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ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to explore the barriers and facilitators to social enterprise start-up for people with disabilities. People with disabilities as a group tend to be self-employed more frequently than people without disabilities, yet relevant research in the field still lacks attentions from the public. This thesis applies systematic literature review and integrates topics and methods from interdisciplinary fields, including disability studies, employment policy, and business related studies, in order to provide greater insights and understanding about social entrepreneurship for people with disabilities. The research found that social entrepreneurs with disabilities have to deal with particular barriers, such as environmental and attitudinal barriers, that entrepreneurs without disabilities do not have to deal with. These barriers create additional obstacles that prevent people with disabilities from participating in the labor market on an equal basis to others. This research offers suggestions for ways to address these barriers and points to the need for further research in this area.
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I. INTRODUCTION

People with disabilities have had a lower working participation rate than people without disabilities for a long time. According to statistics from the Office of Disability Employment Policy (ODEP, 2015), in 2015 only 20.5% of people with disabilities participate in the labor market, compared to 69.1% of people without disabilities. Furthermore, many qualified people with disabilities continue to be directed to shelter or non-integration jobs, which do not provide them economic self-sufficiency, independence, and social inclusion (Blanck & Schartz, 2003; OECD, 2003; Parker & Cass, 2005). Therefore, how to increase the working participation rate of people with disabilities becomes a critical issue in the society.

Recently, the concept of Social Entrepreneurship (SE) has been broadly discussed in society, especially in disability communities. It is considered as a new working pathway for people with disabilities. A noticeable shift is reflected, through the discussion of SE, in contemporary policy towards entrepreneurship and self-employment as a viable employment option for people with disabilities in general (Caldwell, 2014). Caldwell also points out the expected effects of this contemporary policy: to promote autonomy, to reduce dependence on entitlement-based services, as well as to reduce employment disparities and stimulate business. Yet when people with disabilities want to participate in SE, there are some barriers that affect their wills or chances of participation, such as inaccessible environment and social stigma for people with disabilities. In fact, when considering SE as a job opportunity for people with disabilities, these visible and invisible barriers can be regarded as a potential discrimination against people with disabilities. Therefore, examining and clarifying these barriers are crucial for integrating people with disabilities in the society.
Additionally, realizing these barriers can not only benefit people with disabilities to gain visibility, but also assist policy makers to reform existing policies to better include people with disabilities. Therefore, in this thesis I mainly emphasize these specific barriers that block people with disabilities to start up their social enterprise, which people without disabilities do not have to deal with, in order to clarify the meaning of these barriers and facilitate prospective entrepreneurs with disabilities to build up their business.

A. **Definition of Self-Employment, Entrepreneurship, and Social Entrepreneurship**

In order to clarify the relationship between SE and people with disabilities, some key concepts should be distinguished first, such as self-employment, entrepreneurship, and social entrepreneurship. Self-employment and entrepreneurship have some common features, which make it hard to distinguish them sometimes. In general, financial self-sufficiency is the common result from both self-employment and entrepreneurship. While self-employment refers to a sense of financial self-sufficiency, innovation and growth are the significant features that distinguish entrepreneurship from self-employment (Schumpeter, 2000; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Additionally, Terry (1995) points out enterprises as production innovators provide new product or service in the market and assume financial risk. In these points of view, entrepreneurship can be also referred to as an organization, which generates product or service in order to meet the market needs. Furthermore, Klein (1977) defines that entrepreneurship is to make connections and build networks for solving problems or meeting market needs. In Klein’s view, the ability of problem solving can be a feature of entrepreneurship. In conclusion, although both self-employment and entrepreneurship need to bear financial risk, entrepreneurship emphasizes innovation and growth, and entrepreneurship has to accomplish the market’s needs or solve...
problems. Therefore, entrepreneurship means hiring employees to expand the company, which stimulates the economy differently than self-employment.

On the other hand, social entrepreneurship is an emerging topic in disability communities, which also provides job opportunities and self-sufficiency to people with disabilities. Yet, social entrepreneurship has very diverse definitions. Bornstein and Davis (2010) point out that social entrepreneurship is a process that citizens build a new or transfer an old institution to solve or improve some social issues, such as poverty, illness, or environmental problems, in order to make life better for many. In this regard, social entrepreneurship can be seen as a charity with earned income activity (Lyons, Townsend, Sullivan, & Drago, 2010). Moreover, Dees and Elias (1998) indicate five features of social entrepreneurship, which include recognizing and pursuing opportunities, continuously innovating, learning, adapting to the environment, and not being limited by current resources. According to the definition, social entrepreneurship is an entity that is operating like a commercial entrepreneurship, yet the product solves social issues.

To conclude these definitions, social entrepreneurship can be understood as a process of dealing with social issues by applying multiple approaches. As a result, the forms or types of social entrepreneurship are diverse, including not-for-profit, for-profit, and hybrid models (Alter, 2006). Generally, the concept of social entrepreneurship is a fluid concept, which can be changed across different sectors. The main purpose of social entrepreneurship is to develop a process that provides an effective solution to social issues as well as to achieve self-sufficiency (Parker Harris et al., 2013).
B. Barriers of Starting Up a Business and a Social Entrepreneurship

People with disabilities have been marginalized and oppressed by mainstream society for a long time. Parker Harris et al. (2014) point out that people with disabilities have more experience than others about the social problems and unmet needs. These experiences become an approach of reorganization of the social issues. Therefore, people with disabilities are more likely to choose social entrepreneurship than commercial business because they have oppressed experiences, and the urge to correct the problem or supply the unmet market needed. However, there are very few articles directly related to the topic of what barriers people with disabilities have to deal with while starting up a social entrepreneurship. Generally, these articles are separated between disciplines, including business, management, disabilities studies and others. In each chapter, I will collect and analyze these articles to conclude what barriers affect people with disabilities to build an entrepreneurship.

First of all, no matter who you are (with/without disability,) when trying to start up a business, people have to confront different kinds of barriers. A report of Startup America indicates four key barriers for entrepreneurship, such as financial capital, human capital, social capital and opportunity recognition, which affect people attempting to start up a business. In the later chapters, this thesis will be divided to three chapters to discuss each of these barriers of start-up entrepreneurship (e.g., human capital, financial capital, and social capital).

C. Disability Studies Perspective

Traditionally, disability has been considered as a deficiency of an individual. Because of these deficiencies, people with disabilities have difficulties participating in workplace, which puts them in the situations of inability, poverty, and isolation (Fletcher & Hurst, 1995). Therefore, in order to help them come back to the society and workplace, people with disabilities
have to be healed by medical professionals. Brisenden (1986) indicates medical model refers to disability as a deficit or problem within the individual, which needs to either be fixed or eradicated. This viewpoint of disability emphasizes negative consequences, such as a lack of education and/or self-sufficiency, as caused by individual’s deficit (Oliver, 1996). This perspective dominates how society values people with disabilities for a long time.

On the other hand, disability studies scholars argue against the medical perspective of disability. Instead of the medical model, they believe that environmental barriers, cultural attitude and social stigma cause disability experience, which is called social model (Oliver 1996). Compared with medical model, social model focuses on the systemic environmental barriers, cultural attitudes and restrictions that people with disabilities confront with, and further remove the blame from individual’s defect. This social view currently affects the lives of people with disabilities profoundly. Thus, public transportations, public spaces and so on are more accessible than before. These changes also increase the possibilities of people with disabilities participating in economic activities and social inclusion.

However, there are only few articles that comply with the social model view to investigate barriers that people with disabilities have to deal with in practice. Although the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) confirm that people with disabilities have equal opportunities to participate in society, what barriers they have to confront in practice are still vague (Parker Harris et al., 2014). The research questions of the present thesis intend to reveal the barriers of people with disabilities starting a business. The researcher will apply the social model and disability studies perspective in the research and try to examine these specific barriers that block prospective entrepreneurs with disabilities to start up their social enterprises.
II. RESEARCH METHOD

Research can be understood as an investigation to develop theories, describe phenomena, establish reality, and solve problems. Through research, I try to find out that when people with disabilities start up either a commercial or social business, what barriers they have to deal with and what are the differences between people with disabilities and people without disabilities when they face these barriers.

A common method of starting research is literature review, and it is important as a research tool, especially in emerging areas (Mertens, 2014). Indeed, disability and starting up an entrepreneurship are irrelevant concepts traditionally, because people with disabilities have been undervalued for a long time. Therefore, the concept of entrepreneurship is disconnected to people with disabilities directly.

However, there are still some articles related to my research interest indirectly. Through the literature review, the researcher can summarize and combine these existing studies to develop the research. Literature review is a research method that collects relevant information of a research topic and summarizes what is known on the topic (Merten, 2014). Yet there are controversial points in literature review. The most common criticism for literature review is its lack of explanation of what criteria should be considered or discussed in research (Boland, Cherry, & Dickson, 2013). Indeed, researcher selects these information or articles based on subjective judgments. Some articles or information may not be included, just because the researcher is unaware of the information, or they exclude them for some specific reasons that are unknown to the readers (Merten, 2014).

Systematic literature review is a research method that tries to minimize the possibility of subjective biases. The purpose of this method is not only addressing a topic area but also trying
to answer the research question (Gough, Oliver, & Thomas, 2012). Systematic literature review is a very different method from traditional literature review, especially in planning and conducting research. The decision points are determined by preparatory document known as a protocol, which explains why these criteria should be involved or considered in the research. In order to minimize the subjective biases, the researcher should organize a review team that manages and conducts the review by their expertise. However, it is difficult to organize a research team. Yet the research advisor, Dr. Sarah Parker Harris, assists and advises me in the process to develop a protocol, which might be less rigorous than traditional protocol yet still has similar effects for minimizing subjective bias.

Khan, Kunz, Kleijnen, and Antes (2003) design the five-step process of systematic review, which includes simplifying the question for the review, identifying relevant review, assessing the quality of the literature, summarizing the literature, and interpreting the findings. Though my research method is similar but not exactly the same as systematic review, the five-step process still provides very detailed and useful guideline in the research. I modified the five-steps process and comply it in the study.

For forming a question, Khan et al. (2003) suggest that researcher should consider four components in the research, including population, intervention, the outcome and the study design, and when to begin to develop the initial question. Gough, Oliver, and Thomas (2012) indicate the kind of method as an aggressive review, which the researcher has a very specific scope in reviewing. Gough et al. (2012) also suggest another way to develop a question. In some research studies there are only some key concepts defined in advance, where the purpose of the review is to identify and configure other concepts from the literature. In my research, there are
only few literatures related to my research topic directly. As a result, taking some concepts from other disciplines to support in this research is necessary in formulating questions.

Identifying relevant literature is critical in systematic review. Khan et al. (2003) explain the process of identifying relevant literature, which includes identifying potential relevant citations, excluding irrelevant sources, retrieving hard copies of potential relevant texts, the second exclusion of irrelevant citations and deciding what citations should be included in systematic review. Although the procedure is very easy to realize, minimizing the research biases is important in the research process. In order to minimize the subjective biases, systematic literature review request at least two people to undertake citations and the protocol should be developed before reviewing these citations. Although resources are very limited when organizing a review team, the thesis advisors provide very useful suggestions in the research. Their expertise covers different academia sectors, such as disabilities studies, sociology, and business. In this research, these experts will work together and function like as a review team, which direct me to develop the protocol and provide professional opinions of the research and determine what citations should be included in the research.

Developing a checklist for assessing the quality of the literature is important in the third step. The reliability of the literature will deeply affect the research result. Khan et al. (2003) suggest the researcher can apply existing quality checklist in the research or develop a specific checklist based on population, intervention and outcomes of the review question.

The last two steps are summarizing the evidence and interpreting the findings. The researcher should provide in-depth analysis for explaining the result. The researcher will describe why these articles are involved in the study and whether the evidence is consistent or not. In fact, systematic literature review is useful in emerging research areas, especially in this
study. This method provides reviewing literature systematically, so other researchers can follow my protocol to examine and develop the similar result, which is the strength compared with traditional literature review.

A. **Operation of Research Method**

In this study, I conduct the systematic literature review as the research method to answer the question of what barriers block people with disabilities from starting up their social entrepreneurship. Initially, the research question is formed by my personal interests and from long discussions with the research advisers, Dr. Sarah Parker Harris, Dr. Maija Renko, and Dr. Kate Caldwell, whose expertise includes disability study, social entrepreneurship, and business related knowledge.

Secondly, in relation to selection of studies I compiled three methods to identify studies for this review: (a) electronic search with a combination of key terms (disability/disabilities, social entrepreneurship/social enterprise, human capital/education policy, social capital/social relationship/social connection, opportunity recognition, financial capital/employment policy, learning/intellectual disabilities, physical disabilities, living arrangements, community services, resettlement, transition to community care, start up/entrepreneurship) on academic search engines (Web of Science, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar); (b) search of selected journals (e.g., Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, Journal of Small Business and Management, Disability & Rehabilitation, Disability & Society, Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, British Journal of Learning Disabilities); and (c) follow-up of references in relevant papers and publications.
One hundred and seventy-nine articles were found potentially relevant, and they were screened more thoroughly using the following criteria: (a) published either in print or electronically between 1995 and 2015; (b) appeared in a peer-reviewed English-language journal; and (c) based on original qualitative or quantitative research and contained information on the participants and methodology. For the final review, 91 articles were selected through the abovementioned guidelines, and also combined with some classical articles that are critically related to the key concepts of this study to help me answer the research question (Appendix A for the Table of Systematic Review). Lastly, summarizing and interpreting these findings are also crucial in this study. In the process, I worked with the thesis advisors and receiving essential suggestions about the study. The results of summarizing and interpreting will be addressed in the following chapters, which include the chapter of the barriers of acquiring human capital, social capital, and financial capital, as well as thesis conclusion.

B. **Chapter Conclusion**

When considering social entrepreneurship as a working pathway for people with disabilities, this research simply intends to answer the question of what specific barriers block people with disabilities from starting up a social enterprise. Since many disability scholars have discussed the issues of what barriers prevent people with disabilities from participating in the labor market, the connection between social entrepreneurship and disability still lacks attention from society (Parker Harris et al., 2014). In fact, this study is not trying to discover new findings, but it is to combine interdisciplinary research so as to explain the research question and to provide a comprehensive view to the issues of interest.

Therefore, this research can be seen as a foundation of my further study and might be able to apply to the future research. In the following chapter, I will expand and integrate these
disciplines to depict these specific barriers that prospective entrepreneurs with disabilities have
to deal with and provide reflections for the each of specific barriers in order to develop a
foundation for the further study.
III. HUMAN CAPITAL

People are the heart of an organization. Acquiring appropriate human capital is the priority of starting up an enterprise. In the first half of this chapter, I will clarify the definitions, the forms of human capital, and how human capital associates with the success of a new firm. In the later part of the chapter, I will analyze what barriers restrict people with disabilities to acquire human capital. The main purpose of the chapter is to provide a comprehensive picture about the barriers that people with disabilities have to confront while starting up a new firm.

A. Definition of Human Capital

The concept of capital is referred to something that can be restored and then to be used in an appropriate time. The first economist who coined the term “human capital” was Adam Smith in 1776. The Nobel Prize winner Becker (1962) defines human capital as investments in expenditures on education and training. This definition clearly points out that human capital is related to knowledge and learning. Furthermore, Becker (2009) claims that human capital is not only the result of formal education but includes experience and practical learning that takes place on the job, as well as non-formal education, such as specific training courses that are not part of traditional formal educational structures. Therefore, human capital can be seen as a sum of formal education, informal education, and experience. He also points out that human capital comprises the stock of knowledge and skills that reside within individuals and human capital can be developed over time and transferred between individuals.

After Becker’s definition of human capital, many scholars began to enrich the concept of human capital. Coleman (1988) states that human capital is created by changes in people that bring about skills and capabilities that make them able to act in new ways. The term “act in new ways” is the crucial concept in human capital. Davidsson and Honig (2003) refer to the term as
the knowledge of human capital increases cognitive abilities resulting in more productive and efficient activities. In the discussion, we can see that human capital is the knowledge and skills of improving the productive and efficacy of the entity.

As can be seen from the below Figure 1, the composition of human capital is the summation of formal education, informal education and experience, which can increase the productivity and efficiency of the organization. Indeed, the main structure of every organization is people. Therefore, human capital can be also considered as a foundation of an organization. Acquiring appropriate human capital is the most vital step of starting up an organization.

Figure 1. The Composition of Human Capital
B. **Forms of Human Capital**

In order to clarify what barriers exist for people with disabilities to acquire human capital, explaining the forms of human capital is the first step. Laroche, Merette, and Ruggeri (1999) state that there are two forms of human capital, general human capital and specific human capital. General human capital is considered as a learning process of overall knowledge, skills that people have acquired throughout their life. For instance, learned knowledge or skill through formal education or training courses can be considered as general human capital. In contrast, individual’s may possess specific human capital, which is directly relevant to the business they are setting up, such as prior experience within the same industry or prior start-up experience (e.g., business ownership experience, managerial capabilities, entrepreneurial capabilities and technical capabilities.) Certainly, both types of the human capital are critical for starting up an enterprise. The following section will discuss the influence of lack of the two forms of human capitals.

C. **Influence of Human Capital in a New Firm**

Organization is composited with human. Therefore, human capital plays a critical role in an organization. Although how to become a survival company is a complex issue, there is research providing insight into this issue. Gottschalk, Muller, and Niefert (2010) indicate that the start-up size of an organization is related to the survival rate as well as founder’s human capital. The founder’s human capital includes educational background, management skill and work experience. Furthermore, they also indicate that the relationship between company’s size and the survival rate of a new firm has a positive correlation. Thus, analyzing the influence of each of the human capital (e.g., general human capital and specific human capital) and acquiring these human capitals are vital for a startup enterprise’s survival.
General human capital is considered as the educational and training background. Lacking general human capital may restrict people to seek an appropriate job opportunities. Especially some jobs are critical for people who want to be an entrepreneur, because the jobs provide a good pathway of acquiring some important skills and experience (e.g., leadership skills). Qian, Acs, and Stough (2013) point out that new knowledge and new firm formation have a positive correlation, especially in start-up firms. Clearly, a start-up firm must create new products or service to meet the market needs, which mainly rely on plenty of knowledge and innovation. Therefore, an entrepreneur with related education background and job experience would have a higher possibility to recognize the market need and provide products or services to meet the need.

The funder’s human capital also affects the attitude of research and development investment (R&D) to the organization, which influences the innovation and development of the firm directly. Kato, Okamuro, and Honjo (2015) indicate that founders with higher educational background, prior innovation output and academic affiliation tend to raise more funds for R&D, which affects the sustainable development of a firm. In fact, a company should keep providing new products or services in the market. The relationship between innovation and the investment of R&D is positive correlation and it also related to the survival rate of a new firm. Thus, the general human capital influences not only starting up a new firm, but also maintaining the competitiveness of the company.

Traditionally, human capital means high-level educational background. However, there are many successful entrepreneurs who do not have strong educational backgrounds, yet they still start up their enterprise and become successful. Their specific human capital, such as management skill, leadership skill or related working experiences that are not learned from formal education system, might be accounted for these non-traditional successful cases. Brixy
and Hessels (2010) note that people who were employed just before starting their own firm are more likely to succeed in starting up their business and less likely to postpone the start-up attempt than people who were not employed before, such as being unemployed or out of the labor force. Thus, being unemployed or out of the labor force before or during starting up a firm decreases start-up success. Hence, working experience can be considered as a learning process of specific human capital. It provides opportunities for people to learn the critical skills of how to be an entrepreneur.

Furthermore, Baptista, Karaöz, and Mendonça (2007) indicate that firms started by portfolio entrepreneurs (i.e., individuals who owned other firms at time of start-up) do have a significantly higher probability of survival. It is easy to understand that people learned from mistakes. The prior experience of starting up an entrepreneurship can be also seen as a learning process, which people correct failed processes and acquire experience from these actions. Therefore, work experience is not only a pathway for achieving specific human capital, but also a road towards being an entrepreneur.

D. **Barriers of Acquiring General Human Capital**

In moving to a more specific discussion of disability, entrepreneurship, and human capital, before I begin to analyze what barriers resist people with disabilities to acquire human capital, there are some statistics numbers I have to address first. About 56.7 million people, which is around 20% of the U.S. population, have a disability (Brault, 2012.) Furthermore, only about 11% of the population who attend to postsecondary education (including programs whose purpose is academic, vocational, and continuing professional education) are people with disabilities (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Indeed, the percentage of receiving postsecondary education does not equal to the population of
people with disabilities in the U.S., and actually it is almost ten percent less than the U.S. disabled population. Therefore, in this section I will discuss what barriers people with disabilities face in acquiring general human capital, beginning with a discussion of educational barriers. The section can be divided in two forms of barriers, environmental barriers and attitude barriers.

(1) Environmental barriers of acquiring general human capital

Generally, environmental barriers are the priority issues that people with disabilities have to deal with in the educational system. Since the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) was enacted, all public buildings, transportation facilities and government agencies are more accessible. However, there are many environmental barriers that still prevent students with disabilities from pursuing their education (Ogilvie & Eggleton, 2011). These barriers include the lack of assistive technology, disability resource center, and the transportation supports. Stodden, Whelley, Chang, and Harding (2001) provide a comprehensive picture of the current status of educational support provisions to students with disabilities in postsecondary education. The researchers collected data from 650 students with disabilities in the U.S. The results are shown in Appendix A.

There are some interesting findings in the study. Firstly, testing accommodation is an educational support offered most frequently to students with disabilities in postsecondary educational settings (84% of the respondents reported that they offered this service more than 75% of the time). Generally, the educational system typically provides supports that are related to the academia directly, such as personal counseling, tutors and study skills.

On the other hand, some other supports (e.g., transportation, opportunities of study aboard, and scholarship) are the most infrequently offered supports. These supports are also critical for the educational system. For instance, educational scholarships are an important
resource for most disadvantaged students. However, people with disabilities have been oppressed and marginalized for a long time. Poverty almost becomes a common feature of people with disabilities in the society. Russell and Malhotra (2009) point out that under feudalism, the economy exploitation was direct. Only few landowners reaped the surplus and limited amount of disabled people were able to participate in production in feudalism. Yet, under industrial capitalism, people’s bodies were valued by their ability to function like machines. As a result, those people who couldn’t fit the system would be excluded from the work place and became the new class of “disabled people.” Therefore, suitable foundational support is necessary for students with disabilities to achieve their academic goal as well as acquire useful human capital.

Additionally, lack of accessible transportation is another crucial point for them, because it might affect disabled students to develop their social connection as well as social inclusion in the society. For example, if a student lacks accessible transportation in the university, it might decrease the disabled student’s motivation of attending the school events, which can in turn be detrimental to the student’s social network. Therefore, they may feel isolated in these educational settings, and further, the isolation can hinder the completion of postsecondary education.

Knowledge is the key composition of human capital. Yet when discussing the barrier of acquiring human capital, people usually simplify the issue to how physical barriers blocking people with disabilities from entering educational system, which is more related to how to assist people with disabilities to “attend a class.” In fact, the barrier issues should be expanded further, because most people receive knowledge not only from formal educational system, but also from life experience, social connections, and the media. For entrepreneurship, the practical knowledge is also important. In the following discussion, I will address how attitude barriers affect people with disabilities to acquiring general human capital.
(2) **Attitude barriers of acquiring general human capital**

Advocating for and by people with disabilities’ right to fully participate in the society is a current movement in the world. In order to achieve the goal, eradicating the environmental barriers is pivotal. Nevertheless, environmental access is not equal to the concept of full participation. Participation is more related to a sense of belonging, inclusion and identity. Therefore, feelings of disconnection from a group will decrease their motivation to participate in this group (Caldwell et al., 2012).

Indeed, removing attitudinal barriers is a very complicated issue in the society. Although students with disabilities may be included in the classroom, they still feel disconnected from other students. There are many descriptions to explain the circumstance. One of the main reasons is that the reluctant of disclosing their disability, especially for students with invisible disabilities (e.g., mental disabilities and light visual impairment) (Morina Diez, 2010). In other words, these students with disabilities only disclose their disability conditions in the situation of more good than harm. She found that one of the most controversial issues appearing over and over in the stories these young people told was the case of a disabled student who was placed in a mainstream “integrated” educational environment and, as a result, was continued experience the pain and ostracism of segregation. For most, integrated environments have not only failed to offer both social and academic opportunities, but have actually become a barrier to a fulfilling educational trajectory. Gabel and Miskovic (2014) address the situation as a containment, which happens when disabled people are silenced, ignored, forgotten, or defined using an individual deficit model. Although the educational system has the responsibility to support students with disabilities to deal with these issues, the students are still struggling with these attitudinal barriers.
There are two main reasons to explain the situation. The first reason is that students with disabilities do not want to disclose their disability due to the fear of being labeled as an “abnormal” student, and then in turn experience discrimination. Vickerman and Blundell (2010) point out that 25% of students with disabilities chose not to disclose their disability on their application due to a perceived fear that they may not be offered a place in the course of their choice. Furthermore, Venville, Street, and Fossey (2014) reveal further concerns of students with disabilities. They found that students considered their education and training as a direct pathway to work, and feared that a disclosure of mental illness could damage their prospects of gaining work upon course completion. As a result, when the students do not disclose their disabilities, it is hard to get support from the resources. Eventually, they become invisible in the disability support system and meanwhile they feel segregated and isolated from the peers as well.

The second reason is that students with disabilities do not receive the suitable support from educational system. Vickerman and Blundell (2010) reveal that 11.1% of the disabled students in their study indicate that their accommodations did not meet their needs, compared with 3.6% of their non-disabled peers. Although the differences between the students’ groups were diverse, there was a perception that the assessments were more obstructive for disabled students. Consequently, it may decrease the willingness of disabled students requesting support.

In this section, I discuss the reasons and barriers that obstruct the path people with disabilities achieving the general human capital. Fundamentally, the environmental barriers are still a current issue for students with disabilities, yet attitudinal barriers also contribute to creating educational barriers. Social stigma and the fear of being labeled as an “abnormal” person essentially restrain them from requesting supports, which decreases the motivation of staying in the educational system as well as acquiring the general human capital.
In order to respond to the learning gap of students with disabilities, there are some key policies intended to assist students with disabilities address such barriers, such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The purpose of IDEA is to provide children and youth with disabilities with the opportunity to participate in and benefit from a free appropriate public education. Moreover, the identification of children who qualify the service under IDEA was also modified from the discrepancy model to Response to Intervention (RTI), which is a series of alternative processes that documents the child’s response to evidence-based interventions in determining eligibility for special education (Ahearn, 2010). Minton and Sullivan (2013) indicate that RTI meets the goals of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act. Although RTI still confronts many challenges (e.g., lack of validity and reliability of the measure), I still can observe the improvements that come from educational system. I think people should acknowledge that the system can be better, but at the same time they also need to see the positive improvements in educational system and try to make it better.

E. **Barriers of Acquiring Specific Human Capital**

Work experience is a main pathway to acquire specific human capital, which includes management skills and leadership. These specific types of human capital are vital of starting up an enterprise. According to the statistics from United States Department of Labor in May 2015, the labor force participation rate of people with disabilities is 19.8% (compared with people without disabilities is 68.8%). Moreover, the unemployment rate of people with disabilities is 10.1%, which is almost double the rate of people without disabilities (5.1%). Therefore, in terms of acquiring specific human capital, people with disabilities are clearly disadvantaged than people without disabilities.
Russell (2002) points out two observations trying to explain this kind of phenomenon. The first observation is macro-economic realities of U.S. capitalism. The capitalist economy inherently restricts the liberal application of “equal opportunity” to employment for all because unemployment is not an aberration of capitalism. Rather, it is a built-in component of the market economy that requires many people be unemployed against their will. In Russell’s observation, unemployment is a part of the function of capitalism. For instance, unemployment is a tactic to adjust economic inflation and maintain the health of the economy. Consequently, if someone lost their job, it can be not because of job performance, but the necessary failure in capitalism.

Russell (2002) also provides another opinion, a micro-economic reality of U.S. capitalism. In the capitalist system, disabled workers face intrinsic micro-economic discrimination originating from employers’ expectations of encountering additional production costs when hiring or retaining a disabled worker as opposed to a non-disabled worker who has no extra needs for such as job accommodations, interpreters, readers, environmental modifications, liability insurance, and maximum health care. Basically, the observation considers economic activity of capitalism as a competition and it involves a deeply capitalistic calculation. Undoubtedly, people with disabilities are disadvantaged, because they usually need support and accommodations to accomplish their job, which is perceived to cost extra money for the business owners. In turn, they are perceived to be less productive than people without disability (Davidson, 2011).

Nevertheless, as outlined in the ADA, people with disabilities should have equal opportunities to fully participate in society. Moreover, employment should be considered as an important way to participate in the society, which should not be considered a pure economic issue, but instead a civil rights issue. In this thesis, I utilize the concept from the ADA, and
believe that being employed should be human rights. Hence, the following section analyzes the barriers to keep people with disabilities from acquiring specific human capital. As in the above section of general human capital, this section of specific human capital has also been divided into environmental and attitudinal aspects.

(1) **Environmental barriers of acquiring specific human capital**

Whether there is environmental accessibility is one of the first concerns of people with disabilities when applying a job. Kim and Williams (2012) indicate that, especially for people with physical disabilities, the lack of accessibility will fundamentally decrease the motivation of obtaining a job. Since the ADA was enacted in 1990, public transportation, private building and government agency are more accessible than before. Providing accommodations for employment with disabilities is a common idea among the employers.

While request for and provision of accommodations in employment is more commonplace since the ADA, providing accommodation does not necessarily mean that the needs of people with disabilities are met in employment. Lewis, Dobbs, and Biddle (2013) report that flexibility is at the core of providing accommodation, rather than adopting a “one size fits all” approach. For example, reflecting the meaning of flexible, employment with disabilities should receive a wide variety of support, depending on individual circumstances and needs, including transportation, help with specific tasks (e.g., learning a new filing system), and overcoming obstacles (e.g., low motivation or concentration).

Furthermore, job interview is another big challenge for most people with disabilities. Vedeler (2013) points out that people with disabilities usually need to spend more time to prepare for job interviews than people without disabilities. For instance, they have to get there earlier to figure out the location of accessible entrance. During the interview process, they
usually are under some uncertain modes of feeling due to their disabilities. For example, they usually worry whether or not they should disclose their disabilities to the employer before the interview. They worry that if they do, they might lose the opportunities of the job interview. Vedeler also points out that these high-pressure situations become an exclusive barrier for people with disabilities.

When discussing what environmental barriers blocking people with disabilities to participate in the labor market, physical environmental barriers usually will be considered as the major one (e.g., inaccessible architectures). In the previous discussion about accommodations, I found that the need for further accommodations is necessary for people with disabilities who intend to be employed. For instance, a lack of job interview coaching class can be problematic for student with disabilities. In fact, many universities’ career centers provide the information of job opportunities and consultation service for student who intend to seek jobs. However, these services rarely suggest concrete information for student with disabilities to deal with their specific issues (e.g., how to disclose their disability in a suitable way). Therefore, students with disabilities might face the situation that they have equal rights to access to the career center, yet they might have difficulty receiving useful accommodations and relevant suggestions from these entities. As a result, compared with student without disabilities, they confront extra barriers and lack suitable accommodations to deal with these extra barriers, which will decrease the possibility of being employed as well as affect their willingness of start-up.

(2) **Attitude barriers of acquiring specific human capital**

Stigmatization is a big issue for people with disabilities, which devalue the productivity and efficiency of disabled people (Robert & Harlan, 2006). Research has shown that
attitude barriers are the crucial point of restricting people with disabilities from being employed (Thompson, Fisher, Purcal, Deeming, & Sawrikar, 2012).

First, as discussed in the previous section, attending a job interview can be challenging for people with disabilities, because they have to deal with not only environmental barriers (e.g., finding accessibility entrance) but also attitude barriers. Vedeler (2013) argues that employer’s discriminatory attitude towards people with disabilities is one of the main barriers. In her study, some participants report that employer usually holds negative attitude for people with disabilities. Moreover, some employers indicate that the applicants should indicate they are disabled people, because the employers believe the job is not suitable for people with disabilities. Obviously, this kind of dialogue is discrimination. Although under the ADA this type of discrimination is prohibited, it can be difficult to prove. Furthermore, Roets, Kristiansen, Van Hove, and Vanderplasschen (2007) point out that people with disabilities typically have a starting point of disadvantage, with inadequate opportunities and support during their early years with regard to family situation, obtaining inadequate education and encouragement in pursuing a career. Thus, because of these disadvantages and attitude barriers, people with disabilities are vulnerable when seeking a job. This contributes to low labor market participation, which in turn contributes to the lack of human capital.

In the workplace, people with disabilities also confront many other attitude barriers. Because of prejudice and discrimination, disabled people are facing the dilemma of whether or not to disclose their particular condition to their employer and peers. Shier Graham, and Jones (2009) indicate that many disabled people do not request or receive appropriate accommodation, because they are afraid of being labeled as a “troublemaker” or “abnormal” employee, which will essentially devaluate their work performance.
According to the report from Benoit, Jansson, Jansenberger, and Phillips (2013), around 40% of people with visual impairment in Canada had been stigmatized due to their disability. Of those who reported perceived discrimination, approximately one-third said they had the experience when employed. Although these numbers are diverse based on different kinds of disabilities and countries, it shows a comprehensive picture about the situation of people with disabilities in workplace. Still, contemporary employment policies focus on increasing the labor force participation of qualified persons with disabilities and reducing dependence on governmental entitlement programs, which include The Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act (TWWIIA) passed in 1999 (Blanck, Clay, Schmeling, Morris, & Ritchie, 2002). These policies encourage people with disabilities to participate in workplace and to reduce dependence, yet whether people with disabilities have equal opportunity to learn the leadership skills and acquire specific human capital is still questionable beyond the policies. This is the further research question that scholars have to be aware of.

F. **Chapter Conclusion**

In this chapter, human capital can be divided into general human capital and specific human capital. General human capital is associated with formal educational system. So if a person lacks general human capital, he or she may decrease the possibility of being an employee. In relation to entrepreneurship, the level of educational background influences desires to invest in R&D, which will affect the company’s innovation. On the other hand, specific human capital, including leadership and management skills, is more related to the knowledge learned from informal educational system and experience. Specific human capital is also important for people who want to start up an enterprise. Fundamentally, specific human capital is more practical than
general human capital, because specific human capital usually comes from working experience, life experience, and social connection, which is more practical for the entrepreneurship.

In this chapter, I analyze what barriers restrict people with disabilities from acquiring human capital. These barriers can be generally divided into environmental barriers and attitude barriers. Environmental barriers include lack of accessible classrooms, transportations, and architecture facilities for people with disabilities. The environmental barriers deeply affect people with disabilities to fully participate in both activities and being an employee. Attitude barrier is another factor that blocks people with disabilities from achieving the human capital. Attitude barriers are related to the social bias toward people with disabilities. In previous research, many people with disabilities report that even though they have been integrated in the classroom or workplace, they still feel isolated and segregated from peers. These attitude barriers fundamentally decrease the motivation of acquiring both general human capital and specific human capital of people with disabilities.

However, policy improvement, which includes the effect of ADA, IDEA, and Tickets to Work, is also a point that has to be taken into account when discussing the relationship between entrepreneurship and human capital. Although these policies seek to ameliorate many of the challenges outlined in this chapter, the barriers people with disabilities facing in acquiring human capital remain significant. There have been some positive shifts in these areas however. For example, in both educational and employment policy for people with disabilities, the issues are shifting from whether the society should provide assistance for people with disabilities to the issue of what accurate assistance should be provided to achieve the goal of fully participation. This shift in both attitude and structure could positively impact human capital for people with disabilities moving forward. For instance, for entrepreneurs with disabilities, accessing into a
physical environment is a less serious issue than before. Yet, getting suitable assistances, which include financial advice and management skill, to deal with the specific barriers of starting up business still lacks attentions from the society (Parker Harris, Owen, Jones, & Caldwell, 2013). One of the explanations to the question is that the concept of the entrepreneurship is still disconnected from people with disabilities. Therefore, when formatting educational and employment policy related to the entrepreneurs with disabilities, the policy maker have to be aware of whether the policy really helps achieve the concept of fully participation as well as whether it is able to assist people to connect the concepts of people with disabilities and entrepreneurship together. This kind of social culture shifting is crucial and important for entrepreneurs with disabilities.
IV. SOCIAL CAPITAL

Social capital can be reflected as a very influential resource that not only relates to the social connection of entrepreneurs, but also is further associated with an approach of acquiring human capital and financial capital. In this chapter, I will define the meaning of social capital, the types of social capital, and the relationship between social capital and entrepreneurship. Secondly, I will analyze what barriers prevent people with disabilities from acquiring social capital and the influence of lack of social capital when people with disabilities starting up their enterprises. However, the meaning of people with disabilities is diverse, so people might experience different barriers than others (Prime Minister’s Strategy Unit, 2005). Therefore, the discussion of this chapter can be understood as a connection between disability studies and entrepreneurship that provide a wide-ranging picture of the issues for the further research.

A. Definition of Social Capital

The concept of social capital is becoming more prominent in a number of different disciplines including sociology, education, politics and economics as well as disability studies (Whiting & Harper, 2003). Approximately a century ago, Louis Hanifan (1916) indicates social capital as good will, fellowship, mutual sympathy, and social intercourse among a group of individuals and families who make up a social unit. Since then, multiple disciplines have adopted the concept of social capital, which, broadly speaking, identifies how involvement and participation in groups can have positive consequences for the individual and the community. Pierre Bourdieu (1985) defined the first systematic definition of social capital. Bourdieu (1985) points out social capital is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources that are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition. Coleman (1988) and Lin (1999) have drawn on Bourdieu’s
definition to focus on the effect of social capital for individual outcomes. Coleman (1988) focuses on how social capital and social structures of relationships could be actualized into concrete resources for use by individuals. Lin (1999) further ties social capital to networks of relationships, defining it as resources embedded in one’s social networks, resources that can be accessed or mobilized through ties in the networks. Moreover, Putnam (1993) defines social capital broadly as the features of social organizations, such as networks, norms, and trust that facilitate action and cooperation for mutual benefit. Despite multiple different definitions of social capital, a consensus is growing in the literature that social capital stands for the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures, which is the heart of social capital.

Generally, social capital has three dimensions - structural, relational, and cognitive (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). They also indicate that structural social capital refers to the frequency of contact and the connectivity levels among individuals’ network relationships. Relational social capital refers to the underlying normative conditions that guide an individual actor’s relations and the resulting exchanges. Cognitive social capital refers to language-based resources that provide shared representations, interpretations, and systems of meaning between parties.

B. **Types of Social Capital**

In order to value how social capital influences people with disabilities when starting up a new firm, it is important to first examine the different types of social capital. Szreter and Woolcock (2004) indicate that there are three types of social capital, which are bonding, bridging, and linking. Bonding social capital describes the connections among individuals who are emotionally close, such as close friends or family relatives, and result in tight bonds to a
particular group. Bonding social capital is commonly characterized in high levels of similarity on demographic characteristics, attitudes, and available information and resources. On the other hand, bridging social capital describes acquaintances or individuals loosely connected that span social groups, such as class or race. These ties are more likely to display demographic diversity and provide novel information and resources that can assist individuals to advance in society. The third type of network connection is linking social capital, which connects regular citizens with those in power. Woolcock (1998) also refers to linking social capital as the ties between people in communities and their local organizations.

However, in this thesis I will only focus on bonding social capital and bridging social capital. Although linking social capital has a huge influence in increasing commercial competition, for the early level of a new firm, it is less important than the other two types of social capital. As a result, when discussing the barriers people with disabilities face in acquiring social capital, I will mainly focus on the influence of bonding and bridging social capital for entrepreneurship. These two types of social capital are critical for starting up a new firm, because they provide not only financial but also emotional support for entrepreneurs. So, if a person starts up a new firm without suitable social capital, the possibilities of success may decrease dramatically.

C. **Influence of Social Capital**

Social capital theory refers to the ability of actors to extract benefits from their social, structures, networks, and memberships. In this study, I consider social capital as social exchange, using this concept to examine the exchange effect. Exchange effects may range from the provision of concrete resources, such as a loan provided by a mother to her daughter, to
intangible resources, such as information about the location of a new potential client. Figure 2 shows the influence of social capital for start-up firms and the composition of social capital.

Figure 2. The Influence of Social Capital

For a start-up business, both bridging and bonding social capital can be related to the Discovery Theory and the Creation theory. Shane (2003) indicates that the Discovery Theory assumes that opportunities are objective, that entrepreneurs differ from non-entrepreneurs in important ways, and that the decision-making context within which entrepreneurs operate is risky. On the other hand, Venkatraman (2003) also pointes out that the Creation Theory assumes that opportunities are created by entrepreneurs through an emerging and iterative search process,
that differences between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs are created by this search process, and that the decision making context within which entrepreneurs operate is either ambiguous or uncertain.

In this thesis, both of the theories will be applied in the research. For instance, bonding social capital provides networks that facilitate the discovery of opportunities, as well as the identification, collection, and allocation of scarce resources. On the other hand, bridging social capital may assist with the entrepreneurial exploitation process by providing and diffusing critical information and other essential resources. Indeed, both theories are critical and also related to the key concept of opportunity recognition for entrepreneurship. Therefore, I will apply these two social capital concepts and provide further explanation and discussion in the section.

(1) **Influence of bonding social capital**

Bonding social capital refers to multiple interpersonal relationships, such as family with their relatives and individuals with their friends. There are many scholars who have pointed out that family is considered as the most importance part of bonding social capital. Sanders and Nee (1996) indicate that family not only simply provides tangible products, such as inexpensive labor, but also involves the mutual. Clearly, when family members participate in entrepreneurship, they usually have a great stake in the growth and success of the business. Because of involvement in the business, they usually are more motivated to make the business successful.

The involvement of family relatives in start-up activities is common in a lot of start-up firms. Dyer (1992) notes that some potential entrepreneurs are discouraged from starting their own businesses because their families are not supportive. The initial capital to fund the same
venture generally comes from personal and family assets. Therefore, the family's willingness to support the venture financially is a critical variable. Handler (1990) addresses that there are four advantages when family involve in the entrepreneurship: (1) initial costs and early losses may be more easily shared, (2) later success benefits the family as a whole, (3) the family can be together, and (4) trust. Moreover, family relatives usually are crucial human resources as not only voluntary labor forces but also the human resource of management.

However, some research has found that family members can also be a problem when the business grows and becomes a mature company. Dyer (1992) notes that the problems inherent in working with family members are a function of the intersection of two systems, the family and the firm. These systems are typically based on different, and often incompatible, values. For instance, a father who is an employee in the business operated by his son might feel confusion, because the traditional role of family and the role of employment can function in a very different way, which might decrease the efficiency of the business. Therefore, the involvement of family relatives is not always positive and there are still some conflicts that entrepreneurs need to deal with.

Although family involvement in entrepreneurship has both negative and positive effects, I still maintain the previous notion that family relatives should be considered as a vital social capital of entrepreneurship – if family is available and willing to be considered a source of support for an entrepreneur. The reason is because initial funding and voluntary labor force are critical in the level of start-up, and the support of family members clearly will raise the survival rate during the early stage of the business.

However, while living with the family and building up a relationship with relatives is common for people without disabilities, for some people with disabilities who live in non-
family-setting residence receiving support from family relatives might be difficult in practice. To the report from National Council on Disability 2009, the number of people with intellectual disability/developmental disability (ID/DD) residing in state-run institutions has declined from a peak of 194,650 in 1967 to 32,909 in 2009. The extent to which states continue to rely on institutions to house people with ID/DD varies significantly by state. Moreover, Larson, Hallas-Muchow, Aiken, Hewitt, Pettingell, Anderson, Moseley, Sowers, Fay, Smith, and Kardell (2014) explain that nationally 148.5 people with IDD receive Long Term Service and Supports (LTSS) while living in non-family settings per 100,000 of the population. The national average per 100,000 of the population of living in non-family settings with 1 to 6 people was 114.8, for non-family settings with 7 to 15 people was 17.7, and for nonfamily settings with 16 or more people was 15.9. Although living in non-family settings is not always equal to the lack of supports from family, the result clearly shows that people with disabilities confront some extra or specific challenges (e.g., attitude barriers specific toward people with disabilities) that people without disabilities do not have to deal with, which is what I want to emphasize in this section.

(2) **Influence of bridging social capital**

Bridging social capital focuses on individuals as the unit of analysis. Adler and Kwon (2002) indicate that bridging social capital explains how an individual’s success is related to the contacts and connections that social capital brings to them. Moreover, the bridging form of social capital is most prominent in the entrepreneurship literature given its relevance to the formation of new ventures. Therefore, bridging social capital can be seen as the good will and resources that emanate from an individual’s network of social relationships. Furthermore, Adler and Kwon (2002) explain that this good will and resources are manifested in the information, influence, and solidarity that become available to the individual.
Although both bonding and bridging social capital can contribute useful information and influence for entrepreneurship, bridging social capital is considered as the main source of information and influence. Shane and Venkataraman (2000) point out two direct benefits of bridging social capital, which include information and influence. Moreover, social capital may facilitate access to information, which is a critical component of entrepreneurial opportunities. For instance, individuals with close ties to universities, perhaps through alumni associations, may develop relationships with researchers and thus have access to information about emerging technologies that can be commercialized. These individuals then have early access to promising technologies before the new information becomes public knowledge. Another benefit of bridging social capital is influence. Individuals may accumulate obligations from others in their network and then leverage these obligations at a later time. For instance, many business people participate in kinds of either local commercial chamber or international commercial organization, which provide good opportunities to explore the market needs as well as developing social connections. However, for people with disabilities, accessing social capital through educational networks or professional workplace connections is constrained by broader structural discrimination that people with disabilities have had in these key domains (Riddell, Tinklin, & Wilson, 2005).

Furthermore, because of their physical or mental limitations, living with family and accompanied by family members most of time is common for people with disabilities (Schulz & Sherwood, 2008). Especially for people with developmental disability and intellectual disability who live with family relatives, the relationship is solid and strong (Petry, Maes, & Vlaskamp, 2005). The positive side of the situation is they can usually receive free labor from family members to assist them to achieve their daily tasks. On the other hand, the negative side of the situation is not only the issue of whether people with disabilities receiving overprotection from
family, but also lacking opportunities for them to build up personal relationships with others (Heiman, 2002).

Therefore, for prospective entrepreneurs with disabilities, how to develop the bridging social capital as well as to balance their bonding social capital (e.g., family relationship) is the crucial point for start up.

D. **Barriers of Acquiring Social Capital**

Traditionally, social capital is associated with many vital resources of starting up a new firm, which include initial funding, crucial information of start-up, and opportunity recognition. However, when people with disabilities intend to acquire social capital, they confront additional barriers that are different from people without disabilities, such as stigma, negative attitude, and lack of accessible transportation (Barnes & Mercer, 2005). While people with disabilities are diverse and can experience different barriers (e.g., people with physical impairments might face different challenges than people with developmental disabilities), generally people with disabilities collectively face a range of environmental and attitudinal barriers that will be discussed in the subsequent section.

1. **Barriers of acquiring bonding social capital**

Many entrepreneurs receive initial funds and voluntary labor forces from family relatives and friends when starting a new firm (Hamilton & Fox, 1998), which can be referred to as bonding social capital. Yet, people with disabilities have difficulty in translating family relationship and friendship into bonding social capital for many reasons. One of the major reasons can be an attitudinal barrier that prevents them from acquiring bonding social capital.

In terms of attitude barriers (e.g., stereotype and stigma of people with disabilities from society), family relatives usually consider people with disabilities as a “protected” subject. For
example, in discussing parental voices and controversies in autism, Langan (2011) addresses that since autism was first widely recognized, parents of children with autism have made a distinctive contribution in contesting expert theories and professional practices. These contestations include in the 1970s and 1980s, parents challenged the “refrigerator” mother theory that blamed parents for causing their children’s autism. Additionally, since the 1990s, some parents have blamed vaccines and environmental toxins for causing autism and have sought to “defeat” autism through a range of alternative treatments (although, this has since been refuted through research). Instead of people with disabilities challenging the authorities themselves, parents become a main role of challenging social stigma and stereotypes.

Moreover, parents often participate in every level of disabled children’s lives, especially in the decision-making process. Orlowska (1995) addresses that parents involved in many important decision-making processes in every life stage of people with disabilities, such as school choice and job selection. Furthermore, especially for people with intellectual disabilities and developmental disabilities, they usually lack opportunities to make choices and decisions by their own (Werner, Tulchinsky, Gryga, Kovess-Masfety, Levav, & Pathare, 2012). Barron (2001) explains the situation as mothers tend to be described (implicitly) as either some kind of good Samaritans or villains. Such parents are considered good Samaritans in the sense of being subject to admiration for the time spent on their disabled children and the involvement generally in their children’s lives. Mothers are seen as giving up a lot for the sake of the welfare of their children. The other way parents are described focuses on them serving as obstacles to a good life for their children by way of “overprotection” and generally hindering them to lead an autonomous life. Although there are many advocates consistently promoting the right of self-determination of people with disabilities, people with disabilities still respond that they lack chances to make a
“real” decision. Rabiee and Glendinning (2010) explain that people feel exercising choice is only meaningful if choices are “real.” Furthermore, many disabled people thought their desired options were still either not available, or limited. Many felt they did not have access to information that could enable them to make “informed” choices.

From these discussions, the researcher concludes that in the macro perspectives of disability rights, people with disabilities have been isolated from the mainstream of society. These historical experiences have contributed to some people with disabilities who becoming passive recipients, and many having little to no opportunity to advocate for themselves.

In terms of micro perspective, these issues also can be observed from a decision-making process. For instance, job options and opportunities may be limited for people with physical disabilities due to a lack of accessible transportation. Therefore, people with disabilities lack practical experiences in making decisions by themselves, which might lead to devalue the decisions they made, no matter what the quality of decision is. Additionally, people with developmental disability or intellectual disabilities also confront the attitude barrier. For those who live with family, they usually are the subjects of protections. Once they decided to transfer their role from protégé to prospective entrepreneurs, family relatives might question whether their decision is serious, instead of assessing the decision they made, which become to an extra attitude barrier of translating the social connections into social capital (Caldwell, 2014). These extra attitude barriers cause people with disabilities to put more efforts to convince their relatives in order to receive bonding social capital, yet decreases the time that they can use on their start-up plan.
(2) **Barriers of acquiring bridging social capital**

Bridging social capital is considered as an important resource for exchanging opinions, receiving professional knowledge, developing social connections, and diffusing information with related friends, co-workers, experts, and entrepreneurs (Williams & Durrance, 2008). Moreover, social capital is also associated with the capacity of opportunity recognition, which influences entrepreneurs to discover or create the market needs (Wang, Ellinger, & Wu, 2013). For years, many people believed that the capacity of opportunity recognition was single insights that entrepreneurs found them because of their inspiration or intuition. However, instead of attributing the ability of opportunity recognition to a particular individual, research has shown that the capacity is linked to the prior knowledge and social influence, and whether entrepreneurs receiving critical information (De Carolis & Saparito, 2006). Dimov (2007) points out that contextual and social influences affect the generation and shaping of opportunity recognition. Shane (2000) also indicates that entrepreneurs discover opportunities related to the information that they already possess (prior knowledge). Furthermore, entrepreneurs may make decisions differently due to their different culture and life experience, even though they may receive similar information and have had the same social connection. While the purpose of the thesis does not specifically focus on opportunity recognition, it is important to point out that lack of ability of opportunity recognition results in lack of opportunities to access to critical information and build up appropriate social connections with the society, which is what I intend to emphasize in this chapter. It is, therefore, when people with disabilities acquire bridging social capital, the environmental barrier is considered as the main barrier that they have to deal with. In the following paragraph, I will discuss how the barrier influences people with disabilities to develop and acquire bridging social capital.
First, environmental barriers of acquiring bridging social capital include the lack of accessibility in transportation and construction, the lack of accurate information (e.g., lack of interpreter for people with hearing impairments), and many other physical environmental barriers. Blackman, Mitchell, Burton, Jenks, Parsons, Raman, and Williams (2003) indicate that the needs of people with disabilities are now informing the design of residential homes and day centers, but the issue of accessibility to public spaces and amenities still needs to be improved. For instance, commercial social networking events usually are held in conference centers or hotel’s conference rooms. Although most of these centers provide shuttle bus services for participants, most of these services are inaccessible for people with disabilities, which may fully exclude people with disabilities from these business-related events. Moreover, even though they can access these programs and events, it still doesn’t mean they have equal opportunities to fully participate in these events. Wilson-Kovacs, Ryan, Haslam, and Rabinovich (2008) explain that people with disabilities usually have to deal with the situations of lacking opportunity, lacking resources, and lacking support when participating in the social events. Furthermore, Parker Harris et al. (2013) indicate that although there are many agencies and formal networks (e.g., Disability Works and the Entrepreneurial Center at the Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce and the Mayor’s Office for People with Disabilities), most respondents in their study reported that they were either unaware of the existence of such programs/services, or more often, did not feel the services were effective in providing the support needed. One of the reasons why respondents are unaware of such programs or services might be because of digital exclusion. Watling (2011) indicates that access technology has the potential to offer independent use of the Internet but many disabled people already face barriers which prevent them having equitable digital experiences. Multiple obstacles include high set-up costs, inadequate technical support, and exclusive design practices.
For instance, if a person with visual impairment lacks a screen reader on his/her personal computer, receiving related information is difficult, which may be the reason why people with visual impairment are unaware of these formal support provided by government. It will also decrease the motivations of participating in the programs and services.

In the discussion of what barriers people with disabilities face in acquiring bridging social capital, the focus was primarily on environmental barriers. Although, it is important to acknowledge that, attitudinal barriers are also critical in acquiring bridging social capital. However, attitudinal barriers are similar across bonding social capital (as discussed in the previous section) and will not be repeated here.

Furthermore, in terms of bridging social capital, sharing information and benefiting from the bridging social capital is based on the premise that those people usually have some similarities in terms of life experience, culture perspective, and economic status, making it much easier for people to apply the information in practice (Lin, 2008). For instance, Taiwanese American Chamber of Commerce of Greater Chicago (TACCGC) hosts many commercial event that assist Taiwanese American to deal with issues of immigration, tax, as well as help prospective entrepreneurs to start up. Because these people all share some similarities in culture and life experience, the information sharing from the TACCGC would be useful for the group members. On the other hand, if people lack these similarities, they can still benefic from the information, yet the influence of the information might be less. Parker Harris et al. (2013) find that many entrepreneurs with disabilities believe that they need a “mentor” who can provide suggestion and assist them to deal with the problem of starting up. Though the definition of mentor was not provided in the research, the meaning of mentor in the context might be not only someone who has business knowledge, but also someone who have similarities in life experience,
cultural perspective, and economic status. Therefore, whether prospective entrepreneurs with disabilities have chances to build up bridging social capital with “mentors” (e.g., other successful/experienced entrepreneurs with disabilities) critically influences the effects of this social capital directly.

E. **Chapter Conclusion**

Traditionally, social capital is referred to as social connections, which include family relationship, friendship, and the relationship in the workplace (Stone, 2001). Social capital can be associated with knowledge receiving and information diffusing in the social connections, which impacts entrepreneur’s opportunities to explore the market needs as well as recognize the opportunity in the markets. For the ability of opportunity recognition, people usually attribute the “inspiration” to a particular individual, but ignoring that inspiration is mainly influenced by prior knowledge and social connection. Some people could not discover opportunity, even though they have well-educated background and social connection, because people all have different cultural and life perspective that would affect their decision making as well.

In fact, when discussing the issues of why people with disability rarely start up business compared with people without disabilities, people should at least confirm whether people with disabilities have the equal opportunity to participate in the society and access to the appropriate information. Because of a lack of full participation and opportunity in the society, people with disabilities become disadvantaged, which is a critical point when discussing the issue of the relationship between entrepreneurship and disability.

Furthermore, in this chapter, social capital also plays an important role of acquiring human capital and financial capital when people start up a business. For instance, entrepreneurs may start up their business because of their family relatives supporting the decision and
providing initial funds and voluntary labor force, which is an advantage for entrepreneurs, compared with entrepreneurs without these resources.

When discussing what barriers block people with disabilities from acquiring bonding social capital and bridging social capital, I connected bonding social capital with attitudinal barriers, and bridging social capital with environmental barriers. However, both attitudinal barrier and environmental barrier can affect people with disabilities acquiring social capital in both direct and indirect ways, and are not mutually exclusive.

In the discussion of the barriers people with disabilities confront, although there are still many barriers they have to deal with, the meaning of barriers is changing positively. In terms of attitudinal barrier, society is more inclusive for people with disabilities than before. Many people believe that if people with disabilities with suitable accommodations, their performance and capability are like people without disabilities. On the other hand, the meaning of environmental barriers is also shifting from total lack of accessibility in the environment to the needs of providing accurate accommodations for people with disabilities. As a result, although the social stigma and stereotype for people with disabilities still firmly exist, the positive and ongoing changes should be recognized and emphasized.

Using the term “social capital” instead of “social relationship” in this thesis is because the term of capital refers to further thoughts than the term of relationship for entrepreneurship. Indeed, because of social changes and improvements, the stereotype of people with disabilities is shifting from full dependency on others to living independently. Yet, the concepts of entrepreneurship consist of more ideas than the idea of independence. The concepts of entrepreneurs include creative, opportunities recognition, and creating the need of interdependent relationship with others. In bonding social capital for prospective entrepreneurs with disabilities,
rather than only receiving free labor from their family due to the relative responsibility, interdependent relationship means that they have to create a vision that can not only accomplish their life purposes, but also benefit their family. Moreover, in terms of bridging social capital, interdependent relationship associated with the concept of two-way exchange of information-entrepreneurs with disabilities should not only attend to the commercial events, but also are able to contribute their meaningful information to others. The point of creating the visions or providing meaningful information for others does not mean these ideas should work in practice every time, yet these ideas should convey an important idea and precious experience that all people can benefit from.
V. FINANCIAL CAPITAL

For most entrepreneurs, raising the initial funds for starting up is a difficult task. Commonly, entrepreneurs start the business relying on their personal savings (OECD, 2014). For some others, they know how to seek external funds to become their financial capitals, which include debt and equity finance. Only a small proportion of entrepreneurs start up their business because of receiving heritages. Normally, raising financial capital can be via either human capital or social relationship. Therefore, a lack of financial capital can be seen as the result of the individual lacking human capital and social capital. In this chapter, firstly I will introduce the types and the influences of financial capital in entrepreneurship. Then, I will apply these perspectives in order to investigate what barriers prevent entrepreneurs with disabilities from seeking and acquiring the financial capital.

A. Definition of Financial Capital

Adam Smith defines capital is a type of good that can be consumed now, but if consumption is deferred an increased supply of consumable goods is likely to be available later. In this chapter, financial capital of entrepreneurships can be considered as three major resources: personal savings, debt finance, and equity finance (Marsh, 1982). Marsh indicates that debt financing means borrowing funds from creditors with the stipulation of repaying the borrowed funds plus interest at a specified future time. Equity financing refers exchanging a portion of the ownership of the business for a financial investment in the business.

Obtaining the necessary financing to start and grow a business is generally considered one of the entrepreneur's major challenges (Cassar, 2004). The choice of an appropriate capitalization structure and decisions about the sequencing of capital sources are widely acknowledged as important to venture success. The pecking order theory of Myers (1984) is a
theory of a common procedure of the entrepreneur for seeking finance resources. Pecking order theory means financing capital comes from three main sources, including internal funds (e.g., personal savings), debt, and new equity. Companies prioritize their sources of financing, first preferring internal financing, and then debt, lastly raising equity as a “last resort.” Florin, Lubatkin, and Schulze (2003) extend this logic and argue that the most common financing strategy for entrepreneurships begins with the funding team's reliance on personal savings, bank loans, or government programs.

In this chapter, the pecking order theory is being applied to define that financial capital comes from three main categories, which are personal savings, debt, and new equity. Although entrepreneurs have many resources of seeking financial capital, such as bootstrap financing and angel investor, the purpose of the thesis is to focus on what financial barriers people with disabilities face when starting up a new firm.

B. **Types of Financial Capital**

In order to discuss the relationship between financial capital and entrepreneurship, I will first define the types of financial capital and to distinguish the difference between each of types, which include personal savings, debt and, new equity. First, different people may understand the meaning of personal savings differently. To some people, it means putting money in the bank. On the other hand, some other people consider saving as buying stocks or contributing to a pension plan. Kotlikoff (2008) indicates that in the field of economics, saving means consuming less out of a given amount of resources in the present in order to consume more in the future. Saving, therefore, is the decision to defer consumption and to store this deferred consumption in some form of asset.
Secondly, pecking order theory suggests that debt will be included among the first external sources of funding entrepreneurs seek in financing their business. Debt involves borrowing funds from creditors with the stipulation of repaying the borrowed funds plus interest at a specified future time. The debt can be from many sources like credit cards, or from more formal sources like banks or other larger institutional providers. Moreover, debt may be secured or unsecured. Secured debt has collateral (a valuable asset, which the lender can attach to satisfy the loan in case of default by the borrower). Conversely, unsecured debt does not have collateral and places the lender in a less secure position relative to repayment in case of default.

Thirdly, equity financing means exchanging a portion of the ownership of the business for a financial investment in the business. The ownership stakes resulting from an equity investment allows the investor to share the company’s profits. Equity involves a permanent investment in a company and is not repaid by the company at a later date. The investment should be properly defined in a formally created business entity. An equity stake in a company can be in the form of membership units, as in the case of a limited liability company or in the form of common or preferred stock as in a corporation.

In this thesis, the lack of financial capital is considered the result of the lacking appropriate human and social capital. In fact, knowledge, capabilities and an effective network have been shown to be key to financial capital. Greene and Brown (1997) indicate that human capital and social capital are critical components of entrepreneurial knowledge and capabilities. Moreover, both types of capital are important because they represent initial abilities that provide the basis for acquiring other resources, including financial capital (Brush, Carter, Gatewood, Greene, & Hart, 2002). The relationship between social capital, human capital, and financial
capital is drawn/can be seen in Figure 3. Figure 3 shows that social capital, human capital, and financial capital are the main composition when seeking financial support.

![Figure 3. The Composition of Financial Capital](image)

C. **Influence of the Financial Capital for Entrepreneurship**

Personal savings, debt, and equity are considered three main sources of financial capital. In this section, the disadvantages and advantages of the three financial sources will be analyzed, and how the three main sources influence the operation of entrepreneurship will be discussed.
(1) **Personal savings**

According to the pecking order theory, personal savings is the priority financial resource of entrepreneurship. Blanchflower and Oswald (1998) address that raising financial capital is the most critical step for potential entrepreneurs. Additionally, when individuals receive inheritance or gifts, the possibility of starting up an enterprise will be increased significantly. Therefore, compared with the person who does not have personal savings, the person who has savings will find it easier to raise the initial capital for the enterprise, because the personal savings can be easily transferred to be the funds of entrepreneurships.

However, some scholars hold different views of the relationship between personal savings and entrepreneurship, where the propensity to become a business owner in the United States is a non-linear function of wealth. For instance, Dunn and Holtz-Eakin (2000) find that young men’s own financial assets exert a statistically significant, but quantitatively modest, effect on the transition to self-employment. In contrast, the capital of parents exerts a large influence. Parents’ strongest influence runs not through financial means, but rather through human capital, which includes the intergenerational correlation in self-employment. Moreover, Hurst and Lusardi (2004) point out that the relationship between wealth and entry into entrepreneurship is essentially flat over the majority of the wealth distribution. The positive correlation only appears at the top of the wealth distribution. Hurst and Lusardi (2008) also argue that personal wealth has no effect on business survival.

In this discussion, it is noticeable that personal savings or personal wealth are assets that can easily become the financial capital of the entrepreneurship, but it does not have a significant impact on the motivation of the entrepreneurship or success rate of business. The situation might depend on what business types people want to start up. For microbusiness or self-employed, the
demands of financial capital can be satisfied from personal wealth. However, for those businesses that demanding huge financial capital, personal wealth and savings will be hard to meet the financial needs. Therefore, the founder needs to find other financial recourse to accomplish the needs.

(2) **Debt financing**

Debt financing means borrowing money from an outside source with the promise of paying back the borrowed amount, plus the agreed-upon interest, at a later date (Palermo, 2014). Traditionally, loans are one form of debt financing, such as loans offered by banks. Such loans are typically paid back in monthly installments and require a personal guaranty on the part of the borrower. Inventory, accounts receivable, equipment, real estate, and insurance policies can all be used as security on a bank loan. If the borrower can't pay back the loan, this collateral can be used to satisfy payment.

In fact, debt finance exists in every type of business. Berger and Udell (2009) find that the proportion of debt in the capital structure of small businesses in the U.S. is similar to the 50% overall proportion of debt in the capital structure of all U.S. businesses. Yet, the purpose of the debt finance is different between large firms and small business. For large firms, the majority of debt is in the form of trade instruments, such as commercial paper and public bond issues. In contrast, for small firms, the debt is non-traded, the purpose of which in small business is more related to the operational needs, such as manufacturing facilities and renting offices.

There are two main advantages of businesses choosing debt as their financial recourses. Palermo (2014) suggests that the first advantage of debt financing is that can be used to fund just about any kind of business. The business type can be either large firm or small business. The second advantage is that lenders don't have rights to involve in the business. With debt financing,
business owners enter into a relationship with lenders that ends as soon as the lender has been paid back.

On the other hand, the main disadvantage of the debt finance is businesses that are strapped for cash will have to spend a sizable portion of their monthly revenues repaying the money they borrowed from lenders. Once the business is in the situation of serious deficit, debt finance can become a main factor for the bankruptcy of the business.

Debt finance is critical for entrepreneurship, as how to manage debt finance is a key issue for the entrepreneur and the enterprise survival (Berger & Udell, 1998). In fact, the capability of debt management is related to the founder’s human capital. Therefore, if the founder lacks chances and opportunities to learn the skills of debt management, the debt can be an unstable or dangerous factor for the entrepreneur.

(3) **Equity financing**

Equity financing means raising capital by selling shares of a business to investors. Compared with debt financing, the capital raised through equity financing isn't paid back in monthly installments with interest. Instead, investors put money into a business and become partial owners of that business. They are then entitled to a share of the business's profits over time. Basically, the most common source of equity for small business owners is friends and family (Palermo, 2014). Therefore, if the funder lacks social relationships with friends, family members and communities, equity financing will be a difficult resource for the entrepreneurs to obtain.

The main advantage of equity financing is that equity eliminates the disadvantages of debt in that it does not divert capital from the business in order to pay down debt, and it also shares in the business risk along with the entrepreneurs. Moreover, another advantage for using
equity to fund a business is that the individual does not have to pay investors back right away. Therefore, Audretsch and Lehmann (2004) indicate that small business owners are more likely to be financed by venture capitalist instead of banks, because the founder has more time to focus on the business instead of raising money to pay back the debt. Bertoni, Colombo, and Grilli (2008) also find that external private equity financing spurs growth of firms. Conversely, only weak evidence is provided that firm’s growth leads to a greater likelihood of obtaining access to private equity financing. As a result, if a business founder can seek external investors who are willing to become the shareholder of the firm, benefit not only financial capital, but also the growth of the company.

The main disadvantage of the equity finance is that equity investors actually own a percentage of the business in which they invest (Palermo, 2014). Therefore, if the business owner gives up too much of an equity stake (more than 49%) in his or her business, he or she can quickly lose control of the business. Moreover, when an individual with large equities of the business, she or he will have rights to involve and offer opinions in the operations of business. These kinds of situations will easily become an issue of operation rights struggle, which can damage the benefits of the business profoundly.

(4) **Section summary**

The decision of financial resources between personal savings, equity and debt financing will ultimately come down to the kind of business that people want to start. Mostly, personal savings and wealth is a suitable financial capital when the individual wants to become self-employed or start up a small business. However, when the owner wants to expand the businesses that are like those in the retail and manufacturing sectors, the founder prefers debt financing to start or build a business. In contrast, if the founders are in the business that has
rapidly growth potential, they prefer equity finance to debt finance. Yet when discussing the issues of what barriers block people to seek financial capital, the issues actually involve beyond wealth, debt and equity, since social capital and human capital should be included into consideration. For instance, when people seek debt financing for entrepreneurship, the capacity of debt management (human capital) is a major consideration for lenders. Moreover, social capital also has great influence when entrepreneurs intend to seek outside investor. Therefore, it can be concluded that the lack of financial capital essentially might be resulted from people’s lack of suitable human capital and social capital. In the later discussion, I will provide more evidence to support this point and connect these points with entrepreneurs with disabilities.

D. **Barriers of Acquiring Financial Capital**

In the previous section, the financial capital of entrepreneurship could be divided into three main parts: personal savings, debt, and equity. Moreover, each different type of business prefers different types of financial resources depending on their specific situations. For instance, self-employed prefers personal savings as the main financial capital, instead of debt and equity financing. In this chapter, I apply the perspective from the previous chapters that people with disabilities confront different structural and culture barriers when acquiring financial capital compared with people without disabilities. Therefore, in this chapter, I focus on what specific barriers people with disabilities face in acquiring financial capital. The analysis will be based on three main resources of financial capital, which are the barriers of acquiring personal savings, the barriers of seeking debt financing, and the barriers of seeking equity financing.

(1) **Barriers of acquiring personal savings**

Personal wealth is considered the most accessible financial resource when people start up their business. Mostly, people accumulate their wealth based on their job salary.
Therefore, if an individual experiences challenges when accessing the labor market, they will have difficulties in accumulating personal wealth. In 2010 the World Bank estimated that 20% of people living on or below the poverty line in developing countries are disabled. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics also reported that only 17.6% of persons with a disability were employed in 2013. In contrast, the employment-population ratio for those without a disability was 64%. Moreover, according to the information from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the rate of people with disability being part-time workers in 2013 was higher than people without disabilities (33.7% vs. 22.9%).

Furthermore, workers with disabilities who have at least a high school education earn 37% less on average than their peers without disabilities. The statistics clearly showed that people with disabilities find it difficult to accumulate wealth, because they experience significant barriers in the labor market, and when employed, do not receive an equal salary compared with people without disabilities. Although non-discriminatory compensation is protected through the Civil Rights, Americans with Disabilities, and Rehabilitation Acts, the results show that earning inequalities are still gaping (Diament, 2015).

The issue of poverty actually is a result of many different factors. Hartley and Coleridge (2006) indicate that poverty is best understood as a complex matrix of social exclusion that extends beyond income to encompass access to education, employment, housing, transport and the built environment, leisure, family life, and social relationships. In the previous chapters I discussed the barriers that impact people with disabilities in acquiring human capital (e.g., education) and social capital (e.g., social relationship). The employment policy of people with disabilities will be emphasized in this chapter. Furthermore, I will discuss some main employment policies related to people with disabilities in the U.S. in order to reveal the
structural barriers and cultural barriers, which hinder people with disabilities to accumulate wealth and start up their business.

According to the report from Illinois Employment First Summit 2012, the barriers that affect people with disabilities to be employed can be divided into two parts: the barriers of systemic culture change and uncompleted employment policy. Firstly, the barriers of systemic culture change is a fundamental factor that represents a shift in the culture surrounding people with disabilities, their abilities, and their role in the community. The purpose of systemic culture change is that individuals with disabilities are not meant to be “cared for” or “fixed,” but are to be supported to live independent lives in the community. As a result, ongoing and continuous examples of individuals with disabilities working successfully in the workplace are critical in creating this fundamental shift in mindset.

In the society of neoliberalism, participation in the labor market in order to meet people’s needs is considered essential. In response to growing disability benefit enrollment and continued low labor market participation rates of people with disabilities, Congress enacted the Ticket to Work and Workforce Incentives Improvement Act (TTW) in 1999 (Thornton & O’Leary, 2007). The purpose of TTW is to provide people with disabilities more opportunities to participate in employment; to reduce disincentives and to employment; and to increase financial well-being while simultaneously decreasing dependence on welfare benefits. In fact, TTW was a good example to reveal the structural of disability benefits and how the policy decreases the motivation of people with disabilities to be employed. For instance, TTW is related to the policy of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Social Security Disability Income (SSDI). Generally, both of them are like safety nets for people with disabilities who lack necessary resources for living. Eligibility for both programs is based on medical assessments of a person’s
inability to engage in substantial gainful activity because of a physical or mental impairment. Wittenburg and Loprest (2007) point out the defect of the system and raise a question “how do you provide return-to-work services to a population of participants who must show a permanent inability to work at the time of application to qualify for benefits?” (p.10). This situation is a paradox, because once people return to work, they must lose their social benefits from government. The policy lacks a transition plan to assist people with disabilities to move from social beneficial system to participation in labor market without confusion. Therefore, because people with disabilities lack equal opportunities to be employed and they also confront additional structural barriers (e.g., uncompleted employment policy), this situation might discourage their motivation for the employment as well as decreases the willingness of starting entrepreneurship.

(2) **Barriers of seeking debt financing**

Debt financing is another critical resource for entrepreneurship. Over 50% of entrepreneurs start up their business relying on debt financing. The resource of debt financing can be formal and informal. The informal debt financing means borrowing money via social relationship, such as friend, co-workers and families. Yet, most people with disabilities lack chances to develop their social relationship, and thus informal debt financing will be difficult for them to acquire in practice. In fact, the barriers of developing social capital were discussed in the previous chapter. Therefore, this chapter focuses on the issues of formal debt financing, which include debt finance from private sector and public program.

First, the operations of mortgage industry involve many professional knowledge and skill. In short, risk assessment is the core knowledge and skills of the industry. Burns (2002) indicates that risk assessment within institutions is used to determine the probability of a client failing to make repayments, hence helping decide the client base, and is an inherently
exclusionary approach, relying on some form of “discrimination” to operate. Basically, financial services have shown a shift from a more traditional, qualitative calculation of risk to an increasingly complex system of quantification (Leyshon, Thrift, & Pratt, 1998). Furthermore, for those using more traditional approaches of risk assessment to underwriting, manual processes are more commonly used with affordability calculations based on income multiples, which means looking at the loan amount against earnings. In contrast, the untraditional approach of risk assessment is that credit scoring is an automated underwriting process using ‘score cards’ (where client details are used to determine a score which informs the decision to lend) and often automated affordability models (which use an approach focused on individual budgets). Aalbers (2005) points out that both methods examine each case on an individual basis, but traditional methods offer more flexibility. Because the untraditional approach of risk assessment is considered as more objective than traditional approach, credit scoring becomes golden factors of risk assessments. Therefore, if people do not have good credit scores and work history, their credit scores will become negative and damages the possibilities of borrowing from private lenders.

Traditionally, once people have stable income and pay the bills on time, they usually will have good credits scores and be able to borrow money from banks. However, for those who have disabilities, the situation is more complex. The first issue is that some lenders do not consider state benefits as a stable income, even though these benefices are consist and stable flowing into individual’s bank account. In some industry perceptions and treatment of benefits, several lenders are willing to include state benefits if combined with employment income. Therefore, for people with disabilities, they not only need to show their stable income and good credit scores,
but also have be employed, which seems like an additional requirement of debt financing and can develop a potential discriminating situation.

Additionally, the mortgage industry concerns people with disabilities in different perspectives based on specific situation of people with disabilities. Some of their concerns were caused by worries that impairment might cause unemployment, which in turn impacts their ability to pay the debt. Such concerns demonstrate a lack of knowledge and understanding for people with disabilities. Hemingway (2010) interviews lenders about how they evaluate applicants with disabilities when they apply for loans. Many lenders assess entrepreneurs with disabilities based on their own personal bias and prejudices, and lack reliable evidence to support their ideas. This specific situation also becomes a potential culture and attitude barriers that prohibit people with disabilities from acquiring debt financing.

Furthermore, the public program is another critical resource for entrepreneurs with disabilities to apply. However, systematic environmental barriers also appear in public programs. These programs include, but are not limited to, Plan for Achieving Self-Support (PASS), community economic development funding, and Individual Development Accounts (IDAs). Parker Harris et al. (2013) indicate that PASS program only works for individuals who have enough money at the beginning to put towards it. IDA program focuses on spending resource in secondary education and home ownerships. A matching funds program, individuals who start an account receive either a dollar-for-dollar match or a two-for-one match. However, raising the capitals to start the account can pose a barrier for some entrepreneurs with disabilities due to the defects of social benefic system. These public programs become unavailable resources and are full of barriers that block entrepreneurs with disabilities to acquire.
Entrepreneurs with disabilities basically confront double barriers when seeking debt financing, which include systematic structural barriers and perception bias. Whether a person has a job or not is an important factor for seeking debt financing. Yet if the society is full of structural barriers (e.g., lack of accessible transportation or architecture) that block or discourage people with disabilities to get a job, this kind of risk assessment will automatically exclude entrepreneurs with disabilities to apply a loan. For the public program, uncompleted and contradictory social policies also further perpetuate the structural barriers that people with disabilities face in acquiring debt finance. According to the discussion in this chapter, entrepreneurs with disabilities confront the barriers that entrepreneurs without disabilities have to deal with, but also have to deal with additional barriers that those without disabilities do not need to deal with. This kind of systematic structural barrier impacts entrepreneurs with disabilities profoundly.

(3) **Barriers of seeking equity financing**

For more than four decades, the venture capital industry has played a quiet, yet crucial role in the development and expansion of successful ventures. Indeed, equity financing is a difficult topic for most entrepreneurs, because selling equities to the public or private shareholders involve lots professional knowledge and social relationships, which include the knowledge of business valuation, the skill of public relationship, the skill of presentation, and many other important factors. As a result, I will briefly discuss the process of acquiring equity financing especially in the file of business valuation, which is the initial and most crucial process for equity financing. Unfortunately, the relationship between entrepreneurs with disabilities and venture capital is still rarely discussed in the past decades. Yet, the topic of women business owners and equity financing has been studied for years. Women business owners as a class
oppressed by male-dominated society have difficulty acquiring venture capital especially in equity financing. This is the problem entrepreneurs with disabilities also confront in present. Therefore, I will consider the experience of women business owners as a reference to reflect the barrier that entrepreneurs with disabilities confront for acquiring equity financing.

Small businesses are usually controlled by few people, and shares of stock are not regularly traded on any exchange. Nevertheless, formal valuations are necessary because they provide objective evidence of value, in contrast to publicly traded companies where value is set by the markets on which they are traded. Nowicki, Lewis, and Lippitt (2005) find that the value of a business ultimately depends on the following factors: (1) magnitude and duration of future economic benefits, (2) risk associated with the future economic benefits, (3) marketability of the business, and (4) nature and extent of the contributions of the owner/manager(s) to the business. Indeed, the process involves multiple experts in the practice, such as financial experts, accountants, lawyers, and bankers. Mostly, the founders need to cooperate with these experts to determine the business valuation in order to raise capital from the market. Yet, because of social barriers and attitude barriers that I have discussed in previous chapters, equity financing become unreachable resources for entrepreneurs with disabilities.

Although there are few articles that focus on the relationship between entrepreneurs with disabilities and equity finance, research about women business owners as a group oppressed by male business owners/dominated society provides numerous experiences that can be references for entrepreneurs with disabilities to apply. Brush et al. (2002) conclude eight barriers and myths that restrict women business owners from seeking equity finance. One of these major barriers is similar to the experiences of people with disabilities. The most common barrier or myth for women business owners and entrepreneurs with disabilities is they are considered as a group of
lacking right educational background to build up growth business. Since 1920 female U.S. citizen had the equal rights in the politics as to men. Women’s holding high education degree is common today. Yet, attitudinal barriers and myth still block female business owners to acquire equity finance. For example, women applying for equity capital through the Springboard program reported significant human capital in terms of personal and team education levels. In fact, only 6% of the women applying had less than a bachelor’s degree. One third of the women applying to the program had bachelor’s degrees. But, the myth and barriers of female business owners who do not have enough business knowledge to build up a growth business is still shared in today’s society.

In the discussion of entrepreneurs with disabilities and equity finance, although there are only few academic articles related to the topic directly, the experience from female business owners leads the discussion at good starting points. Brush et al. (2002) suggest that society should encourage women to participate in the investment process (angels, corporate venture funds, and venture capital firms), because investment is also an activity that should practice and learn from mistakes. For entrepreneurs with disabilities, they need to address disability-specific issues (such as accommodations) and also social bias, which are invisible barriers that can prevent entrepreneurs with disabilities from acquiring capital.

E. **Chapter Conclusion**

In capitalism, employment means not only a job for living but also a certification that proves someone has the ability to live in the society. In this thesis, the lack of financial capital is considered the result of the individual lacking human capital and social capital. So, if individuals lack suitable education background, work experience, and social relationships, finding a job will
be very challenging for them. This result affects not only about accumulating wealth, but also blocks them from seeking debt finance and equity finance.

In this chapter, firstly I took two factors into consideration, personal wealth and employment. The reason was that most people accumulate their wealth through their job salary. Therefore, if people lack the chance to be employed, they will have difficulty accumulating their wealth as well, which might end up decreasing the motivation of starting up a business (Parker Harris et al., 2014). The factor of employment plays a critical role in the mortgage industry. For instance, a person with a job indicates the ability of paying back and the possibility of securing loans. Therefore, if structural barriers and attitudinal barriers block people with disabilities to be employed, people with disabilities will be automatically excluded from the mortgage industry as well. This impact is huge for entrepreneurs with disabilities, because over 50% of the business owners acquire funds from mortgage industry to expand or modify their business. Thus, a lack of funding supports from mortgage industry can fundamentally decrease the possibility of expending the business.

Moreover, the uncompleted and contradictory policies of people with disabilities are also a critical barrier for acquiring financial capital. In this chapter I discussed some important employment policy and public program, which include PASS and TTW, to indicate how contradictory policies block entrepreneurs with disabilities to acquire financial capital. I think the fragmentary and contradictory policies can be regarded as a conflict between social welfare system and capitalism in the society. The evidence is these policies usually intend to provide return-to-work services to a population of participants who must show a permanent inability to work at the time of application to qualify for benefits. Furthermore, the root of these contradictory policies is that the society still questions whether people with disabilities have the
ability to fully participate in the capitalism society. Mostly, these people confront a situation of nothing or all, because they can either maintain the benefit from the welfare system or lose social benefits due to employment. In fact, lack of thoughtful transitions plans for people with disabilities who intend to move from social welfare system to labor markets is one of the major reasons why the application rate of these policies are lower than expected. The fragmentary and contradictory policies block those who need supports but hard to acquire public resources. As a result, in order to assist people with disabilities to fully participate in the society and support entrepreneurs with disabilities to start up business, reviewing these policies to reform transition plans are necessary in the society.

The relationship between equity finance and entrepreneurs with disabilities seems like an unexplored area. Yet reviewing some findings from the topic of female business owners and equity finance, I found that female business owners also confront some kind of attitudinal barriers that prohibit them from seeking equity finance. Compared with entrepreneurs with disabilities, the situation and levels of attitudinal barriers may be different, but the experiences and related studies of female business owners can be good references for our further research in the topic of entrepreneurs with disabilities and equity finance.

Lastly, in terms of financial capital, social entrepreneurship, and disabilities, these three concepts are still disconnected from the society and instead when thinking about people with disabilities, poverty might be one of the top words connected to people with disabilities most frequently. For sure, because of their physical or mental impairments, they have difficulty acquiring human capital and social capital, which also affects them to accumulate their wealth as well as seek financial supports from others. However, when considering people with disabilities as a class oppressed by people without disabilities, the influence of structural barriers of the
society on people with disabilities acquiring capitals can also be investigated. Moreover, although empirical evidences have shown that self-employed and small business program can be job options for people with disabilities, topics in relation to social entrepreneurship and prospective entrepreneurs with disabilities still lack research support (Parker Harris, 2014). Therefore, if the policy makers are aware that social entrepreneurship is another work pathway for people with disabilities, these employment policies and public program should be included into consideration in order to reform the new employment policy to support prospective entrepreneurs with disabilities to start up business.
VI. CONCLUSION

People who have experienced social-based forms of oppression are well-placed to recognize that the system itself is the source of many of their difficulties (Charlton, 1998). Those with a long history of oppression have also experienced a lengthy period of exclusion from society. Through the activities of disability movements and their advocates, people with disabilities begin to realize that poverty, unemployment, and low education result not only from individual limitations but from systematic social barriers that prevent disadvantaged groups from fully participating in society and living independently.

Social entrepreneurship is an approach to disability-related issues that has received increasing attention (Caldwell, 2014). It offers an alternative to the charity model, such as sheltered workshops that segregate people with disabilities from the wider society, which can include people with and without disabilities in its operation (Parker Harris, 2014). Research has indicated that people with disabilities who have experienced oppression are interested in participating in social entrepreneurship. Moreover, people with disabilities who have started up a commercial or social organization are more willing than those without disability to include others with disabilities in their enterprises (Caldwell, 2014).

In the present study, human capital, social capital, and financial capital were considered as the three main resources that need to be acquired in preparation for starting up a social entrepreneurial or commercial enterprise. All prospective entrepreneurs confront the same start-up issues relating to these three forms of capital. The study’s findings, however, showed that the barriers to acquiring capital are different for entrepreneurs with and without disabilities.

For entrepreneurs without disabilities, these capital issues take the form of a multiple-choice scenario. For instance, when dealing with the barrier of lack of human capital, people
without disabilities have multiple options. The main concern for them is to choose the most appropriate or efficient approach to the acquisition of human capital (for instance, via the educational system or work experience). People with disabilities, however, usually confront a true-false question scenario. For instance, wheelchair users wishing to undertake a particular activity (such as attending an educational institution) first have to establish whether the venue is accessible or not. If it is inaccessible, they face exclusion.

The main research question addressed in this study was: What are the barriers that restrict the ability of people with disabilities to acquire human capital, social capital, and financial capital when starting up an enterprise? Initially, these barriers were considered separately in order to gain an accurate picture of specific barriers. In fact, however, the various barriers interact with each other within the context of conflicting social structural forces. People with disabilities face difficulties in acquiring these forms of capital not only because of individual limitations, but because the social structure itself resists their acquisition.

Human capital can be divided into general human capital and specific human capital. General human capital is associated with the formal educational system. Usually, the founder’s educational level influences her/his desire to invest in R&D, which will have a direct effect on the company’s capacity for innovation. Specific human capital, including leadership and management skills, is more related to the knowledge gained from informal education and experience.

In relation to the acquisition of human capital, the barriers confronting people with disabilities can be categorized as two main types: environmental and attitudinal barriers. Environmental barriers include inaccessible classrooms, transport, and buildings. The activities of disability movements have increased awareness of these barriers, which are gradually being
removed although many remain. The attitudinal barrier, however, is less widely recognized and continues to restrict the access of people with disabilities to human capital. Attitudinal barriers are associated with social bias toward people with disabilities. This study has shown that, even when people with disabilities are integrated into the classroom or workplace, they can still feel isolated and segregated from their peers. In fact, these attitudinal barriers reflect a long history of oppression and social stigma. For change to occur, greater attention must be given to educating the public that no one should be excluded from society on the basis of race, gender, or disability.

Policy improvement is another important consideration for future research. Although Acts such as ADA, IDEA and Ticket to Work (TTW) still confront many challenges, they have at least led many people to rethink their ideas and practices. In relation to educational and employment policy, the issues have shifted from questions about whether society should provide assistance for people with disabilities to questions about exactly what type of assistance is necessary for them to achieve the goal of full participation in society.

Social capital usually refers to social connections, which include family relationships, friendship, and relationships in the workplace. In this study, however, social capital was more closely associated with the acquisition of knowledge and information through social connections, which affects the ability of entrepreneurs to explore market needs and recognize market opportunities. The ability to recognize opportunity in particular is usually attributed to the “inspiration” of a particular individual, but this ignores the fact that inspiration is greatly influenced by prior knowledge and social connection. Before any conclusion can be reached about why people with disability are far less likely than those without disability to start up a business, it is important to establish whether people with disabilities have equal opportunity for social participation and access to appropriate information.
Social capital also plays an important role in the acquisition of human capital and financial capital in the start-up process. For instance, some entrepreneurs are able to start their business because of family support in the form of initial funding and voluntary labor. Therefore, these issues should not be considered separately. Rather, for people with disabilities, each form of capital influences the expression of the others.

In this study, connections between attitudinal barriers and the acquisition of bonding social capital, as well as between environmental barriers and bridging social capital have been illustrated. Both sets of barriers, however, directly and indirectly affect the ability of people with disabilities to acquire social capital. The relationships have been simplified only to emphasize the importance of the barriers they confront and to provide a guide for future research.

Although many such barriers remain, some positive changes have taken place. In relation to attitudinal barriers, society has become more inclusive of people with disabilities, and there is increasing acceptance of the view that if they are suitably accommodated, their performance and abilities are no different from those of people without disabilities.

In this study, the term “social capital” is used instead of “social relationship” because the concept of capital has wider implications for entrepreneurship. Indeed, social changes are transforming the stereotype of people with disabilities as fully dependent on others, and they are now seen as capable of living independently. Yet the concept of entrepreneurship embraces more than the idea of independence. It includes notions of creativity, recognition of opportunity, and the need for interdependent relationships with others. In relation to bridging social capital, an interdependent relationship is associated with the concept of a two-way exchange of information; that is, entrepreneurs with disabilities should not only attend commercial events in order to learn, but are also able to contribute meaningful information to others. While it is not always possible
to create such a vision or to pass relevant information on to others, the important point to emerge from this study is that all people can benefit from these ideas if they participate in entrepreneurship.

In a capitalist society, employment means more than simply having a job; it also signifies that a person has the ability to live in that society. I have argued that a lack of financial capital results from a lack of human and social capital. For individuals without appropriate education, work experience, and social relationships, finding a job will be problematic. Unemployment affects not only the ability to accumulate wealth, but also prevents people from seeking debt finance and equity finance.

The discussion of financial capital focused on two factors: personal wealth and employment. This is because most people accumulate wealth through their employment earnings. Lack of employment opportunities, therefore, limits the ability to accumulate wealth and might also negatively impact on motivation to start up a business. Employment also plays a critical role in the mortgage industry. Holding a job indicates that one has the ability to secure and repay a loan. If structural and attitudinal barriers block employment for people with disabilities, they will automatically be excluded from the mortgage industry. This has a huge impact on entrepreneurs with disabilities, since more than half of business owners acquire funds to expand or modify their enterprise through mortgages.

However, it can be argued that programs such as PASS and TTW that have been developed for people with disabilities form a critical barrier to the acquisition of financial capital because they are partial and contradictory. The absence of transition planning to assist entrepreneurs with disabilities to move from the social welfare system to the labor market is the main such barrier. This situation represents a conflict between social welfare and capitalism. The
intention of these programs is to provide return-to-work services for a population who must demonstrate a permanent inability to work at the time of application in order to qualify for benefits. At the same time, society still questions whether people with disabilities have the capacity to fully participate in the capitalist economy. Entrepreneurs with disabilities thus confront an all-or-nothing situation, since they can either choose to maintain their welfare benefits or to lose these benefits through participation in employment or entrepreneurship. In fact, the absence of suitable transition plans between social welfare and the labor market is one of the main reasons for the lower-than-expected application rate for these programs. Their fragmentary and contradictory nature blocks those who need support from accessing public resources. Clearly, review and reform, particularly in relations to transition planning, are necessary.

This study has emphasized the difference between social entrepreneurship and charity-based activities such as sheltered workshops for people with disabilities. Social entrepreneurship offers job opportunities that can be equal in value to other forms of work participation such as self-employment, commercial entrepreneurship, and employment (Caldwell, 2014). Indeed, given the shared experience of oppression, social entrepreneurship might provide a more effective means of participating in the labor market than other types of employment.

This study has demonstrated that social structural barriers prevent people with disabilities from acquiring human capital, social capital, and financial capital. As a result, although they might be able to “overcome” their limitations or differences through effort or accommodation, they can still be excluded from capitalist society. The removal of social structural barriers should depend not only on individual effort but also on social consensus and policy support. While government has invested in pilot programs to demonstrate that self-employment can be
successful for people with disabilities, one of the key findings of this research is the need for further investment specific to social entrepreneurship. Policy makers need to acknowledge people with disabilities as an oppressed group and to recognize that many of their policies reflect widespread prejudice and stereotypes of people with disabilities.

In this thesis, when the systematic literature review being conducted, the multiple barriers of entrepreneurs with disabilities reflect a need for future research to present examples of successful social entrepreneurs with disabilities. Such positive examples not only provide guidance for prospective entrepreneurs with disabilities, but also present the public with empirical evidence that social entrepreneurship can be a job option for people with disabilities (Parker Harris et al., 2014).
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Frequency of Provision of Different Types of Educational Supports


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Support</th>
<th>Not offered</th>
<th>Offered less than 25% of the time</th>
<th>Offered 25–50% of the time</th>
<th>Offered 51–75% of the time</th>
<th>Offered more than 75% of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer orientation programs for students with disabilities</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority registration/course scheduling</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class relocation</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing accommodations</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability-specific scholarships</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability-specific assessment/evaluation</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports for study abroad</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning center laboratory</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special learning strategies</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental/remedial instruction</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal counseling</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible transport on campus</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretor/translator</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notetakers/scribes/readers</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-time captioning</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive technology evaluations for students</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training on equipment/software</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment or software provision (loan/lease/purchase)</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT supports across campus</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive furniture</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document conversion</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study skills</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory skills</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-cognitive strategies</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational and time management skills</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-advocacy skills</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/vocational assessment and counseling</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience or work-study opportunities</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships/externships</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement services</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate transfer of supports to the work setting</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B

Summary Table of Systematic Literature Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>List of articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **The Definition of Human Capital** | 1. Human capital  
2. Definition  
3. Theory  
4. Entrepreneurship  
| **The Forms of Human Capital** | 1. Human capital  
2. Dimensions  
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|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental barriers of acquiring general human capital</th>
<th>1. Education 2. Barriers 3. Student with disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Education 2. Barriers 3. Student with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Russell, M., & Malhotra, R. (2009). Capitalism and...
### Appendix B (continued)

|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
### Appendix B (continued)

| Environmental barriers of acquiring specific human capital | 1. Disabilities  
2. Employment  
3. Barriers  
4. Job/Work  
5. Environment  
### Appendix B (continued)

| Attitude barriers of acquiring specific human capital | 1. Disability  
2. Employment  
3. Barriers  
4. Job/Work  
5. Attitude  
Appendix B (continued)

**Topic: Social Capital**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>List of articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Definition of Social Capital and The Types of Social Capital | 1. Social capital  
2. Definition  
3. Forms  
4. Social network  
5. Theory  
|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
### Appendix B (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Decision/Choice</td>
<td>urther references can be found at the end of this document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** Further references can be found at the end of this document.
## Appendix B (continued)

| Barriers of Acquiring Bridging Social Capital | 1. Disability  
2. Barriers  
3. Social capital  
4. Entrepreneurship  
5. Small business  
6. Employment  
7. Exclusion  
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|---|
**Appendix B (continued)**

**Topic: Financial Capital**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>List of articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Forms/Types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B (continued)

| Barriers of Acquiring Personal Savings | 1. Disability  
2. Entrepreneurship  
3. Small business  
4. Employment  
5. Savings  
6. Barrier  
7. Start up |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
## Appendix B (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers of Acquiring Debt Finance</th>
<th>1. Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Start up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers of Acquiring Equity Finance</td>
<td>1. Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Start up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Objective:
Improving lives of people with disabilities by inclusion in the community and by participation in cultural life, particularly in music and the arts.

Education:
- **Master of Arts in Disability and Human Development**, June 2012-Current
  Graduate Institute of Applied Health
  University of Illinois at Chicago, Illinois, USA
  Overall GPA: 3.75/4.00

- **Master of Arts in Futures Studies, June 2007**
  Graduate Institute of Futures Studies
  Tam Kang University, Tamsui, Taiwan
  Overall GPA: 4.00/4.00

- **Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering and Management**, June 2002
  St. John’s University, Taipei, Taiwan

- **Associate Degree in Industrial Engineering and Management**, June 2000
  St. John's & St. Mary's Institute of Technology (Five-Year Junior College), Taipei, Taiwan
  Overall GPA: 3.07/4.00

Disability-Related Experience:

**Professional Performer and Volunteer Worker** 2014-present
Bodies of work  Access Living, Chicago, IL
- Performed my own songs in Bodies of Work
- Assisted in labor works for Bodies of work’s events

**Professional Volunteer Worker** 2009-present
Taiwan Retinitis Pigmentosa Association  Taichung, Taiwan
- Providing professional technical, musical support and vocal guidance to the chorus
- Wrote, composed, and produced the anthem of the association
- Performing in all kinds of communities, including disability community

**Course Work** 2014
Community Integration  DHD, UIC
- Focuses on historical and contemporary issues pertaining to the empowerment and integration of persons with developmental disabilities into community settings
- Learned about bills of long term service and support, focusing on developmental disabilities

**Course Work** 2014
Exploring the Promise of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990  DHD, UIC
- Learned about ADA of 1990
- Wrote a project on violations of ADA of 1990 in our daily life
Research Experience:

**Graduate Student Researcher**

October 2006-October 2007

International Conference of Futures Studies, TamKang University, Tamsui, Taiwan

- Participated in research team investigating trends of recreational and entertainment industries in Taiwan
- Conducted qualitative research and quantitative studies by doing in-depth interviews and surveys
- Prepared and maintained research materials and records; managed data collection and ran data analyses with software SPSS and Microsoft Office Excel
- Reviewed literature and composed manuscripts for conference presentation
- Oral presentation in World Conference of Futures Studies, Tamsui, Taiwan (2006)
- Assisted to arrange the International Conference of Futures Studies, Tamsui, Taiwan (2006, 2007)

**Graduate Student Intern**

October 2006-October 2007

Institute for Information Industry, Dept of Digital Education and Applications, Taipei, Taiwan

- Conducted interviews with the head companies of digital music industry
- Proposed ideas for Digital Music Trends Exposition
- Event-planned and held Digital Music Trends Exposition, Taipei, Taiwan (2007)

**Project Manager**

June 2002

Undergraduate Symposium, St. John’s University, Taipei, Taiwan

- Led and organized the team on research project “Creation of automation graphic control system”
- Won the third place award

**Project Manager**

September 1999-June 2000

Graduation Project, Dept of Industrial Engineering and Management, Taipei, Taiwan

- Led the team from generating ideas, executing project to final presentations
- Organized and participated in weekly meeting
- Won the final championship from graduation projects contest
- Selected as graduate representative and gave speech on the graduation ceremony
- Got directly admitted to St. John’s University due to excellent performance on the graduation project contest

Work Experience:

**Founder and CEO**

2008-present

Geng-Yuan Integrated Marketing and Communication Corporation, Taipei, Taiwan

- Created the company in 2008 with Yung-Tsen Chen
- Lead and organize the company
- Creatively design and organize cultural and artistic activities, exhibitions, and performances
• Cooperate with Taiwan government to hold large-scale activities or exhibitions, such as Heng-Chun International Folk Song & Music Festival, for two consecutive years (2010-2012)

**Significant Extracurricular Activities:**

**Music Artist/ Singer-songwriter** 1997-2011

Sony Music, Universal Music, and Street Performance  
Taipei, Taiwan  
- Individual Extended Play album was released by Sony Music (1998)  
- Music produce assistant in Sony Music, had composed and songwriting for many singers (2000-2002)  
- Contracted singer-songwriter at Universal Music Taiwan, and my self-creation music album was released in 2007 (2007-2010)  
- Street performing (singing and guitar playing) to share the music I love with as many people as possible (2004-2011)

**Student Association Leader** 1995-2002  
St. John’s University  
Taipei, Taiwan  
- Vice President of Guitar Club (1996-2000): I was responsible for teaching part of the advanced guitar classes and play-and-sing classes. I also collaborated with other musical clubs to organize and hold singing contest for college students  
- Elected as student councilor to serve all the students and proposed students rights (2001-2002)  
- Elected as graduate representative and gave speech on the graduation ceremony (2002)

**Publications:**

**Hsu, C. C.** A Study on Intention of Digital Musical Industry in Taiwan, graduate thesis, Tamkang University (2007)

**Skills:**  
- Proficient in Microsoft Office, SPSS, and audio recording and editing software  
- Fluent speaker of Mandarin Chinese, Taiwanese, and moderate in English

**Honors and Awards:**

- **Scholarship for overseas graduate study,** Ministry of Education, Taiwan 2013-2016  
- **U-Start entrepreneurial start-up grant,** Ministry of Education, Taiwan 2008-2009  
- **Top 10 Street Performer in Taiwan** 2008  
- **Third Place Award** and “**Best Presenter**” Award, Undergraduate Symposium 2002  
- “**Best Proposer**” Award and **Final Championship**, Graduation Projects Contest 2000  
- **First Place Award**, National singer-songwriter contest 1998  
- **Individual and Group First Place Awards**, Guitar Playing and Singing Contest 1996, 1997

**Licensure:** Licensed street performer of Taipei City and New Taipei City, Taiwan