ISTR International Society for Third-Sector Research
Voluntas (2013) 24:1071–1090
DOI 10.1007/s11266-012-9301-1
ORIGINAL PAPER

Social Entrepreneurship: Action Grounded in Needs, Opportunities and/or Perceived Necessities?

Malin Gawell

Published online: 9 June 2012

Abstract The interest in social and/or societal entrepreneurship has increased rapidly during the past decade. Yet, the field is still young and fragmented and its heritage includes tensions and shortcomings. The theories grounded in entrepreneurship research tend to address the entrepreneurial ventures' ability to recognise, explore and/or exploit *opportunities*. Other research argues instead that social entrepreneurial ventures respond to *needs* in society. However, none of these lines of research extensively problematise the issues of opportunities and needs. Furthermore, the discussion in this paper is related to a third concept, *perceived necessities*, as a suggestion to nuance our understanding of social entrepreneurship. The analysis in this paper is based on four social entrepreneurship cases.

Résumé L'intérêt pour l'entrepreneuriat social et/ou sociétal s'est rapidement accru au cours de la dernière décennie. Pourtant, le domaine est encore récent et fragmenté, et son héritage comporte des tensions et des carences. Les théories fondées sur la recherche en matière d'entrepreneuriat tendent à traiter de la capacité des initiatives entrepreneuriales à reconnaître, explorer et/ou exploiter les opportunités. Une autre recherche postule au contraire que les initiatives entrepreneuriales sociales répondent à des besoins dans la société. Cependant, aucune de ces lignes de recherche ne pose de problématique élargie concernant les questions d'opportunités et de besoins. En outre, la discussion dans cet article est afférente à un troisième concept, à savoir les nécessités perçues, en tant que suggestion pour apporter une nuance relativement à notre compréhension de l'entrepreneuriat social. L'analyse dans cet article se fonde sur quatre cas d'entrepreneuriat social.

M. Gawell (✉)
Entrepreneurship and Small Business Research Institute (ESBRI), Saltmätargatan 9, 113 59 Stockholm, Sweden
e-mail: malin.gawell@esbri.se

Zusammenfassung Das Interesse an sozialer bzw. gesellschaftlicher Unternehmerschaft ist im Laufe des vergangenen Jahrzents stark gewachsen. Trotzdem ist dieser Bereich noch neu und fragmentiert und zeichnet sich durch Spannungen und Mängel aus. Die Theorien aus der Forschung zur Unternehmerschaft beschäftigen sich häufig mit der Fähigkeit der Unternehmen, Gelegenheiten zu erkennen, zu erforschen und zu nutzen. Andere Studien behaupten hingegen, dass soziale Unternehmen auf gesellschaftliche Bedürfnisse eingehen. Allerdings problematisiert keine dieser Forschungen eingehend die Aspekte Gelegenheiten und Bedürfnisse. Zudem bezieht sich die Diskussion in dem vorliegenden Beitrag auf ein drittes Konzept, die wahrgenommenen Bedürfnisse, als eine Anregung, unser Verständnis von der sozialen Unternehmerschaft abzustufen. Die Analyse in diesem Beitrag beruht auf vier Beispiele sozialer Unternehmerschaft.

Resumen El interés en el espíritu emprendedor social y/o societal ha aumentado rápidamente durante la última década. Sin embargo, el campo sigue siendo joven y se encuentra fragmentado y su herencia incluye tensiones y deficiencias. Las teorías basadas en la investigación sobre el espíritu emprendedor tienden a abordar la capacidad de las aventuras emprendedoras para reconocer, explorar y/o explotar oportunidades. Otras investigaciones argumentan, en cambio, que las aventuras emprendedoras sociales responden a las necesidades de la sociedad. Sin embargo, ninguna de estas líneas de investigación problematiza extensamente las cuestiones de las oportunidades y necesidades. Asimismo, la discusión del presente documento se refiere a un tercer concepto, las necesidades percibidas, como una sugerencia para proporcionar un matiz a nuestra comprensión del espíritu emprendedor social. El análisis del presente documento se basa en cuatro casos de espíritu emprendedor.

Keywords Social entrepreneurship · Activist entrepreneurship · Opportunities · Perceived necessities · Civil society

Introduction

During the last decade, we have seen an increased interest in issues related to social or societal entrepreneurship and social enterprises (Leadbeater 1997; Dees 2001; Borzaga and Defourny 2001; Mair et al. 2006; Nicholls 2006; Perrini 2006; Borzaga et al. 2008; Gawell et al. 2009). The increased interest, combined with the fact that we are at an early phase in the emergence of this field, means that there is a fragmented understanding of these fields based on slightly different assumptions, theoretical and conceptual approaches as well as different methodological and empirical grounds. The theories grounded in entrepreneurship research tend to focus on the ability of entrepreneurial ventures to recognise, explore and/or exploit opportunities (Gartner et al. 2003; Mair 2006; Robinson 2006) while research on social entrepreneurship instead argues that the phenomena represents ventures or individuals responding to needs in society (Dees 2001).

But the issue of what needs are addressed—and what needs are not addressed—is not extensively elaborated within the emerging field of social entrepreneurship (Gawell 2006, 2008). Neither is the relationship between people's engagement in different entrepreneurial ventures and the specific needs in question. Through a problematisation of the relationship between needs and entrepreneurial action, it has been suggested that another conceptualisation, *perceived necessities*, contributes to the understanding of social entrepreneurial action (Gawell 2006). Perceived necessities can be more or less grounded in a thorough analysis of needs, but they are first and foremost related to the perceptions that drive the individual's action and engagement in social entrepreneurship.

The aim of this paper is to further the understanding of social entrepreneurship's relationship with needs, opportunities and perceived necessities. The study is guided by the question: In what way is social entrepreneurial action grounded in opportunities, needs and/or perceived necessities?

First, in this paper, a review of the field is presented. Second, a methodological account is provided. Then, the analysed cases are described. Last, there follows an analysis and a discussion of the results.

Social Entrepreneurship: A Concept with a Combined Heritage

The field of social entrepreneurship has emerged rapidly during the last decade and is rooted both in entrepreneurship research, research on civil society as well as in behavioural and organisational studies. Some of these theoretical roots form coherent frameworks that share ontological and epistemological approaches. Other roots are characterised by tensions and, at times, even contradictions. Assumptions, normative positions and empirical settings influence the studies in the emerging, and still fragmented, field in different ways. The tension between the dominating economic embeddedness of the field of entrepreneurship and the social and/or common aims addressed in the field of social entrepreneurship is one such example. The ideas of participatory organisational models that are embedded in democratic ideals versus the business-like models governed by owners and investors are another example.

The following review is based on a conceptual framework that draws from both entrepreneurship and civil society theories. More specifically, entrepreneurial action, viewed as a social process of organising in an early or dynamic entrepreneurial phase (Hjorth et al. 2003; Steyaert and Hjorth 2006) integrates the individual as well as the collective processes that construct reality (Weick 1979, 1995). The focus on social entrepreneurship then relates the entrepreneurial process to the field of non-profit organisations and civil society where the aspects of social issues are related to organisational initiatives in the form of non-profit organisations (Salamon 1996; Wijkström and Lundström 2002; Annheier 2005), social movements (Melucci 1991; Della Porta and Diani 1999) or other notions of civil society (Ehrenberg 1999; Amnå 2005). The aim of this approach is to facilitate the development of the studies of social entrepreneurship beyond the assumptions and 'logic' in one or the other field of research.

The following review elaborates on the issue of how opportunities and needs are addressed in the diverse heritage of social entrepreneurship literature. This review is followed by a discussion of how needs and different related concepts are addressed in this emerging field. Then, the perceived necessities concept is introduced and elaborated on. Finally in this section, the research question that was initially articulated is further developed.

Entrepreneurship Theory with a Focus on Opportunities

Discussions relating to innovation and opportunities are, along with aspects of organisation creation and management in entrepreneurial phases, pivotal dimensions that are addressed in the entrepreneurship literature (e.g. Sexton and Landström 2000). Schumpter's commonly used definition of entrepreneurship as (1) the introduction of a new good, (2) the introduction of a new method of production, (3) the opening of a new market, (4) the conquest of a new source for the supply of raw material, and (5) the creation of a new organisation within an industry implies opportunities, or at least possibilities, of some kind, although these opportunities are not explicitly elaborated on (see Schumpeter 1934).

According to Schumpeter, all truly important changes in the economy have been set off by entrepreneurs; then the changes have worked themselves through the economic system as business cycles. Entrepreneurship sets off these changes not only by adding smoothly to the economy, but also by challenging the established equilibrium in the competition for resources and demand in what he called *creative destruction* (Schumpeter 1934). This rather radical view on entrepreneurship, and what could be understood as opportunities, is related to a struggle over resources and demand as inventions are taken to the point of becoming innovations. Schumpeter's arguments, which are fundamental for the construction of the phenomenon that we call entrepreneurship, are highly relevant in the current development of social entrepreneurship theories. For as Schumpeter explicitly argued—the dynamics of bringing new ideas into action in all social phenomena, such as art and politics, could be conceptualised as entrepreneurship (Swedberg 2000).

Kirzner, however, describes entrepreneurs as active and creative organisers with the explicit ability to spot profit. But entrepreneurship does not, according to Kirzner, change the economic equilibrium. Instead, entrepreneurship uses imbalances as opportunities and, through entrepreneurial operation, entrepreneurship restores equilibrium (Kirzner 1973). In 1997, this discussion on opportunities was re-intensified by Venkataraman's suggestion that the field of entrepreneurship should be defined as 'the scholarly examination of how, by whom, and with what effects opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered, evaluated, and exploited'. The opportunities are, according to Shane and Venkataraman (2000), objective phenomena that are not known to all at all times. Shane later presented 'a general theory of entrepreneurship' as 'the individual-opportunity nexus', arguing that entrepreneurship research should be positioned with a focus on opportunity recognition and exploitation by individuals (Shane 2003).

This view on opportunities has, however, been criticised because it views opportunities as objective phenomenon. Gartner, Carter and Hill argue that

opportunities should be viewed as 'favourable events' that are enacted as opportunities and conceptualised through the topics on entrepreneurship (Gartner et al. 2003). Drawing from pragmatism and from the social psychology of organising, Sarasvathy et al. (2003), overarched this discussion by suggesting a creative view on opportunities with reference to Sarasvathy's argument (2001) that opportunities do not pre-exist but are created in a dynamic process of interaction between different stakeholders.

These different views of entrepreneurship and their explicit or implicit discussions on opportunities demonstrate the focus on opportunity in entrepreneurship theory and the significant contributions to this particular discussion. These discussions are embedded in an economic discourse and therefore connected to the demand of customers or the potential demands of society in general terms. It should then here be noted that demand in economic terms consists of both the ability and the willingness to pay, which can be quite different for social needs or the other types of requests being addressed when entrepreneurship is contextualised in the social and/or societal spheres.

The Emerging Field of Social and Societal Entrepreneurship

The emergence of the field of social entrepreneurship has, during the last decade, brought attention to the type of entrepreneurship that primarily addresses social issues and/or issues of a more general character that address development in society. Social entrepreneurship, as well as the overlapping conceptualisations of societal entrepreneurship and social enterprises, has spread rapidly (Leadbeater 1997; Dees 2001; Borzaga and Defourny 2001; Mair et al. 2006; Nicholls 2006; Perrini 2006; Borzaga et al. 2008; Gawell et al. 2009).

This emerging field has been, and still is to a large extent, dominated by an Anglo-American approach to businesses with a social purpose (Palmås 2000). However, social entrepreneurship contextualised in the non-profit spheres, both in theory and practice, has also been elaborated on (Hisrich et al. 1997; Gawell 2006). In a European context, this emerging field has been more influenced by the co-operative movement; although there are often references to social enterprises rather than social entrepreneurship, the issues of social entrepreneurship are also addressed (Borzaga and Defourny 2001; Borzaga et al. 2008).

The conceptualisation of societal entrepreneurship that has primarily emerged in the Nordic context is sometimes used synonymously with social entrepreneurship. However, because of differences in translations as well as contextual differences, there has been a hesitation to adopt the Anglo-American influenced discourse on social entrepreneurship because of certain tensions (Gawell et al. 2009). Of interest for the discussion in this paper are the tension between social entrepreneurship grounded in the tradition of philanthropy and charity on the one hand, and on the other hand, a context that is characterised by the idea of a public welfare society.

There is, furthermore, a tension between the dominant characteristics of the Swedish civil society, such as the ideas and norms of democratically organised popular mass movements with idealistic traits (Wijkström and Zimmer 2011), and the social entrepreneurship model(s), which are highly influenced by a group of

dominant actors (Nicholls 2010) that give prominence to business thinking and business models that show other characteristics. The tension relates to leadership culture, organisational structures, references/relationships with beneficiaries and also, although not so obviously, the aims of the social entrepreneurial ventures (see discussion below).

Opportunities are also addressed in this emerging field. According to Robinson, social entrepreneurial opportunities exist but are not seen by everyone (2006). He furthermore argues that the social market is highly influenced by social and institutional factors as barriers to market entry. These barriers are perceived by some people but not by others. Robinson therefore focuses on the cognitive and strategic navigation of social entrepreneurial venturing, which contributes to the understanding of how social entrepreneurs can adopt the business strategies of entrepreneurs and managers. In his arguments, the view and approach from the entrepreneurship literature are adopted and contribute to the understanding in this partly new context. His arguments are not, however, based on an extensive problematisation of the 'new' context and its different aspects of social relationships. Even if there are individual contributions towards opportunities related to social entrepreneurship (Mair 2006; Robinson 2006), the focus is more commonly on how these ventures respond to needs in society.

Social Entrepreneurship Addressing Needs and Perceived Necessities

For social entrepreneurs, the social mission is explicit and central (Dees 2001). Social entrepreneurs are generally defined as entrepreneurs that respond to the needs in society in different ways (Peredo and McLean 2006). However, the degree of the relationship between the social aims and the economic and/or other aims vary both in theory and practice, and therefore, our understanding of social entrepreneurship has to be nuanced and critically evaluated (Peredo and McLean 2006). The different issues addressed are first and foremost highlighted by cases such as fighting poverty, empowerment of vulnerable groups, providing health care or education for children in poor countries or organising shelters for the homeless. However, there is very seldom an analysis of which issues are addressed and which are not addressed.

The role of social entrepreneurship, in relation to these rather generally expressed needs, is basically related to two different concepts. One concept is social entrepreneurship's role in creating value for the common good. The other is to 'change the world'. At times, both of these arguments are used without differentiation. These two concepts can be connected to the earlier discussion with reference to Schumpter and Kirzner, where Schumpeter stresses the innovative aspects of entrepreneurship while Kirzner stresses the ability of entrepreneurship to act within systems. The latter facilitates the creation of value according to the system, while the innovative aspects are not necessary valued until a shift has occurred in the system and new criteria for value creation are set. In both of these approaches, it is possible to argue that social entrepreneurship responds to the needs of society in general terms. In the Kirzner-influenced approach, it is furthermore possible to link the arguments of value creation to the mobilisation of resources, which can become a useful opportunity for action. The Schumpter approach

challenges the discussion of both opportunities and needs because it is not limited to, but rather challenges, the overarching system (Swedberg 2000).

In addition to the discussion of opportunities, which is highly influenced by the discussions adopted from the field of 'business' entrepreneurship of the social entrepreneurs' response to needs in society, it has been suggested that the conceptualisation of *perceived necessities* can contribute to the understanding of social entrepreneurship engagement and action (Gawell 2006). The conceptualisation of *perceived necessities* refers to what has been expressed as a 'lack' of something or a conviction that some issues are so important that people engage, at times in new forms, to respond to what they perceive to be a need (Gawell 2006). These arguments are made on the same level of analysis as entrepreneurial engagement and action—that is, on the level of entrepreneurs. It can be, but does not have to be, based on an analysis of the needs of society in general. It is rather related to the perceived anomalies that individuals feel that they must act upon (Gawell 2006). These necessities are not automatically related to a personal lack or to the needs among the people who are involved in entrepreneurial action. In fact, many social entrepreneurs act for, or on behalf of, the groups that they perceive have certain needs.

Needs, Opportunities and/or Perceived Necessities?

Opportunities, needs and perceived necessities are addressed and elaborated on within the field of social entrepreneurship. These discussions are, however, highly fragmented and the relationship between these conceptualisations is seldom addressed other than in reference to the particular characteristics of social entrepreneurship (Dees 2001; Peredo and McLean 2006). The discussion of opportunities is highly embedded in a business/economic context. The discussions of needs are related to a more public discourse on 'doing good', which has not yet been critically problematised from a behavioural approach that either addresses the links between individual or group action or addresses the needs among the specific groups or society at large. The conceptualisation of perceived necessities is suggested as a complement to these discussions to further our understanding of social entrepreneurship. But in what way is social entrepreneurial action grounded in opportunities, in needs and/or necessities? And, how do these conceptualisations interrelate?

Methodology

Because of the phenomenon social entrepreneurship as such and because of the early phase of still fragmented theoretical development of the field this study is based on a qualitative analysis of four social entrepreneurship cases. Methodologically, the approach used in this study is related to the linguistic turn in social science and the development of a narrative approach in organisational and entrepreneurship theory (Czarniawska 1998, 2004; Steyaert and Bouwen 1997; Bjerke 2005). The point of departure is here that oral as well as documented

narratives express ideas and thoughts that are linked to action (Bruner 1990; Czarniawska 2004). These narratives are both in practice and in research constructed through social interaction (Weick 1979, 1995).

The four cases have been chosen through a process. It can be described as a purposive sampling (Neuendorf 2002) conducted step by step. The four cases, that all were initiated from the mid-1980s to the early 2000s in Sweden, are purposively chosen out of over 50 studied social entrepreneurship cases because they all specifically elaborated on and expressed different aspect relating to opportunities, needs and perceived necessities.

The cases furthermore varied in how they conceptualised their mission and they have taken different shapes regarding roles and organisational as well as funding structures. The variation in the cases represents diversity in the field of social entrepreneurship and brings dynamics to the study, even though it is not a representative selection of all of the potential cases in this emerging field.

The first case study of an entrepreneurial process for social change and an initiative for global justice was conducted in 2001–2006. The second case study focused on an entrepreneurial initiative for youth. The third case study analysed an entrepreneurial initiative run by former criminals aiming for a constructive return into society. The fourth case study focused on an entrepreneurial initiative for integrating the long-term unemployed into the labour market. In total, this study included 50 cases that could all be considered to be social entrepreneurial initiatives. The particular case that is included in this analysis was chosen because of the important aspects of this particular research question raised by the people interviewed. Furthermore, the case was initiated by people who, at that time, worked within the public sector, which could potentially contribute to a broader range of aspects than the other cases. The other three studies were conducted during the 2009–2011 period.

Between five and fifteen semi-structured interviews, which included space for open answers and comments generated by the respondent, were conducted in each case study. The interviews, each lasting between one and 2 h, were recorded and listened to again later, during analysis. Primarily, the people in leading positions were interviewed. The citations from these interviews have been translated here into English by the author. Complementary to these interviews, participatory observations of between five and thirty internal meetings or public events, either organised by the studied actors or where representatives of these actors participated, have been conducted. At the larger events, it would be more accurate to refer to observations. However, at these events, as well as during participation in meetings and smaller events, discussions and talks of a less formal character have generated additional empirical material. In this way, the participants who are not necessarily in leading positions have also been heard. During meetings or events with fewer participants, the participatory features have been more obvious. For instance, the introduction and attendance of a researcher at a morning meeting of approximately 10 persons with a background in drug abuse and criminality means that the researcher participates in the narratives expressed at the specific event. Informants, both in more structured interviews and informal talks, were informed of the conducted research. Finally, the empirical material includes an analysis of documents,

primarily generated by the entrepreneurial actors. These documents include pamphlets, books, websites, films, applications and reports to funders. To a certain extent, the documents also include reports, books and articles written by other actors with reference to the studied cases.

The narrative analysis such as presented in this paper is conducted through a systematic close reading as well as an interpretive based writing (Czarniawska 2004). This allows the influence of both empirically generated induction and theoretically generated deduction by alternating the questioning of both empirical material and theoretical reviews (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009). The close reading has been guided by the 'hermeneutic triad' (Hernadi 1987) first with a reconstruction or explication. Second, with an inferential detection or explanatory deconstruction examining how does the text express the message that equals the stance of a crucial or semiotic reader (Eco 1990). Third, the reading has partly been inspired by exploration, or as a reader to stand in for the author and partly construct the narrative based on a position. It has here been done through taking the standpoint presented by the other cases. This can also be related to what Czarniawska calls an interruptive interpretation (2004). This interpretive systematic methodological processing is, rather than coding, providing devices that allow connections between what is expressed, action and behaviour as well as between the specific and the whole. Finally the interpretive based writing constructs a representation, mimesis, relating both to the field of theory and the field of practice (Czarniawska 2004).

Opportunities, Needs and Perceived Necessities in Practice

In this section, opportunities, needs and perceived necessities in four social entrepreneurship cases are elaborated on. The cases relate to (1) global justice, (2) youth, (3) former criminals return to society, (4) the long-term unemployed.

An Entrepreneurial Initiative for Global Justice, 'Another World'

Initially, Attac began in France. In December 1997, Ignacio Ramonet, Chief Editor of *Le Monde Diplomatique*, wrote in an editorial: 'Why not set up a new worldwide non-governmental organisation, Action for a Tobin Tax to Assist the Citizen (ATTAC)? With the trade unions and the many social, cultural and ecological organisations, it could exert formidable pressure on governments to introduce this tax at last, in the name of universal solidarity' (www.attac.org and Ramonet 1997). The response was large, and in June 1998, the association Attac was founded in France by citizens, associations, trade unions and newspapers. During the first 2 years, the association had 25,000 paying members (www.attac.org). The idea of Attac spread to several other countries, but it was not set up as copy of the French organisation. In each country, a slightly different organisation was created, yet with the same overarching goals.

Some Swedish people reached out to Attac internationally and started a Swedish process with meetings to mobilise people from different interest groups. The response was huge, and more people than anyone expected turned up. Many of the

participants were young—which was remarkable at a time when established organisations and political parties complained that youth no longer engaged. There were close ties to the global justice movement, which attracted media attention through demonstrations during the WTO meetings in Seattle 1999, Prague 2000 and Gothenburg 2001 (Thörn 2002; Della Porta 2007). The organisation Attac Sweden was formally launched in Stockholm on 6 January 2001 as a 'political party independent network aiming for global justice and democracy' (www.attac.se). Attac appeared to meet an increased interest both in the issues at stake and in the new non-hierarchical ways of organising.

Within Attac Sweden, even from the start, there were explicit references to *opportunities*. At the launching, there was a banderol on stage saying 'Another world is possible'. In interviews, people referred to 'a golden opportunity'—but all in slightly different ways.

The expression 'a golden opportunity' was first articulated in relation to the worldwide political situation. It referred to the phrase 'a golden opportunity for structural change', developed by Abrahamsson as he analysed the current globalisation process (2001, 2002, 2003, author's translation). Abrahamsson had identified opportunities to 'make globalisation global', as he put it. Aside from being an associated professor at a Swedish University, Abrahamsson was also an active member in Attac Sweden. The conceptualisation of 'a golden opportunity' was adopted by the members of the organisation when referring to these perceived opportunities for structural change on a global level. But these members, some even more explicitly, referred to the 'golden opportunity' to be part of the global justice movement that was attracting attention and engagement at the time. Other members instead referred to the opportunity to mobilise young and engaged people through this new type of organisation. However, no one referred to these golden opportunities as being the reason for them to engage.

Instead, people justified their engagement and action as 'having to do something' or as 'a lack' among the established organisations or in the system. 'If I am to face myself in the mirror in the morning—I just have to do something about the situation in the world', as one person said, referring to the Balkan conflict. Another person, with a prominent background in politics said: 'We have to abolish hunger in the world—that is what I will focus on'. Other people referred to the importance of basic democracy for ensuring that people have access to political power regarding issues such as water or other basic resources. However, these expressions did not refer to either the physiological or the psychological needs of the people engaging in the entrepreneurial venture. References to other people's needs were only vaguely and/or generally articulated. The references also referred to different 'needs'. In general, people had a perception that it was necessary for something to happen and that it was necessary for them to act—a *perceived necessity*—which was connected to conviction and, at times, outrage.

The initial entrepreneurial surge has now abated. Still, Attac Sweden has over one thousand members discussing and debating globalisation and global justice. The issues at stake have partly seen a renewed interest among the different groups in discussions related to the current financial instability.

An Entrepreneurial Initiative for Youth

In the early to mid-1980s, Stockholm experienced a phase of youth protests. Groups of young people did not turn to established organisations and activities. Instead, they expressed alienation through protests that featured destructive and violent means. The response from society was that something had to be done, and anti-violent initiatives that targeted these young people were instigated. A man named Anders Carlberg, a middle aged construction worker who was engaged in union work and had a background in student politics in the late 1960s, was asked to organise some of these.

At this time, there were also other groups wanting to find facilities for sports and rehearsal studios for bands. The YMCA had a basketball team searching for an arena and a desire to revitalise their youth activities. The people from these interest groups joined forces and headed by Carlberg they started Fryshuset with social activities, primarily with a focus on anti-violence; sports such as the for the YMCA basketball team; and music, primarily through providing rehearsal studios for pop and rock bands. It was named Fryshuset, which means 'cold store' in Swedish because they moved into a large store building that earlier was used as a cold store. The name is now the brand of a well-known organisation.

Today, Fryshuset has moved to new facilities: a large nine storey house in Stockholm. Fryshuset has two skateboard halls, three basketball halls, concert halls, dance halls, rehearsal studies and cafés. Furthermore, Fryshuset runs a gymnasium (upper secondary school) and approximately thirty different social projects. Most activities are in Stockholm, but they also run projects in other Swedish cities and they are currently launching a national organisation. Approximately 420 people are employed, and the annual turnover is over EUR 200 million (2010). They have up to 40,000 visits a month (www.fryshuset.se).

The early initiative was both a response to the YMCA and the music groups' search for facilities and to the public's request to have the security problems in the city solved. Other established organisations' difficulties to reach out to the troublesome groups of young people, opened up, welcomed and even requested new solutions. Together, these issues was conceptualised as opportunities and means for mobilising both people and financial resources. As the founding of Fryshuset, there has also been a shift in Swedish welfare policies. Reforms have improved the conditions for running schools and providing other welfare services in private organisations with public funding. It has enabled Fryshuset to run a large gymnasium that has provided administrative and financial structures, which has benefited the venture as a whole. Even if the people working at Fryshuset experience a struggle accessing resources, they have also had significant opportunities to benefit from the public means by way of grants for youth activities and the emerging publically funded market for social services. Combined with Carlberg's engagement and persistence in combination with political networks and other influential groups, it has been possible.

Again, these opportunities are not what the people at Fryshuset refer to when they speak about why they engage with young people or why they engage in Fryshuset. Instead, they refer to how important they believe it is for young people to be met

adequately and treated 'properly' as young citizens in a society where adult men and women care. Almost everyone interviewed referred to society's failure in relation to these young people. 'The public sector and established non-profit associations have to realise that these young people do not want to attend general meetings or just play floor ball certain hours a week. They need adults to be there in their daily situations—even if it is beyond regular working hours or domains', said one person, and many others expressed similar stories. As for the question of why they had chosen to engage in Fryshuset, one citation here will represent many voices: 'My work here gives me a sense of meaning, even though working hours, work load, stability and salaries would be better if I worked elsewhere'.

Within this entrepreneurial initiative, the importance of working close to young people was identified as crucial. 'The ones who know the problems are also the ones who know and can find and carry through solutions' is repeated again and again. This idea is partly ideological, but it has also proved to be successful for establishing relationships with groups to which no other organisation reaches out. This aspect of participation has, in the interviews and also in the other material, been described as a necessity. 'Youth themselves just have to be allowed to deal with their own lives and communities they live in. They know the problems and also how to solve them'. This approach has not really been requested, beyond the regular conditions of participatory influence that comes with most public funding in Sweden. The approach was, however, believed to be necessary in the beginning, and it has since been described as a key to success.

An Entrepreneurial Initiative for Former Criminals Return to Society

In 1997, Christer Karlsson was released from prison for the last time. After more than 30 years in and out of prisons, he decided to find another way of living. He contacted others in a 12-step community that shared his wishes. Together, they decided to start a new organisation to help people like themselves. Together they started the organisation Criminals Return to Society, CRIS (www.kris.a.se).

CRIS wishes to give hope to criminals and drug abusers and to inform them that it is possible to change. The idea is to help the people who are released from prison to stay away from crimes and drugs by offering them a new, honest and drug-free social network. Those that want are met by CRIS when they leave prison. Their releases are celebrated in a drug-free environment in CRIS facilities and the members of the organisation offer comradeship, structure and, as far as possible, practical support. The comradeship offered also includes a requirement that problems such as drug abuse and/or other behaviour or social problems are dealt with. The guiding principles of CRIS are honesty, liberty from drugs, friendship and solidarity. The organisation now has over 5,000 members, all being former criminals and/or former drug abusers. Some local branches run outpatient care and different types of housing projects.

One of the difficulties for former criminals is to find an honest way to make a living. Combined with a desire to set up and run different ventures, such as housing, that supports lifestyle training for people just released from prison, ideas regarding an entrepreneurship program developed. In 2008, funding from the European Social

Fund was granted for a training program in which the people in CRIS are offered personal development training that is closely connected to entrepreneurship training. The training program is called Creative Honest Entrepreneurs and includes personal development as well as knowledge about social entrepreneurship as a way to help one self, to help others exposed to similar situations and to help society at large.

In interviews, the people engaged in CRIS and the training program Creative Honest Entrepreneurs emphasise the possibility for change, the opportunity to provide support and to constructively develop healthy, productive and 'good' life styles in spite of troubled backgrounds that are often combined with personal impairments such as cognitive disabilities, problematic impulse control and, at times, just bad social experiences. The experiences of those involved have been turned into useful knowledge regarding what is necessary for this transition and how to create functional, long-lasting structures. CRIS differs from the public sector and private initiatives run by people without the same 'background'. 'I know what it is like, I know it is possible to change, but I also know you have to change, you can't get away from that'.

Even if policy makers and grant facilitators recognise CRIS and Creative Honest Entrepreneurs as an opportunity to reach their aims, there is a constant struggle to fund the everyday long-term work that is necessary. 'It is OK to fund new project for a few years. But then, when people with harsh backgrounds start to feel ready to deal with deeper aspects of guilt and self-esteem, then they need heavy therapy to prevent relapse. And for that there are no funds'. Even if CRIS has identified this and other needs, they do not have their own funding ability. Therefore, if they want to respond to the identified needs, they are limited in what they can do because the resources beyond their own reach must match identified needs before it is possible to relate these needs to demand in economic terms—that is the ability and willingness to pay.

The ideas and the developed methods of CRIS and Creative Honest Entrepreneurs are grounded in the perceived necessities based on self-experience. In this case, what is perceived to be necessary is closely linked to people's personal needs. Those involved are involved as much to help them selves as to help others in a similar situation. The aim to try to help others has been described not only as aiming to 'do good' in a general sense but also as a way to heal for many with burdens of guilt towards family, victims and society at large. The basic foundation—the decision to change—combined with comradeship supporting this change and the development of functional and supportive structures are grounded in what is perceived to be necessary for a honest and healthy life style.

An Entrepreneurial Initiative for the Long-Term Unemployed

In mid-1990s, the first work integrating social enterprises (WISE) initiatives were launched in Sweden. Inspiration was found in Southern European co-operative model, and valuable links to the European Social Fund that began operating in Sweden in 1995 was established at an early stage. Since then there has also been a shift in the Swedish tradition of unemployment measures. Publically organised

programs have been subject to competition, which has opened this field up to more private actors. Those involved in WISE have become an emerging group of actors that has caught policy interest.

During the early phase of development, these WISE challenged the established public support structures. The WISE had to struggle with public regulations and administration. In part, this struggle still continues today, even though the attitudes and the regulations have become smoother, in part through collaboration with the public authorities responsible for the labour market, social security and small business development. Currently, there are approximately 270 WISE in Sweden with approximately 2,500 people employed. Another 6,000 people participate in different training programs or other activities organised by these enterprises (Tillväxtverket 2012).

One of the entrepreneurial initiatives that led to the start of 10 WISE is Vägen ut! Kooperativen. Translated into English, the name means The Road Out co-operatives. Vägen ut! cooperatives started in 2002 as a project funded by the European Social Fund, in which a partnership of private initiators, cooperative consultants and public officials aimed to develop methods to help the long-term unemployed to work at '100 % of their capacity'—even if that meant a couple of hours a day or a week. Today, 10 Vägen ut! cooperatives collaborate through a consortium. In total, approximately 80 people are employed. Most of these people have a background in long-term unemployment. Approximately one-third of the employees are also co-owners in one of the enterprises (www.vagenut.coop).

The organisational separation from the public sector is emphasised, even though the roles as well as the funding are highly intertwined with the public welfare aims, services and resources. Some of the initiators originally worked within the public sector and experienced the shortcomings and limitations of bureaucracy as well as the role that they could play in relation to these target groups. These initiators experienced that it was necessary to work differently. 'Many long-time unemployed need support—but most of all they need to deal with their own situations. And work, proper work, is a key to be able to do this', said one of the early entrepreneurs who now works full time at Vägen ut!. 'And they need to meet people that do not give up on them'.

This entrepreneurial initiative targets a variety of people. The common denominator is the difficulties in the labour market, in some cases because of disabilities and in others because of social factors; several have never held an ordinary job. The potential for these people to become integrated into the labour market vary. Some people need adjusted tasks to work with and more or less continuous support. Others 'just' need a route and a bit of time. Empowerment is a key concept in the work of Vägen ut!. The participation in everyday activities including decision-making is highlighted as a central success factor for personal development as well as for increasing the possibilities of employment. The WISE has been seen as a 'road out' from several types of social problem. There are several success stories. However, there are also people that try the program and drop out. Currently, there are no systematic evaluations so that conclusions on success/failures are not available (Gawell 2011).

The qualitative aspects are to a certain extent combined with funding opportunities. Portions of the funding come from public support that covers the

long-term unemployed and/or rehabilitation and/or compensation for reduced capacity to work for people with disabilities. In addition, the European Social Fund has initially and repeatedly granted means. Other business ideas, such as running cafés, cleaning, garden work, carpentry, and so on, have also provided funding for the creation of non-substituted job opportunities for people with difficulties on the labour market. Profits from these business activities are reinvested in the venture. Still, the people in these ventures struggle to mobilise resources. 'The road to the more or less regular labour market is at times so long. It takes a lot of resources'.

The needs referred to by the people in Vägen ut! are at times articulated in relation to policy aims, for instance, as a response to the needs articulated in the call from the European Social Fund or in the National or European strategies in this field. The references to European policies are noticeable both within Vägen ut! and from others addressing and developing WISE. However, the entrepreneurial initiatives target on the most vulnerable groups and a sharper articulation of the necessity of supportive manners, individual flexibility and a well-considered approach for empowerment to reach the overarching aims and to design efficient work methods.

Social Entrepreneurship Facilitated by Opportunities but Grounded in Perceived Necessities

The combined theoretical heritage of social entrepreneurship with the ambiguous references to opportunity recognition and exploitation, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the response to needs in a more general sense and the suggested conceptualisation perceived necessity, still provides an unclear frame of reference in the emerging field of social entrepreneurship. In this paper, the fragmented insights, including the unclear or different definitions of these concepts, from the theoretical review has been related to how these concepts are used and can be understood in four empirical cases.

In the case of Attac, references to a 'golden opportunity' are explicit. But the people involved refer to different favourable events, as Gartner et al. have argued, where they see this opportunity (2003). The people refer to different events of a more temporal character, such as current global power structures, an interest in the issues at stake and young people's interest in finding new organisational forms. But people also refer to aspects in society such as freedom of speech, freedom of organising and the right to demonstrate as opportunities to express their opinion. However, none of those interviewed and none of the studied documents referred to these opportunities as reasons to act in this particular way. The opportunities were instead referred to as facilitating the entrepreneurial venture. In addition, in the references to what, in the analysis of Attac Sweden, was conceptualised as perceived necessities, the people related to different issues of different character such as the perceived necessity to prevent hunger, conflict or inequality. Other people referred to the importance of democracy and everyone's right to participate in the decisions affecting their own lives. These perceived necessities were related to people's explanations of why they engaged and in what effort their engagement in

Attac was seen as a tool. The needs were referred to in general terms and then often linked to visions of 'another world'.

In the case of Fryshuset, there are also references to opportunities related to facilitating activities and the development of the organisation. To a large extent, these opportunities are related to both different favourable events and aspects. The requests from different interest groups are vaguely expressed as demands in more economic terms, with the assumption that these requests are linked to public funding opportunities. Analytically, this is interpreted as a rhetorical transformation of people's interests and requests into resource mobilisation that is exploited as opportunities. Similarly, the people engaged in Fryshuset refer to the public 'need' for security or the public 'need' to be able to reach out and to respond to young people. This is interpreted as rhetorical arguments that are interlinked with policy aims as well as perceived necessities articulated by the people engaged in Fryshuset. These people point out, and even stress, the necessity to engage with young people and to develop and act in "the Fryshuset spirit". Those involved furthermore stress the importance of working differently than the public initiatives or the many established youth organisations. They perceive working differently as necessary to reaching out, gaining trust and impacting development. These people have chosen to engage in Fryshuset because of these necessities and a sense of meaningfulness, even though they have the option to choose more convenient and/or lucrative positions.

In the case of CRIS and Creative Honest Entrepreneurs, the needs and perceived necessities are more closely linked than in the other cases. The initiatives not only target but are also initiated and run by people with a background in drug abuse and/or criminality. The decisive decision made by each and every one to change his or her life style can be seen as an expression of perceived necessity. Together, the members know what does not work, and gradually they have developed practices and structures that do work—particularly for people with the different types of personal impairments that are common among this group. The perceived necessity of different activities, services and methods permeates the organisation. But the people in the organisation also highlight the opportunities. As in the other cases, the opportunities are referred to in plural. Some refer to their opportunities to support the transformation and the lives of individuals. Others refer to their organisation as an opportunity for society to address the difficulties that come with abuse and criminality. Still others refer to the different funding opportunities, in the form of different possible grants and through increased public procurements in the welfare system. Again, different favourable events and aspects are conceptualised as opportunities.

The initiative with a focus on long-term unemployed people addresses similar opportunities as the labour market policies also open up for more private actors. The possibility for people to make a living through work or business has continuously been a priority for the European Social Fund and also for other policy initiatives. This theme is obvious both in the documents and in the interviews. However, in the interviews, other aims are also elaborated on. They emphasise the benefits of work, but they also refer to the importance of providing a supportive social community in more general terms combined with social training and 'meaningful' activities—no

matter whether this led to paid work or not. Behind the most obviously expressed aims that can be related to what potential funders ask for, slightly different perceptions of the necessities appear. Work and WISE are then tools that match both practical functionality and the expectations of potential funders. The perceived necessities are thereby interwoven in multiple levels with the events/aspects that are conceptualised opportunities. Basically, in this case there is a perceived necessity that the long-term unemployed, including people with different impairments, illnesses, backgrounds, and so on, also have the right to a 'good' life, a healthy social community, citizen influence and the independent means for making a livelihood. Needs are hardy touched upon except in discussions on the necessity of an individual and holistic approach in which the tasks and the methods are adjusted to each and every one's needs combined with a human and personal engagement beyond job descriptions.

The ability to spot, evaluate and exploit *opportunities* (Shane and Venkataraman 2000; Sarasvathy et al. 2003) has shown to also be highly relevant for social entrepreneurship. Even more precisely, the cases studied tell us about favourable events that can be conceptualised as opportunities as argued by Gartner et al. (2003). The cases relating to policy initiatives are, as also described by Robinson, navigating and exploiting institutional borders (2006). Looking at the cases with a broader scope and the historical roots of public support for certain social activities, it can even be argued that some social entrepreneurs not only spot and exploit opportunities, but they also create opportunities by articulating and mobilising favourable events by convincing the actors with resources to make those resources available. Altogether, the analysis in this study shows that opportunities facilitate social entrepreneurship rather than bring knowledge about why people engage. Apart form contributing to a more nuanced understanding of social entrepreneurship this result raises new questions on definitions of social entrepreneurship in relation to commercial driven entrepreneurship.

The people involved express instead their eagerness to engage because they feel that it is meaningful or even necessary. They perceive it as necessary to address global justice, young people, former criminals and/or the long-term unemployed. People relate this perception to emotions such as compassion, ideological anomalies, solidarity or even anger. Therefore, both emotional and political aspects are highlighted. The people involved perceive they have to and can, through the entrepreneurial initiatives, do something—at least a bit—to improve conditions for themselves and/or for others. These arguments can be related to the suggested conceptualisation: *perceived necessities* (Gawell 2006), which should be seen as ground for social entrepreneurial engagement and action. The analysis of perceived necessities can also be seen as a link between social entrepreneurship and what theoretically are elaborated on as voluntary work or social engagement—in the case of social entrepreneurship combined also with aspects of organising and organization creation.

The response to *needs* in society, which Dees (2001) argues is a fundamental behaviour for social entrepreneurs, is touched upon in this study. This response is, however, not prominent, and it is rather vaguely expressed and not primarily related to the arguments regarding why people engage in these specific initiatives. It is instead related to the arguments of why these types of initiatives should be funded.

These arguments convey the message that needs means a demand and that these initiatives therefore contribute to respond to societal demand. However, demand in economic terms consists of both the ability and a willingness to pay, which mean a more complex relation between needs and demand in the emerging field of social entrepreneurship. The analysis in this paper raises several questions on the relation between social entrepreneurship and needs in society. It rather shows the need to problematize and analyse this relation beyond descriptions of arguments raised by social entrepreneurs to be able to analytically relate both to individual's needs and or needs in society.

The fragmented theoretical contributions regarding how social entrepreneurial action is grounded in opportunities, needs and/or perceived necessities do not tell us about the relationship between these conceptualisations. The analysis of the studied cases however, indicates an intricate and dynamic interplay between the concepts. It is argued in this analysis that engagement and action in specific issues, target groups or even to specific ventures are grounded in perceived necessities. Activities and the development of ventures are however, facilitated by opportunities or, rather, favourable events or aspects that are conceptualised as opportunities. At times, in certain cases, the perceived necessities and what the potential funders perceive as necessary coincide, and there is a match between the social entrepreneur's perception and what they relate to as opportunities. But there are also examples with partial, or no, matches between the different perceptions or, at least, how the perceptions are transformed into priorities and/or realisations.

The analysis also indicates a similar relationship between perceived necessities, opportunities and needs, even though the expressions of needs are rather vague. In the case of the CRIS, the perceived necessities are, to a large extent, based on their own personal experiences and personal needs. But in neither this case nor in the other cases are the different needs in society compared or evaluated in relation to other, or others', needs.

To conclude, this qualitative analysis provides insights that by analogy can be used to further theoretical specification in the emerging field of social entrepreneurship and through that contribute to more precise analysis, which is important since this is a field with persuasive rhetoric, promoting actors and interested politicians and up to now a lack of systematic evaluations. The study furthermore calls for a continuous theoretical development and then these specific contributions can be useful to nuance and problematize the pivotal aspects elaborated on in this paper. It can furthermore contribute to linking emerging theories on social entrepreneurship also to other related behaviour or linguistic based theories.

The concepts needs, perceived necessities and opportunities all contribute to the understanding of the phenomenon but in slightly different ways. Social entrepreneurial engagement and action has in this study first and foremost shown to be grounded in perceived necessities and facilitated by opportunities. These two conceptualisations are then more or less clearly related to the discussion on needs. This study furthermore indicates that aspects of people's perceived necessities, the available and potential opportunities to facilitate entrepreneurial ventures and the evaluation of needs in society must be considered in the analysis, the theoretical development and in the policy development in this field.

References

Abrahamsson, H. (2001). Det gyllene tillfället att göra globaliseringen global. In J. Egon (Ed.), *En annan värld är möjlig*. Stockholm: Manifest kulturproduktion.

Abrahamsson, H. (2002). Moblisering för global rättvisa—konfrontativ dialog och politiskt manöverutrymme. In K. Talltorp & O. Unsgaard (Eds.), Globalisering. *Hur då? Nya vägar för den globala rättviserörelsen*. Stockholm: Leopard förlag.

Abrahamsson, H. (2003). *Det gyllene tillfället*. Stockholm: Leopard förlag.

Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology. New vistas for qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Amnå, E. (2005). Scenöppning, scenvridning, scenförändring. In E. Amnå (Ed.), *Civilsamhället. Några forskningsfrågor*. Stockholm: Riksbankens Jubileumsforn in collaboration with Gidlunds förlag.

Annheier, H. (2005). *Nonprofit organizations. Theory, management, policy*. New York: Routledge.

Bjerke, B. (2005). *Förklara eller förstå Entreprenörskap*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Borzaga, C. And., & Defourny, J. (Eds.). (2001). *The emergence of social enterprise*. London: Routledge.

Borzaga, C., Galera, G., & Nogales, R. (Eds.). (2008). *Social enterprise: A new model for poverty reduction and employment generation. An examination of the concept and practice in Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States*. Bratislava: UNDP Regional Centre for Euorpe and the CIS.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Czarniawska, B. (1998). *A Narrative Approach to Organization Studies*. Qualitative Research Methods Series 43, , Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in social science research*. London: Sage.

Dees, G. (2001, first published 1998). *The meaning of'social entrepreneurship*. FEDF Partners. www.redf.org.

Della Porta, D. (2007). *The global justice movement*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Della Porta, D., & Diani, M. (1999). *Social movements*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Eco, U. (1990). *The limits of interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Ehrenberg, J. (1999). *Civil society. The critical history of an idea*. New York: New York University Press.

Gartner, W., Carter, N., & Hill, G. (2003). The language of opportunity. In C. Steyaert & D. Hjorth (Eds.), *New movements in entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Gawell, M. (2006). *Activist entrepreneurship. Attac'ing norms and articulating disclosive stories*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Gawell, M. (2008). *Social engagement and entrepreneurial action. Soci(et)al entrepreneurship and different forms of social enterprises*. EMES selected conference paper series. www.emes.net.

Gawell, M. (2011). *Inte vilket entreprenrskap som helst*. Stockholm: Tillväxtverket.

Gawell, M., Johannisson, B., & Lundqvist, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Entrepreneurship in the name of Societ. A reader's digest of a Swedish Research Anthology*. Stockholm: KK-foundation.

Hernadi, P. (1987). Literary Interpretation and the Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. In J. Nelson, et al. (Eds.), *The rhetoric of the human sciences*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hisrich, R., Freeman, E., Stanley, A., Yankey, J., & Young, D. (1997). Entrepreneurship in the not-for-profit sector: The state of the art. In D. Sexton & R. Smilor (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship 2000*. Chicago: Upstart Publishing Company.

Hjorth, D., Johannisson, B., & Styeyaert, C. (2003). Entrepreneurship as discourse and life style. In B. Czarniawska & G. Sevon (Eds.), *The northern lights. Organization theory in Scandinavia*. Malmö: Liber.

Kirzner, I. (1973). *Competition and entrepreneurship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leadbeater, C. (1997). *The rise of the social entrepreneur*. London: Demos.

Mair, J. (2006). Introduction to part II—Exploring the intentions and opportunities behind social entrepreneurship. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, & K. Hockerts (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship*. New York: Palgrave.

Mair, J., Robinson, J., & Hockerts, K. (2006). *Social entrepreneurship*. New York: Palgrave.

Melucci, A. (1991, first published in Italian 1989), *Nomader i nuet. Sociala rörelser och individuella behov i dagens samhälle*. Daidalos, Göteborg.

Neuendorf, K. (2002). *Content analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nicholls, A. (2006). *Social entrepreneurship. New models of sustainable social change*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nicholls, A. (2010). The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: Reflexive isomorphism in a pre-paradigmatic field. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 34*(4), 611–633.

Palmås, K. (2000). *Den barmhärtiga entreprenören. Från privatisering till socialt företagande.* Stockholm: Agora.

Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business, 41*(1), 56–65.

Perrini, F. (2006). *The new social entrepreneurship. What awaits social entrepreneurial ventures?.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Ramonet, I. (1997). Editorial article in Le Monde Diplomatique 1/12/1997, France.

Robinson, J. (2006). Navigating social and institutional barriers to markets: How social entrepreneurs identify and evaluate opportunities. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, & K. Hockert (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship.* Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Salamon, L. (1996). *Defining the nonprofit sector: The United States.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University.

Sarasvathy, S. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 243–263.

Sarasvathy, S., Dew, N., Velamuri, R., & Venkataraman, S. (2003). Three views of entrepreneurship opportunity. In Z. Acs & D. Audretsch (Eds.), *Handbook of entrepreneurship research. An interdisciplinary survey.* Boston: Kluwer.

Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The theory of economic development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sexton, D., & Landström, H. (Eds.). (2000). *The Blackwell handbook of entrepreneurship.* Oxford: Blackwell Publisher.

Shane, S. (2003). *A general theory of entrepreneurship. The individual-opportunity nexus.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 217–226.

Steyaert, C., & Bouwen, R. (1997). Telling stories of entrepreneurship. Towards a narrative—Contextual epistemology for entrepreneurial studies. In R. Donckels & A. Miettinen (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship and SME research: On its way to the next millennium.* Aldershot: Ashgate Publiching.

Steyaert, C., & Hjorth, D. (2006). *Entrepreneurship as social change.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Swedberg, R. (2000). *Entrepreneurship. The social science view.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tillväxtverket. (2012). *Sociala företag i Sverige.* www.sofisam.se.

Venkataraman, S. (1997). The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research: An editor's perspective. In J. Katz & R. Brockhaus (Eds.), *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence, and growth.* Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.

Weick, K. (1979, first published in 1969). *The social psychology of organizing.* New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations.* Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wijkström, F., & Lundström, T. (2002). *Den ideella sektorn. Organisationerna i det civila samhället.* Stockholm: Sober Förlag.

Wijkström, F., & Zimmer, A. (Eds.). (2011). *Nordic civil society at a cross-roads.* Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Thörn, H. (2002). *Globaliseringens dimensioner. Nationalstat, världssamhälle, demokrati och sociala rörelser.* Stockholm: Bokförlaget Atlas.

www.attac.org (Attac International). Accessed 18 April 2005.

www.attac.se (Attac Sweden). Accessed 24 September 2003.

www.fryshuset.se (Fryshuset). Accessed 9 March 2011.

www.kris.a.se (CRIS). Accessed 10 April 2012.

www.vagenut.coop (Vägen ut! Kooperativen). Accessed 19 April 2012.