. *Wetlands*, 37, 603–613.

Hetzer, N. D. (1965). Environment, tourism, culture. *Links*, 1(*3*), 1–3.

Honey, M. (2008). Setting standards: certification programmes for ecotourism and sustainable tourism. In Ecotourism and conservation in the Americas (pp. 234–261). Wallingford, UK: CABI.

Koh, K., & Hatten, T. (2002). The tourism entrepreneur: The overlooked player in tourism development studies. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 3, 21–48.

Kotler, P., Bowen, J., & Makens, J. (2015). Marketing for hospitality and tourism (6th ed.). Pearson, Boston, MA.

Li, K., Mei, J., & Li, K. (2016). A fund-constrained investment scheme for profit maximization in cloud computing. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 11(*6*), 893–907.

Lu, J., & Nepal, S. K. (2009). Sustainable tourism research: An analysis of papers published in the Journal of Sustainable Tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(*1*), 5–16.

Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(*3*), 1–57.

Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29(*7*), 770–791.

Mirvis, P., & Googins, B. (2018). Catalyzing social entrepreneurship in Africa: Roles for western universities, NGOs and corporations. *Africa Journal of Management*, 4(*1*), 57–83.

Mollick, E. (2014). The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study. *Journal of business venturing*, 29(*1*), 1–16.

Mottiar, A., & Boluk, K. (2017). Understanding how social entrepreneurs fit into the tourism discourse. In P. Sheldon & R. Danielle (Eds.), Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice. Springer. E-ISBN: 978-3-319-465180-0.

Noruzi, M. R., Westover, J. H., & Rahimi, G. R. (2010). An exploration of social entrepreneurship in the entrepreneurship era. *Asian Social Science*, 6(*6*), 3.

Page, S. J., & Dowling, R. K. (2002). *Themes in tourism*. Pearson Education Limited, Harlow, 26.

Pinchot, G. (1985). Intrapreneuring, why you don't have to leave the corporation to become an entrepreneur. New York: Harper & Row, publishers.

Pollock, J. L. (2015). Knowledge and justification. Princeton University Press.

Rankhumise, E. M., & Masilo, K. H. (2016). The effectiveness of small and medium enterprises: Perspective from the small enterprise: A comparative study between South Africa and China. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 9(*6*), 166–173.

Samia, J., Temme, A., Bregt, A., Wallinga, J., Guzzetti, F., Ardizzone, F., & Rossi, M. (2017). Characterization and quantification of path dependency in landslide susceptibility. *Geomorphology*, 292, 16–24.

Schwienbacher, A., & Larralde, B. (2010). Crowdfunding of small entrepreneurial ventures. Handbook of entrepreneurial finance. Oxford University Press, Forthcoming.

Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business horizons*, 48(*3*), 241–246.

Sheldon, P. J., & Daniele, R. (2017). Social entrepreneurship and tourism. Springer, Cham.

Sheldon, P. J., & Park, S. Y. (2011). An exploratory study of corporate social responsibility in the US travel industry. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(*4*), 392–407.

Sherman, S. (2011, October 31). Teaching the key skills of successful social entrepreneurs. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.

Situmorang, D. B. M., & Mirzanti, I. R. (2012). Social entrepreneurship to develop ecotourism. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 4, 398–405.

Sundbo, J. (1997). Management of innovation in services. *The Service Industries Journal*, 17(*3*), 432–455.

Taplin, J., Dredge, D., & Scherrer, P. (2014). Monitoring and evaluating volunteer tourism: A review and analytical framework. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(*6*), 874–897.

Teltumbde, A. (2006). Entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs in corporations. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers*, 31, 129–132. Retrieved on February 13, 2007 from https://www.EBSCOhost database.

The International Ecotourism Society (TIES). (1990). What is ecotourism? Retrieved on February 6, 2008 from http://www.ecotourism.org.

The star online (2020). Boost for social enterprise. Available at https://www.thestar.com.my/opinion/letters/2020/06/24/boost-for-social-enterprises.

WCED, S. W. S. (1987). World commission on environment and development. *Our Common Future*, 17(*1*), 1–91.

Wood, M. E. (2008). Digging deeper-sustainable solutions to tourism and development. Publication for TravelMoles's VISION on Sustainable Tourism, EpplerWood International. Retrieved on February 5, 2022 from http://www.eplerwood.com/pdf/Vision-Social-.

Young, W., & Tilley, F. (2006). Can businesses move beyond efficiency? The shift toward effectiveness and equity in the corporate sustainability debate. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 15, 402–415.

Zainal Abidin, F., & John Kaka, E. (2014). Issues surrounding government support for social entrepreneurship as a change agent. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(*9*), 191–201.