

DETERMINANTS OF CONSUMERS' PERCEPTION TOWARDS PIRATED PRODUCTS; THE CASE OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS AND MARKETERS IN MUSIC INDUSTRY

Ayodotun, Ibidunni (Corresponding Author)¹

Taiye, Borishade²

Joy, Dirisu³

Ph.D Olaleke, Ogunnaike⁴

Abstract

Music is generally viewed as a platform for preaching and imparting social values. As a result of this, entrepreneurs in music industry seem to have succeeded in branding themselves as social entrepreneurs. They engage business models as well as profit-making strategies in championing and/or promoting societal values. Unfortunately, piracy has been a major clog in their business wheels. The study explored the possible determinants of consumer attitude toward pirated products in music industry. Interviews were conducted to explore these possible determinants and two of these determinants were subjected to hypothetical tests. The study revealed that price of the product and the state of the economy has significant effects on consumer attitude towards pirated products. Based on the findings, it was recommended that government should provide enabling environment for the social entrepreneurs in music industry.

Keywords: Piracy, consumer attitude, social entrepreneurship, marketing, Music industry

JEL Classification: M3

1. Introduction

In recent time, the Nigerian economy has been affected by proliferation of several products in which the menace of substandard products has been a threat to the growth of local industries. The over dependence on importation of products has made standardized products to be compromised, despite the control measures put in place by government through establishment of standard organization of Nigeria (SON). This challenge cuts across all sectors from production to service sectors and also the entertainment industry where intellectual capital is to be honored has become a firsthand victim of piracy and copyright compromise. According to Commission of the European Communities, 1998 at present, counterfeiting and piracy have become a widespread phenomenon with a global impact though it started to grow a great extent since the early 1980s, the development of piracy is affecting the proper carrying out of the market and also nations, societies and individuals are exaggerated by the piracy. It has an indirect consequence not only at the market, economy and social level of a country but also in terms of consumer protection. According to Akinbola, Ogunnaike and Tijani, (2013) entrepreneurial development is not in view if the market hostile to the entrepreneurs. In other word, marketing performance defines the sustainability of any business entity ((Akinbola, Ogunnaike and Ojo, 2014).

Though, sometimes piracy is called a 'victimless crime' (IFPI, 2002). The economic losses due to the piracy is too much. Governments lose hundreds of millions of tax revenues, economies are deprived of new investments, consumers get less diversity product and so on. Though, the government has rigorously enforced several piracy laws. However piracy is a big

¹ Assistant Lecturer, Department Of Business Management, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria, ayodotun.ibidunni@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

² Assistant Lecturer, Department Of Business Management, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria, taiye.borishade@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

³ Assistant Lecturer, Department Of Business Management, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria, joy.dirisu@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

⁴ Senior Lecturer, Department Of Business Management, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria, olaleke.ogunnaike@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

problem in Africa and the encouraging patronage of these pirated products worsen the case. This hydra-headed monster has eaten deep into the fabrics of broad range of industries such as textiles, sporting goods, toys, consumer goods, pharmaceuticals, music, and software, etc. The enormous potentiality of the Internet and the development of the communication technology also make the distribution of pirated product (such as, software, music, movie, etc.) much easier (Altinkemer and Guan, 2003).

Consumer behaviour is influenced by consumer perception. Thus, an understanding of consumer behaviour is essential in this study. Consumer behaviour is the study of how people buy, what they buy and when they buy. It blends elements from psychology sociology, anthropology and economics. (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2006), It attempts to understand the buyer decision making process both individually and in groups.

This study explored the determinants of consumers' perception towards pirated products. The secondary objectives include;

- (1) To identify if pricing has significant effect on consumers' perception towards piracy.
- (2) To find out the extent to which the state of the economy has significant effect on consumer's perception towards piracy.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Conceptual Framework

• Definition Of Perception

Perception is a psychological process by which organisms interpret and organize sensations to produce a meaningful experience of the world. Sensation usually refers to the immediate, relatively unprocessed result of stimulation of sensory receptors in the eyes, ears, nose, tongue, or skin. In general perception is gathering information using our senses, which are seeing ,hearing , touching ,tasting, smelling and sensing. Through our senses we can perceive things, events or relations. But as there are so many different stimuli only a small portion of them are noticed and only a smaller portion can reach our attention. Perception on the other hand, better describes one's ultimate experience of the world and typically involves further processing of sensory input. In practice, sensation and perception are virtually impossible to separate, because they are part of one continuous process.

• Overview Of Piracy In Music Industry

Piracy is a severe problem worldwide and the common perception is that it is increasing. However, it is almost impossible to find accurate statistics to substantiate these perceptions because of the clandestine nature of the activity. Consumers who know and still purchase counterfeits may have favorable or positive attitude towards counterfeited goods. They buy counterfeit products just to own certain goods. By owning such products, it makes them belong to a certain social status, because they are unable or unwilling to pay the price for genuine items (Wee et al, 1995). Another perception among consumers who buy pirated goods is that counterfeiting is a soft crime and socially acceptable in 'sharing' principles of Asian region (Cordell et al., 1996).

The most popular pirated goods are entertainment products. This would include Peddlers selling pirated copies of video CDs (VCDs) and CDs and they have been the most targeted in police raids since piracy is intellectual property rights (IPR) infringement and this is a legal issue, as the musicians have also embarked on peaceful rallies to solve this problem. Music and video recordings has been rated the highest pirated products sold. Musicians complain that they spend so much money to do the recording of their songs and even to get beats for song and in return get little or nothing. Piracy of musical CD is so bad that about 25 songs of a musician can be compiled in one CD and sold at a very cheap rate, since consumers are price sensitive they go for the pirated copy and in most cases consumers are aware that they are purchasing pirated musical CD as piracy doesn't come with the intent of deceiving as in the case of counterfeiting.

Consumers will seek the highest value of each market offering. They may value the product in terms of the benefits they gain by using the product relative to the cost of acquiring it. Usually, customers will set the best value which combines some target combinations of price and quality (Cordell, 1991). Customers who are willing to be buyers of counterfeited products of piracy are therefore willing to tolerate the quality issues. These customers may not expect a high quality product of the counterfeit version compared to the original. Therefore, consumers who think themselves as wise shoppers will select a counterfeit product over a genuine product when there is a price advantage (Bloch et al., 1993).

Ang et al (2001) describe this matter as value consciousness. Value consciousness is defined as a concern for paying the lower prices, subject to some quality constraints (Lichtenstein et al., 1990). The significant higher price differential between pirated version and originals seems to be a good reason why consumers prefer to buy pirated products. The pirated products can cost as little as N50 to N100 per copy for a CD or VCD compared to the originals price N300 to N350. Ang et al (2001) suggest that the intention to buy pirated products is also driven by social influence. Peer pressure is one of the determinants of intention to buy counterfeit. The study done by Lin et al (1999), indicates that both executives and colleagues play an important role in influencing information system professionals to commit this crime. According to the study, higher level executives and colleagues' opinions and practices affect the behavior of information system professionals in terms of using the counterfeited version of software.

- *Social Entrepreneurship*

Social entrepreneurship is the practice of entrepreneurship from a social welfare perspective. In an attempt to define the boundaries of social entrepreneurship, some authors have suggested that social entrepreneurship is concerned with not-for profit activities, for example, Boschee (1998). However, Mair and Marti (2005) have argued that social entrepreneurship can take the form of not-for-profit as well as for profit business activities depending on the organization's "relative priority given to social wealth creation versus economic wealth creation". In the opinion of Abu-Saifan (2012) the boundaries that defines the operational scope of social entrepreneurs and social enterprises are divided into two: "Non-profit with earned income strategies" and "For-profit with mission-driven strategies". Under the former scenario, social entrepreneurs are at liberty to earn incomes and profits from their businesses, but such profits must be re-invested to further promote social value. The second scenario explains the financial independence of the social enterprise from the social entrepreneur, as such the social entrepreneur can enjoy from personal financial gains. To further distinguish social entrepreneurs, Dess (1998) observed that social entrepreneurs are basically change agents with specific characteristics such as:

- Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value),
- Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission,
- Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning,
- Acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand, and
- Exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created

Defining the concept of social entrepreneurship has taken different forms according to distinct perspectives of authors. Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum and Shulman (2009) suggested that it is a value adding activity that engages new or existing organizations in enhancing social wealth. In achieving this, Martin and Osberg (2007) suggest that the social entrepreneur identifies large scale transformational opportunities and projects that impact on a segmented part of or the society at large. In differentiating between the entrepreneur and social entrepreneur, they comment that "Unlike the entrepreneurial value proposition that assumes a market that can pay for the innovation, and may even provide substantial upside for investors, the social entrepreneur's value proposition targets an underserved, neglected, or highly

disadvantaged population that lacks the financial means or political clout to achieve the transformative benefit on its own”. The following table reveals the diverse dimensionality of thoughts and opinions of scholars about the concept of social entrepreneurship

Table 1. Definitions of Social Entrepreneurship

Source	Definition
Leadbeater (1997)	The use of entrepreneurial behavior for social ends rather than for profit objectives, or alternatively, that the profits generated from market activities are used for the benefit of a specific disadvantaged group.
Thake and Zadek (1997)	Social entrepreneurs are driven by a desire for social justice. They seek a direct link between their actions and an improvement in the quality of life for the people with whom they work and those that they seek to serve. They aim to produce solutions which are sustainable financially, organizationally, socially and environmentally.
Dees (1998)	Play the role of change agents in the social sector, by: 1) Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value), 2) Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission, 3) Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning, 4) Acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand, and 5) Exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created.
Reis (1999)	Social entrepreneurs create social value through innovation and leveraging financial resources...for social, economic and community development.
Fowler (2000)	Social Entrepreneurship is the creation of viable socio-economic structures, relations, institutions, organizations and practices that yield and sustain social benefits.
Brinkerhoff (2001)	Individuals constantly looking for new ways to serve their constituencies and add value to existing services
Mort et al. (2002)	A multidimensional construct involving the expression of entrepreneurially virtuous behavior to achieve the social mission...the ability to recognize social value creating opportunities and key decision-making characteristics of innovation, proactiveness and risktaking
Drayton (2002)	A major change agent, one whose core values center on identifying, addressing and solving societal problems.
Alford et al. (2004)	Creates innovative solutions to immediate social problems and mobilizes the ideas, capacities, resources and social arrangements required for social transformations
Harding (2004)	Entrepreneurs motivated by social objectives to instigate some form of new activity or venture.
Shaw (2004)	The work of community, voluntary and public organizations as well as private firms working for social rather than only profit objectives.
Said School (2005)	A professional, innovative and sustainable approach to systematic change that resolves social market failures and grasps Opportunities

Fuqua School (2005)	The art of simultaneously pursuing both a financial and a social return on investment (the “double” bottom line)
Schwab Foundation (2005)	Applying practical, innovative and sustainable approaches to benefit society in general, with an emphasis on those who are marginalized and poor.
NYU Stern (2005)	The process of using entrepreneurial and business skills to create innovative approaches to social problems. “These non-profit and for profit ventures pursue the double bottom line of social impact and financial self-sustainability or profitability.”
MacMillan (2005)	Process whereby the creation of new business enterprise leads to social wealth enhancement so that both society and the entrepreneur benefit.
Tan et al. (2005)	Making profits by innovation in the face of risk with the involvement of a segment of society and where all or part of the benefits accrue to that same segment of society.
Mair and Marti (2006a)	...a process of creating value by combining resources in new ways...intended primarily to explore and exploit opportunities to create social value by stimulating social change or meeting social needs.
Peredo and McLean (2006)	Social entrepreneurship is exercised where some person or group...aim(s) at creating social value...shows a capacity to recognize and take advantage of opportunities...employ innovation...accept an above average degree of risk...and are unusually resourceful... in pursuing their social venture.
Martin and Osberg (2007)	Social entrepreneurship is the: 1) identification a stable yet unjust equilibrium which the excludes, marginalizes or causes suffering to a group which lacks the means to transform the equilibrium; 2) identification of an opportunity and developing a new social value proposition to challenge the equilibrium, and 3) forging a new, stable equilibrium to alleviate the suffering of the targeted group through imitation and creation of a stable ecosystem around the new equilibrium to ensure a better future for the group and society

Source: Zahra et al (2009), A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges

According to Abu-Saifan (2012) a social entrepreneur is identified by the extent to which he or she is a mission leader, visionary, highly accountable, socially alert, serve as a change agent, emotionally charged, an opinion leader, manager, and a social value creator.

2.2 Typology of Social Entrepreneurship

Zahra et al (2009) proposed three types of social entrepreneurship given the variations in purposes, types and strategies that form the basis of social entrepreneurial ventures. These include: Social Bricoleurs, Social Constructionists and Social Engineers.

Social Bricoleurs are those who utilize resources available with them at a point in time to execute locally identified opportunities. The conceptualization of this idea is drawn from perceptions and explanations of Weick’s (1993) and Baker and Nelson’s (2005) of bricolage. Though social bricoleurs may be perceived as limited in scope, their social relevance cannot be overlooked as they create value to meet their local environments around their scope of operation. Social bricoleurs are distinctively identified with creating new things from nothing, their refusal to be limited by environmental constraints and skillfully improvising best ways out of constraint situations (Domenico, Haugh and Tracy, 2010).

Social Constructionists “build, launch and operate ventures which tackle those social needs that are inadequately addressed by existing institutions, businesses, NGOs and government agencies” (Zahra et al, 2009). These type of social entrepreneurs seek to exploit opportunities with an objective of creating social wealth. Owen (1995) argued that social constructionists emphasize aspects of humanity in relation to their cultural and social welfare. This view is also explained in Andrew’s (2012) view of the subjective and objective views of social constructionism.

Social Engineers are known for identifying and providing revolutionary solutions social problems which existing institutions cannot provide solutions to. Though some authors have identified a faulty use of social engineering in society (for example, Dimensional Research, 2011), others strongly affirm that social engineers improve radical means of creative and innovative thinking that enhance social values (Hadnagy, 2011).

2.3 Theoretical Base of the Study

• *Theory Of Planned Behaviour*

According to the Theory Of Planned Behaviour (TpB) (Ajzen,1991), human actions are guided by three considerations :beliefs regarding likely outcomes of a behaviour and evaluations of those outcomes (behavioural beliefs), beliefs about the normative expectations of others and the motivation to comply with these expectations (normative beliefs), and beliefs about the presence of factors that may impede performance of a behaviour and the perceived power of these factors (control beliefs). In their respective aggregates, behavioural beliefs produce favorable or unfavorable attitudes towards the behaviour ,normative beliefs cause perceived social pressure or social norms, and control beliefs causes perceived behavioural control. In combination ,attitude towards behaviours ,subjective norms ,and perceptions of behavioural control leads to the formation of behavioural intention .Consequently, individual intention to perform the behaviour in question increase with how favorable the attitude and subjective norm are, as well as the intention of the individual to perform the behaviour in question .Finally, given a sufficient degree of control over the behaviour, people are expected to fulfill their intentions when the opportunity to do arises. From this we can deduce that consumer’s perception is influenced by planned behaviour.

2.4 Empirical Framework

According to Adewole, (2011), piracy, counterfeit, imitation and fake products are all illegal operations done at the lowest cost and offered to consumers at the cheapest price. Their study was to research which variable plays the most important factor in the minds of most consumers. Although most sources say that there is no ending to the word “piracy”, understanding and being aware of why, how, where and when consumers purchase pirated goods will help reduce this menace. Pricing being one of the most essential variable, most producers and creators of original products must come to understand this factor and strive to make original goods affordable .This would be a crucial step in driving consumers away from pirated goods.

According to Jupiter piracy research (2009) on action to stop counterfeiting, it was discovered that piracy impact virtually every product category .The days when only luxury goods were counterfeited, or when unauthorized music CDs and movies DVDs were sold only street corners are long past, Today counterfeiters are producing fake foods and beverages, pharmaceuticals, electronics ,auto parts and every household products. Also, copyright pirates have created multi-million networks to produce, transport and sell their unauthorized copies of music, video and software. Millions of fake products are being produced and shipped around the world to developing and developed countries at an alarming rate. Millions of consumers are now at risk from unsafe and ineffective products, and governments, businesses

and society are robbed of hundreds of billions in tax revenues, business income and jobs. Counterfeiting and piracy has become a global epidemic, leading to a significant drain on businesses and the global economy, jeopardizing investments in creativity and innovation, undermining recognized brands and creating consumer health and safety risks. The drain on the global economy is significant and the longer term implication of the continuing growth in this illicit trade is enormous.

Ramayah and Aafaqi, (2004) in their study explained that there are some specific influences on the purchase of fake copyrights like influences of normative susceptibility, integrity, gender and personal income attitude towards buying of pirated CDs.

3. Research Method

The survey and exploratory research design were employed. The survey research design is considered suitable for the study because it does not attempt to manipulate or control some variables of the research; however it addresses the relationship that exists between these variables as they are. The study adopted purposive sampling technique. The study population includes all film producers, directors and distributors of musical CDs in Lagos, Nigeria. 100 copies of questionnaire were distributed out of which 77 copies of the completed questionnaire were found useable.

The questionnaire comprises of two (2) sections. The first section addresses personal characteristics of respondents while the other section addresses those questions drawn from the statement of research problem and research questions in other to investigate the different opinion and viewpoint of the respondents in relevance to the study.

In addition, series of interview were conducted among the players in music industry. The researchers sought the opinions of the respondents as regards the determinants of consumer perception toward pirated products.

4. Test of Hypotheses and Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis 1:

H₀: pricing does not have effect on consumer's perception towards piracy.

H₁: pricing has effect on consumer's perception towards piracy.

Table 2. Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.011(a)	.000	-.013	1.616

a Predictors: (Constant), price plays a vital role in the purchase of musical CDs.

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.025	1	.025	.010	.922(a)
	Residual	195.975	75	2.613		
	Total	196.000	76			

a Predictors: (Constant), price plays a vital role in the purchase of musical CDs.

b Dependent Variable: i do not mind purchasing pirated musical CDs.

Interpretation of results

The results from the tables above revealed that the extent to which the variance in pricing can be explained by consumers perception towards piracy is 0.0% i.e. (R square = .000) at .922significance level.

Decision

The significance level below 0.05 implies a statistical confidence of above 95%. This implies that pricing has a significant effect on consumer’s perception towards piracy. Thus, the decision would be to accept the null hypothesis (H₀), and reject the alternative hypothesis (H₁).

Hypothesis 2:

H₀: the state of the economy does not have significant effect on consumer’s perception towards piracy.

H₁: the state of the economy has significant effect on consumer’s perception towards piracy.

Table 3. Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.148(a)	.022	-.018	1.621

a Predictors: (Constant), most people consider the economic consequences of using their money to purchase a musical CD, most people will rather use their money for something else than buy an original musical CD, economic conditions influences the purchase of pirated musical CDs.

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.284	3	1.428	.544	.654(a)
	Residual	191.716	73	2.626		
	Total	196.000	76			

a Predictors: (Constant), most people consider the economic consequences of using their money to purchase a musical CD., most people will rather use their money for something else than buy an original musical CD, economic conditions influences the purchase of pirated musical CDs.

b .Dependent Variable: I do not mind purchasing pirated musical CDs.

Interpretation of results

The results from the tables above revealed that the extent to which the variance in social influence can be explained by consumers perception towards piracy is 2.2% i.e. (R square = .022) at .654 significance level.

Decision

The significance level below 0.05 implies a statistical confidence of above 95%. This implies that social influence has a significant effect on consumer’s perception towards piracy. Thus, the decision would be to accept the null hypothesis (H₀), and reject the alternative hypothesis (H₁).

5. Discussion of Findings

The empirical findings of this study are based on the primary data collected and analyzed as well as the interviews conducted among the distributors of musical CDs.

It was found out that price is the major factor that makes people purchase pirated musical CDs, it was also found that other factors that make people purchase pirated musical CDs are influences of demographic variables such as gender and personal income, it was also gathered that consumers that purchase pirated musical CDs do not expect high quality, and the consumers also possess low value consciousness.

According to Haque, Khaibiti & Rahman (2009) piracy, counterfeit, imitation and fake products are all illegal operations done at the lowest cost and offered to consumers at the cheapest price. Their study was to research which variable plays the most important factor in the minds of most consumers and from this research it was found out that price is one of the major reasons for purchasing pirated products.

According to Ramayah, Siron, Dahlan, and Mohammad (2002) their study explained that there are some specific influences on the purchase of fake CDs like influences of normative susceptibility, integrity, gender and personal income attitude towards buying of pirated CDs, this study shows that race, culture and religion as an effect on whether or not people purchase pirated musical CDs.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

In this study, the researcher examined the determinants of consumer's perception towards pirated products using The Nigerian music industry as a case study. The study concludes that price and state of the economy have significant influence on the consumer's decision to purchase a pirated musical CD. Interview conducted for some of these social entrepreneurs also revealed that the consumer personality, social factors as well as the belief and value system were among the determinants of consumer perception towards pirated products.

Based on the findings of the study, the researchers recommend the following;

1. Enabling environment and financial aid should be provided for the entrepreneurs in music industry that will enable them to produce their products at affordable price.

2. There is need to create more awareness on the legal backing, stating that piracy is a criminal offence and all people caught for buying or selling pirated musical CDs should face the legal consequences.

4. Government should geared its economic efforts towards the improvement of standard of living in order to reshape the belief, value system and the perception of the consumers toward pirated products

Bibliography:

1. Abu-Saifan, S. (2012). Social Entrepreneurship: Definition and Boundaries. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, (February 2012), pp. 22-27

2. Abu-Saifan, S. 2012. Social Entrepreneurship: Definition and Boundaries. *Technology Innovation Management Review*. February 2012: 22-27

3. Adewole, A. (2011). Combating Piracy Through Optical Disc Plant Regulation In Nigeria: Prospects And Challenges. *NIALS Journal of Intellectual Property [NJIP]* Maiden Edition, pp. 135-163

4. Ajzen, I. (1991), *The Theory Of Planned Behavior*. *Organizational Behavior And Human Decision Processes*. 50, 179-211 (1991)

5. Akinbola, O. A, Ogunnaike, O. O. and Tijani, A. A. (2013) "Micro financing and Entrepreneurial Development: The Mediating role of Marketing." *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review* Vol 1(6)

6. Akinbola, O.A, Ogunnaike, O.O and Ojo, A.O.(2014) "Enterprise Outsourcing Strategies and Marketing Performance of fast food industry in Lagos State University, Nigeria" *Global Journal of Business Management and Accounting* Vol 3 No.1

7. Alford, S.H., Brown, L.D., Letts, C.W., 2004. Social entrepreneurship: leadership that facilitates societal transformation. Working Paper, Center for Public Leadership. In John F. Kennedy School of Government

8. Altinkemer, K. and Guan, J. (2003). Analyzing Protection Strategies for Online Software Distribution. *J. Electron. Commerce Res.* 4 (1), 34-48

9. Andrews T. (2012), What is Social Constructionism?, *The Grounded Theory Review* (2012), Volume 11, Issue 1, pp. 39-46
10. Ang, S.H., Cheng, P.S., Lim, E.A.C. and Tambyah, S.K. (2001), "Spot the difference: consumer responses towards counterfeits", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 219-35.
11. Baker T. and Nelson R. E. (2005), *Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 50, No. 3 (Sep., 2005), pp. 329-366
12. Bloch, P.H., Bush, R.F. and Campbell, L. (1993), "Consumer 'Accomplices' in product counterfeiting: a demand side investigation", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 27-36
13. Boschee, J. (1998), *Merging Mission and money: A broad member's guide to social entrepreneurship*: <http://www.socialent.org/pdfs/MergingMission.pdf>
14. Brinkerhoff, P., 2001. Why you need to be more entrepreneurial — an how to get started. *Nonprofit World* 19 (6), 12–15
15. Cordell V. V. (1991), Competitive context and price as moderators of country of origin preferences, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 19, 2, 123-128
16. Cordell, V. V., Wongtada, N. and Kieschnick Jr., R. L. 1996. Counterfeit Purchase Intentions: Role of Lawfulness Attitudes and Product Traits as Determinants. *Journal of Business Research*, 35, 41 – 53
17. Dees, J.G., (1998). Enterprising nonprofits. *Harvard Business Review*, 76 (1), 55–66.
18. Dimensional Research (2011), *The Risk of Social Engineering on Information Security: A Survey of It Professionals*, pp. 1-7. Retrieved from http://www.greycastlesecurity.com/resources/documents/The_Risk_of_Social_Engineering_on_Information_Security_09-11.pdf
19. Domenico M. D., Haugh H., Tracey P. (2010), *Social Bricolage: Theorizing Social Value Creation In Social Enterprises*. *Entrepreneurship Theory And Practice*, 1042-2587, Baylor University
20. Drayton, B., 2002. The citizen sector: becoming as entrepreneurial and competitive as business. *California Management Review*, 44 (3), 120–132
21. Fowler, A. (2000). NGOs as a moment in history: beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation? *Third World Quarterly*, 21 (4), 637–654
22. Fuqua School. 2005. <http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/>
23. Hadnagy C. (2011). *Social Engineering: The Art of Human Hacking*. Wiley Publishing, Inc., Canada
24. Haque, A. Khatibi, A. and Rahman, S. (2009). Factors Influencing Buying Behavior of Piracy Products and its Impact to Malaysian Market. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, Vol.5 N0. 2, Pp. 383-401
25. Harding, R., 2004. Social enterprise: the new economic engine? *Business and Strategy Review*, 15 (4), 39–43
26. IFPI (2002). *Piracy – A Blight On Culture, A Drain On Economies*. IFPI Music Piracy Report, June 2002. Retrieved from <http://www.ifpi.org/content/library/Piracy2002.pdf>
27. Jupiter-Research (2009). *Analysis of the European Online Music Market Development and Assessment of Future Opportunities*. Study on online Music Piracy and Purchasing Habits IFPI. Retrieved from http://www.ifpi.org/content/library/Jupiter_Research_study_on_online_piracy.pdf
28. Leadbeater, C. (1997). *The rise of the social entrepreneur*. Demos, London
29. Lichtenstein, Donald R., Richard G. Netemeyer, and Scot Burton (1990), "Distinguishing Coupon Proneness from Value Consciousness: An Acquisition-Transaction Utility Theory Perspective," *Journal of Marketing*, 54 (July), 54-67

30. Lin, N. (1999). Social networks and status attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 467-87.
31. MacMillan, I.A. 2005. <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/index.cfm?fa=viewfeature&id=766>
32. Mair J. and Marti I. (2005), *Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight*, Working Paper, IESE Business School, Barcelona
33. Martin R. L. and Osberg S. (2007), *Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition*. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, spring 2007
34. Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., Carnegie, K., 2002. *Social entrepreneurship: towards conceptualization and measurement*. *American Marketing Association Conference Proceedings* 13, 5.
35. NYU Stern, 2005. <http://w4.stern.nyu.edu/berkley/social.cfm>.
36. Owen I. R. (1995), *Social constructionism and the theory, practice and research of psychotherapy: A phenomenological psychology manifesto*, *Boletin de Psicologia*, 46, 161-186
37. Peredo, A.M., McLean, M., 2006. *Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept*. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 56–65
38. Ramayah, T. & Aafaqi, B. (2004). *Role of self-efficacy in e-library usage among student of a public university in Malaysia*. *Malaysia Journal of Library and Information Science*, 9(1), 39-57
39. Ramayah, T., Siron, R., Dahlan, N., & Mohammad, O. (2002). *Technology usage among owner/managers of the SMEs: The role of demographic and motivational variables*. *The proceedings of The 6th Annual Asian-Pacific Forum for Small Business on Small and Medium Linkages, Networking and Clustering*, 16-18th October, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
40. Reis, T. (1999). *unleashing the new resources and entrepreneurship for the common good: A scan, synthesis and scenario for action*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation
41. Said Business School. 2005. <http://www.sbs.ox.ac.uk/skoll/>
42. Schiffman, L. G. & Kanuk, L. L. (2006). *“Consumer Behavior”*. 8th edition, Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey
43. Schwab Foundation. 2005. <http://www.schwabfound.org>
44. Shaw, E., 2004. *Marketing in the social enterprise context: is it entrepreneurial?* *Qualitative Marketing Research: An International Journal*, 7 (3), 194–205
45. Tan, W.-L., Williams, J., Tan, T.-M., 2005. *Defining the ‘social’ in ‘social entrepreneurship’: altruism and entrepreneurship*. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1, 353–365
46. Thake, S. and Zadek, S. (1997). *Practical people, noble causes: How to support community-based social entrepreneurs*. London: New Economics Foundation
47. Wee, C., Tan, S. & Cheok, K., 1995. *Non-price determinants of intention to purchase counterfeit goods*. *International Marketing Review*, 12(6), 19-47
48. Weick K.E. (1993), *The Collapse of Sensemaking in Organizations: The Mann Gulch Disaster*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 4; *ABI/INFORM Global* pg. 628
49. Zahra S. A., Gedajlovic E., Neubaum D. O., Shulman J. M. (2009), *A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical Challenges*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24, 519–532