



EMES CONFERENCES

SELECTED PAPERS SERIES

3rd EMES International Research Conference on Social Enterprise
Roskilde (Denmark) - July 4-7, 2011

CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS AS INNOVATIVE CHALLENGERS OR ADJUSTABLE FOLLOWERS? RENEGOTIATING ROLES IN THE SWEDISH PRACTICE.

Malin Gawell

Entrepreneurship and Small Business Research Institute (ESBRI), Sweden

Copyright © 2011 Malin Gawell

Any portion of these materials is freely available for information and educational purposes, but cannot be re-published in any format that may entail fees or royalties without the express permission of the copyright holders.

ABOUT THE EMES CONFERENCES SELECTED PAPERS SERIES:

This series aims to ensure that selected papers from conferences in which EMES has been involved will be accessible to a larger community interested in the third sector and social enterprise.

EMES Conferences Selected Papers have not undergone any editing process.

All the papers of the series are available for download at www.emes.net.

ABSTRACT

Sweden, and many other countries, has during the twentieth century, developed a rather large public sector providing, among other things, social welfare services to citizens. Only to a small extent were private for- or nonprofit organizations providing these services. During the last decade we have seen a shift towards more services being provided by private for- and nonprofit actors. This shift means that roles are reconsidered, renegotiated and reconstructed. Entrepreneurial initiatives react and act within this context. But what roles and values are brought into practices by initiatives today and how can we conceptualize these as innovative? The aim of this paper is to empirically describe and analyze emerging civil society organizational practices and contribute to the understanding of their role in the development of society.

INTRODUCTION

Sweden, and many other countries, has during the twentieth century, developed a rather large public sector providing, among other things, social welfare services to citizens. Only to a small extent were private for- or nonprofit organizations providing these services. However, there were examples, many times with a specific complementary role to the public sector services (Svedberg 2005; Trägårdh 2007). During the last decade we have seen a rather rapid shift towards more services being provided by private for- and nonprofit actors. Still, in the case of Sweden, these welfare services are to a large extent financed by public means that are distributed by public procurements and/or through customer's vouchers. This shift means that roles are reconsidered, renegotiated and reconstructed (Trägårdh 2007).

Currently there are two major debates, both related to policy shifts, where these negotiations are noticeable. The first is connected to providing welfare services for example within health care including care for children, people with disabilities or elderly. The second is connected to integrating of (long time) unemployed into the labor market. There are furthermore other topics, such as providing general services in rural areas. But currently these two topics are in focus and therefore also in focus in this paper.

Entrepreneurship initiatives grounded in civil society react and act in this debate. But what roles and values are brought into practices in civil society organizations today and can we conceptualize these roles as innovative, or are they rather adjustable followers?

There are tensions between the above mentioned roles and traditional roles and values that have characterized Swedish civil society and social economy for more than a century. Two such examples are the role of civil society as political actors with a democratic important and for contributing to innovative solutions to public issues. While democratic aspects have been in focus for many years and also debated more recently (Amnå 1999, 2005; Pestoff 2009), innovative aspects of civil society and social economy have not been elaborated on to the same extend neither in the public debate nor in research. However, historically the innovative role of what we today probably would refer to as social entrepreneurship or social enterprises is recognized both in narratives on popular mass movements and literature about the Swedish welfare society (Larsson 2008).

This paper is based on a theoretical frame of references with a focus on organizational dynamics with a specific focus on entrepreneurial processes viewed as a societal phenomenon (Schumpeter 1934; Gawell 2006, 2008; Steyaert, Hjorth 2006) and social entrepreneurship and social enterprises' role in society (Gawell, Johannisson, Lundqvist 2009). Part of the framework was developed in a study of an entrepreneurial process for social change in which a civil society organization for global justice was analyzed (Gawell 2006). Empirically, this study is based primarily on four sets of data. One set is from a study of an entrepreneurial initiative for youth. Another set of data is from a study of initiatives for integrating long time unemployed into the labor market. One set of data is from a study of an entrepreneurial initiative run by former criminals aiming for a constructive return into society. Yet another set of data is from a study of activist entrepreneurship. Analysis is based on an interpretive narrative approach (Steyaert, Bouwen 1997; Czarniawska 1998, 2004, 2005).

1. THE FRAMEWORK

1.1. Institutions, organizations and entrepreneurial dynamics

Civil society consists of more or less institutionalized organizations as well as other components that relates to a sphere in society. These more or less institutionalized organizations act within certain contexts such as geographical, branch related or normative constructed practices and/or regulations. The institutional arrangements of these contexts are fundamental to understand organizations since they tend to be taken for granted (Berger and Luckmann 1967), or reproduced without much reflection in practice (Langer and Newman 1979) and therefore create path dependencies (David 1985; Arthur 1988).

Work on institutions has traditionally focused on continuity (Garud, Hardy and Maguire 2007). However, the interest in organizational innovation and institutional change has increased (Stryker 2000). Through conceptualizations such as institutional entrepreneurship (Garud, Hardy and Maguire 2007) and social entrepreneurship (Nicholls 2010) the institutional approach has been related to a complementary field with focus on change. To both considering literature on institutions and on entrepreneurship and innovation bring different perspectives on the longstanding structure-agency debate and how agency is conceptualized, perceived and what influential ability it can be ascribed (Garud, Hardy and Marguire 2007).

From the perspective of institutions, civil society organizations are embedded in an institutional field and subject to regulative, normative and cognitive processes structuring and even defining their interest and identity (Friedland and Alford 1991; Clemens and Cook 1999). This is commonly referred to as an embedded agency (DiMaggio and Powell 1991; Friedland and Alford 1991; Seo and Creed 2002). From the perspective of entrepreneurship, on the other hand, the institutional setting is not necessary given, at least not in details, from start but rather emerge during the entrepreneurial process (Gawell 2008). Nascent and emerging organizations contribute to the variation of evolutionary processes (Aldrich 1999) and the dynamics of industries (Aldrich 1999; Schoonhoven and Romanelli 2001), and thereby the dynamics of communities (Aldrich 1999). In this paper, the entrepreneurship perspective is therefore used to put focus on changes, still related to institutional aspects, to elaborate on civil society in the age of disruption and civil society organizations role as innovative challengers and/or adjustable followers.

1.2. Entrepreneurship and innovation

The field of entrepreneurship research is not coherently agreeing on a single definition (Hjorth 2001; Gawell 2006). Entrepreneurship can be conceptualized in different ways. The field of research is not coherently agreeing on a single definition (Hjorth 2001; Gawell 2006). During the last decade we have seen more and more publications on entrepreneurship related not only to businesses (see below). But even the classic entrepreneurship scholar Joseph Schumpeter argued already in 1911 that entrepreneurship as a dynamic challenging process could be conceptualized in all spheres in society. This early writing was only published in German and not included in the English translation published in 1934. Since the latter publication has been the standard reference in research entrepreneurship has more or less been limited to businesses and economic aspects of society (Swedberg 2008).

During the last decade research conceptualizing entrepreneurship as a phenomenon not only limited to businesses has grown stronger (Spinosa, Flores, Dreyfus 1997; Steyaert 2000;

Swedberg 2000; Hjorth, Johannisson, Steyaert 2003, Steyaert, Hjorth 2004, 2006; Gawell 2006; Gawell, Johannisson, Lundqvist 2009). Furthermore we have seen a number of publications on “social entrepreneurship” (Mair, Robinson, Hockerts 2006; Nicholls 2006, Perrini 2006), on “social enterprises” (Borzaga, Defourny 2001; Borzaga, Galera, Nogales 2008), and also “public entrepreneurship” (Bjerke 2005), “activist entrepreneurship” (Gawell 2006), or “societal entrepreneurship” (Johannisson 1990; Gawell, Johannisson, Lundqvist 2009).

These scholars do not refer to the one single definition of entrepreneurship. The definition of Schumpeter (1934) in which entrepreneurship challenge equilibrium (Swedberg 2000), or the Kirzner influenced school (see Landström 1999) of viewing entrepreneurs as alert and creative organizers reestablishing equilibrium can most of the time be seen in the background even though the discussions on equilibrium is rather problematic in social contexts. This discussion is developed in economics but the focus or the level of radicalization differs among scholars elaborating on different versions of *social entrepreneurship*.

Schumpeter defined entrepreneurship (1934) as being any of the following:

- The introduction of a new good
- The introduction of a new method of production
- The opening of a new market
- The conquest of a new source of supply of raw material
- The creation of a new organization of an industry

Schumpeter argued that entrepreneurship consists of coming up with innovations, as opposed to inventions, and that entrepreneurship is to be regarded only during the phase when actions are related to these issues. Therefore, according to Schumpeter, nobody is an entrepreneur forever, but only when he or she is actually pursuing the innovative activities (Swedberg 2000). Entrepreneurship does not only contribute by smoothly adding to the economy or other parts of social life, according to Schumpeter. A new combination of materials or forces also competes for resources and demand. There are contributions as well as a creative destruction challenging the established equilibrium. Entrepreneurship is then bringing new ideas into action, as well as challenging established and organized environments.

1.3. Entrepreneurship and roles – renegotiating in practice

This study departs from a social view on entrepreneurship. The entrepreneurial process leading to a venture and the creation of an enterprise is heavily interdependent with its context. It is formed by the context. But it also actively influences the same context. The process is interactive and contains cognitive, literate, social aspects as well highly practical aspects like legal forms, financial means, infrastructure and facilities etc. It can be smooth, but it can also be complicated, frustrating, chaotic, and more or less impossible. The entrepreneurial process can lead to an enterprise taken different forms. However, the entrepreneurial process might not lead to anything that we commonly would call an enterprise. It might not even be the goal or a relevant measurement on success.¹

Forms and roles are influenced by established practices in combination with more or less intentionally set goals and visions. In management based literature goals many times are set through the development of business plans. However, research indicates that this process is not as *planned* as management literature commonly suggests but is rather a process where creation

¹ See further discussions in eg. Gawell 2006; Gawell, Johannisson, Lundqvist 2009

is done in action (Hjorth, Johannisson, Steyaert 2003; Sarasvahty 2001). Forms and practices are then created in action and roles are negotiated in action in entrepreneurial processes being more or less challenging and innovative.

In this context, forms and roles are constructed specially during the entrepreneurial phase. These forms and roles are constantly renegotiated and reconstructed over time. But in what ways are organizational initiatives (re)constructing these roles? Are they innovative challengers, or adjustable followers?

2. METHODOLOGY

This paper is based on studies of current social entrepreneurial initiatives grounded in civil society in Sweden. Focus in this paper is on how these organizations respond to and act in relation to their specific contexts.

Empirically, this study is based primarily on four sets of data. The selection of cases is not representative of organizations, or entrepreneurial initiatives, in general. However, three of the sets of data studied represent areas where shifts currently can be noticed in practice and in policy debates. The fourth set of data is from a field of currently less attention but with a focus on initiatives for social change that is relevant in this paper. Furthermore, these cases represent slightly different fields as for policy initiatives as well as other structuring features.

The sets of data are based on studies of:

- Fryshuset (www.fryshuset.se) – an activity house in Stockholm with a focus on anti-violence and youth. They also organize activities in other parts of Sweden as well as running some international projects.
- Four initiatives for integrating long time unemployed into the labor market. These four initiatives are based in different parts of Sweden and they are all funded from the European Social Fund.
- “Creative Honest Entrepreneurs” (www.khf.se) - an entrepreneurship training program ran by the organization Criminals Return into Society (CRIS).
- Activist entrepreneurship based primarily on the organization Attac Sweden’s (www.attac.se) entrepreneurial process aiming for global justice.

These studies are all based on written documents, interviews and participative observations. The study of Attac was conducted in 2001-2006 with a brief follow up analysis in 2010. The other studies were conducted in 2009-2011. The study of initiatives aiming for integrating long time unemployed has been conducted within a thematic project focusing on entrepreneurship end enterprises in projects funded by the European Social Fund (www.esf.se; www.tillvaxtverket.se/tematiskgrupp).

The analysis is conducted in an interpretive approach with a focus on discourses and narratives related to everyday practices. The method has been developed in the lines of the linguistic turn in social science, narrative approach to organizational and entrepreneurship studies (Czarniawska 1998, 2004, 2005; Steyaert, Bouwen 1997; Silverman 2001; Steyaert 2004; Gawell 2006).

3. THE SWEDISH CONTEXT AND CASES

A common, but not the only, narrative of traditional popular mass movements in Sweden is that these organizations, based on what is described as broad social movements, initiated services to people in need during the second half of the nineteenth century. Apart for providing services they engaged in advocacy to integrate these people's issues to the public agenda as the welfare state emerged during the twentieth century. Several civil society initiatives, such as dental care for children, nursing homes or public access to literature, became parts of the services provided by the public sector. Since the establishment of the welfare state during the twentieth century, the common narrative of civil society organizations has expressed a complementary role with rather niched services combined with advocacy.

The popular mass movement model with an ideology and advocacy role, open and widely based membership, democratic structured decision making, and an independent role in relation to the state (Svedberg 1981), has been 'marinating' the perception of civil society organizations in Sweden and to a large extent also in the other Nordic countries (Hvenmark and Wijkström 2004)². In this model voice and services are combined (Wijkström and Lundström 2002).

But this is not the only organizational model. There have always been several different types of charities, philanthropy, voluntarism, community development or non-governmental organizations. And there are also other stories on these different types of organizations in spite of the dominant story.

Today the public sector still has the primary responsibility for welfare services. But through policy initiatives the dominant role in providing services within public organizations has increasingly been subject for competition during the last decades. Welfare services provided by private actors has therefore increased. Still these services are principally publically funded.

In this overarching context we see an increased interest in social and societal entrepreneurship as well as social enterprises. These emerging concepts are not clearly defined and different spheres debate the meaning and at times claim these concepts by promoting specific definitions (Gawell 2008). There are also initiatives promoting a broad understanding combined with necessary specification in studies and also in development of policy initiatives (Gawell, Johannisson and Lundqvist 2009). The emerging field of social entrepreneurship and social enterprises in Sweden stretches beyond institutional fields such as civil society as well as business just like in many other countries. In this study focus is however on social entrepreneurial initiatives grounded in civil society. The following cases are current examples.

3.1. An Entrepreneurial Initiatives for Youth

In early to mid 1980's Stockholm experienced a phase of youth protests. Groups of young people did not turn to established organizations and activities. Instead they expressed alienation through protests featuring destructive and violent means. The response was that something had to be done. Anti-violent initiatives targeting these young people were taken.

² The concept of a popular mass movement marinade was introduced by L-E Olsson during a Nordic PhD course on Civil Society in 2002 and further developed by Hvenmark and Wijkström 2004.

At this time there were also demands among other groups to find facilities for sports as well as for rehearsal studios for bands. YMCA had a basketball team searching for an arena and a need to vitalize their youth activities. People from these interest groups joined forces. A man called Anders Carlberg, a middle aged construction worker with engagement in union work and a background in student politics in the late 1960's was asked to organize some of the activities as a response to the riots mentioned above. This group, headed by Carlberg, became a team to start and run Fryshuset. Carlberg has since then been the top leader with slightly different positions. During 2010 he is, at least partly, retiring and a new executive director has been appointed.

A former cold store was used for social activities primarily with a focus on anti-violence, sports primarily 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. The name is now a brand of a well known organization.

Today Fryshuset has moved to new facilities, again a big 9 storey house in Stockholm with up to 40 000 visits a month. They also run activities in other cities in Sweden. They have 2 skateboard halls, 3 basketball halls, concert halls, dance halls, rehearsal studios and cafés. They furthermore run a gymnasium (upper secondary school) and around 30 different social projects. They have approximately 420 people employed and 2009 they had a turnover of EUR 200 million (www.fryshuset.se).

The initiative has at least a fourfold ground when it comes to the role(s) emerging during the early phases and with clear imprints also in the current organization.

Firstly, the problems to respond to problems of young people taking what society perceived as destructive means to express their frustrations. This problem attracted renewed attention during the 1980's but is a rather constant issue where different solutions have been used.

Secondly, at this time established public initiatives and also established civil society organizations did not reach these groups of young people with their activities. There was a sense of a need to try out new ways to approach and new methods to reach out and to cope with issues related first of all to the violence among these groups but also how to reach these groups with activities related to more general aims in public youth policies and/or aims of civil society organizations policies.

Thirdly, the well known YMCA established in London 1844, then spread internationally and established in Sweden 1884, had during this time, as many other "old" organizations, difficulties in attracting young people at the same numbers as before. Specifically these difficulties were noticeable among young people in the suburbs build about the same time that these young people were born. YMCA looked into different solutions for their youth activities in general but also specifically YMCA in Stockholm needed new facilities for their basketball teams.

Fourthly, people playing rock and pop were looking for rehearsal studios. Many of these people were influenced by the rock, pop and punk culture and brought some of these ideals and at times ideas about organizing etc.

Within this initiative, there was from start a meeting introducing a dialogue with the young people also being the once making trouble. One central person being part of forming working methods had worked as a police for several years and for some time with youth in the city center. He had gotten to know some of them and tried, together with them and others, to find constructive

methods were they themselves were a part of creating solutions. As these young people started to use their energy in a more constructive way the results helped in mobilizing resources.

There are several references among people involved to this experience when it comes to explaining why things have been done in certain ways and what has generated strength to at times move “against the wind” and to develop activities in a “different way” than has been common in the public sector or more traditional youth organizations. These ideas are not radically different than commonly accepted ideas about broadly based influence and participation with a long tradition in a Swedish context. However, young people and also people engaging in Fryshuset perceived that this was not always the case in other established organizations’ practices – at least not for these groups of young people.

In a way Fryshuset have done things differently than public or civil society organizations established earlier. On the other hand, values and norms are deeply rooted in the tradition of popular mass movements and traditions of the Swedish welfare model called “folkhemmet” (freely translated “people’s home”) – with a vitalization of the advocacy role for issues related specifically to young people. It has furthermore been a vitalization of the role of civil society organizations as actors being able to provide slightly different activities and services than would be possible for the public sector. The difference to be able to say to young people that “we care not because we have to, but because we want to” has been a valuable asset according to people in Fryshuset.

But there has also been an adjustment to established forms for finance such as grant giving institutions accessible for youth activities. Fryshuset has also been successful beneficiaries of emerging possibilities and assets for private actors to run schools, to run social programs in neighborhoods etc. Established structures of YMCA have been helpful especially during early phases. Fryshuset has also, which traditionally has been less common in the Swedish context, attracted private funding both from private for-profit enterprises as well as direct from individuals. This far Fryshuset has been in the front line or resource mobilization both in more traditional forms with grants, in public procurements or publically funded consumer choice programs as well as in more philanthropic forms that has been less common during the twentieth century.

3.2. Entrepreneurial Initiatives for Longtime Unemployed

There is a long tradition of employment measures in Sweden. Primarily different initiatives for long time unemployed have been provided by the public sector. In mid 1990’s the first initiatives of work integrating social enterprises, inspired by southern European co-operative models, were launched (Stryjan 1996, 2006; Pestoff 1998, 2009; Laurelii 2002). Currently there are approximately 150 work integrating social enterprises in Sweden (Tillväxtverket 2010). Many of these have had funding from the European Social Fund to develop their social enterprises or projects related to specific aspects of their development.

During the early phase of development, these work integrating social enterprises challenged established public support structures. They had to struggle with public regulations and administrations. Partly this struggle continues also today even though attitudes and also regulations seem to have become more in favorable. Recently there have been both national projects funded by the European Social Fund and also national and local political initiatives to specifically promote the development of work integrating social enterprises. The Government has for example promoted the development through commissioning national public authorities to collaborate with these enterprises and with other relevant authorities as well as to inform staff how to promote long time unemployed to turn to these work integrating social enterprises.

The entrepreneurial initiatives for long time unemployed included in this study are all funded by the European Social Fund. Two initiatives (“Effektivare vägar ut” and “Orangeriet”) are carried out by actors that have been engaged in developing work integrating social enterprises for at least a decade. Apart from starting new work integrating social enterprises combined with training of long time unemployed they now focus on developing methods for collaboration with the public welfare system. That includes information, training and knowledge of how to adjust public procurements to be feasible also for these rather small entrepreneurial initiatives. One studied initiative (“Trappan”) is also a part of a longer initiative driven first and foremost by a local branch of the Red Cross and during the last years they have gradually adopted the language of entrepreneurship and work integrating social enterprises. The fourth studied initiative (“Kulingen”) emerge from publically organized rehabilitation for long time unemployed and is now run as an entrepreneurial initiative aiming to develop methods and forms for work integration through social enterprises detached from the publically run organization.

These entrepreneurial initiatives are influenced by an increased interest in these particular social enterprises characterized the idea of combining aims of integrating long time unemployed on the labor market with business activities in which profits primarily are reinvested in the venture. The participation in action as well as decision making is highlighted as a central success factor for reaching employment as well as social aims. Empowerment is here a key concept. Furthermore, the organizational separation from the public sector is emphasized even though roles as well as finances are highly intertwined with public welfare aims, services as well as funds. Parts of the funding comes from public support to cover long time unemployed and/or people with disabilities’ rehabilitation and/or compensation for reduces capacity to work. Other major parts of funding come in these cases from the European Social Fund aiming to support the development of initiatives that still are relatively new in the Swedish context. Other business ideas, such as running cafés, cleaning, garden work, carpentry etc, also add to the funding as well as creating job opportunities for people with difficulties on the labor market. The funding from the European Social Fund is temporary and supposingly not necessary for the long time operation.

These entrepreneurial initiatives target a variety of people. The common denominator is difficulties on the labor market. Some because of disabilities, others because of social factors. Several have not ever had an ordinary job for a long time or ever. Their possibilities to integrate on the labor market vary. Several have needs of adjustments and more or less continuous support. Others “just” need a route and a bit of time.

Among these initiatives indicators of innovativeness are a bit ambiguous. They all express a sense of not belonging to or being supported by ordinary structures. They describe themselves as not being ordinary labor market initiatives, ordinary enterprises, and not ordinary non-profit organizations. At the same time, the last few years of increased interest in social entrepreneurship and social enterprises in general, and more specifically the increased policy interest in social enterprises with a focus on work integration is experienced as moving with the flow. At the same time these initiatives all experience the difficulties and lack of resources to durably being able to provide necessary support especially for individuals that have been out of work for a very long time and/or have multiple difficulties to cope with.

The initiatives with a decade of experience within this particular field see a big difference during the years. The phenomenon of work integrating social enterprises emerged during the 1990’s and the early expansion correlated with the Swedish membership in the European Union and the European Social Fund’s operation in Sweden. The model, or rather sets of models, of work integrating social enterprises in Sweden has been strongly influenced by the southern European

work cooperatives. These organizations and methods were thereby already established in European policies including the European Social Fund. At that time almost no one within the Swedish public administration knew what work integrating social enterprises were and even less how they could relate to these organizations within their regulations. The early initiatives had therefore a clear innovative role. More recent initiatives can rather be related to refinement and implementation of innovative ideas.

One reason to why people have made the efforts to develop and to run these initiatives have been highlighted in all cases is the search for, the perceived need for developing forms and methods to reach aimed goals. Other established organizations have been referred to as bureaucratic, stiff or insufficient in other ways. These initiatives are, according to people engaged in them, perceived as more directly beneficial. A noticeable success factor that is highlighted among these initiatives are the combination of sensibility, competence and individual engagement both in relation to coaching participants and leadership in relation to running a social enterprise. Many of the participants are also very positive. But there is up to now a lack of more systematic evaluations to draw extensive conclusions.

3.3. An Entrepreneurial Initiative for Former Criminals Return to Society

In 1997 Christer Karlsson was released from prison for the last time. After more than thirty years in and out he was 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 organization to help people like themselves. Together they started the organization Criminals Return to Society, CRIS (www.kris.a.se).

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

One of the difficulties for former criminals is to find an honest way to make a living. Together with the need to improve knowledge about how to set up and run different ventures such as housing supporting lifestyle training for people just released from prison, ideas about an entrepreneurship program developed. In 2008 funding from the European Social Fund was granted for a training program in which people in CRIS are offered personal development training closely connected to entrepreneurship training. The training program is called Creative Honest Entrepreneurs. For approximately one week a month during almost a year people from different local branches of the organization meet for class, to socialize and network.

Knowledge about the need for supportive structures for returning to society is an important ground for the organization as well as the training program Creative Honest entrepreneurs. People with a background in drug addiction and criminality saw the need of another type of initiative than the regular public activities. One example that has been emphasized by people in CRIS is the fact of being able to say "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". People engaged in CRIS also

have knowledge about the needs of developing constructive structures including basic routines related to physical and mental health, social interaction and as a part of this, developing structures for possible ways to earn a living. And that there is a gap between the lives of people released from prison and established structures in society.

The basic fundament of CRIS and Creative Honest Entrepreneurs is the decisive decision to change combined with the comradeship supporting the change as well as reminding in a demanding way the steps that has to be taken. This “CRIS lifestyle” is expressed through the principles. Through experience the founders of CRIS realized the necessity of these principles for another constructive life style.

The most noticeable innovative aspect is on a very personal level. The decisive decision is fundamental. But there is still a long journey each individual has to make within him- or herself, on a group level as well as in relation to different groups in society, many times including their families and other kinds of personal networks, and society in general. The aim is to manage to reach a durable position where it is not only possible to help oneself but also to help others.

There are also other aspects differing the emerging Creative Honest Entrepreneurs in relation to public sector initiatives and also to other organizations providing different kinds of clinics or other types of services containing methods for treatment and/or training. The organization is owned and ran by former criminals and/or drug abusers. Services are developed out of their own identification of what problems have to be solved combined with what problems are possible for them, or others, to do something about.

Complementary to collaboration with public sector operative and funding institutions as well as other non-profit actors, CHRIS has developed a network of well known business leaders. They have become more and more accessible for giving advice, to provide networks facilities etc.

3.4. An Entrepreneurial Initiative for Global Justice “Another World”

The organization Attac Sweden was launched in Stockholm, Sweden, on 6 January 2001. According to the organization’s website, Attac Sweden is a “party-political independent network aiming for global justice and democracy” (www.attac.se, author’s translation). Attac is an organization related to the global justice movement and for many people it became known through media as one of the organizations demonstrating during the WTO meeting in Seattle 1999, Prague 2000, and Gothenburg 2001 (Thörn 2002, Della Porta 2007). The first years Attac attracted great attention and there were a great influx of people attending meetings and in membership. Attac seemed to fill a role for an increased interest both in issues at stake and the new non-hierarchical ways of organizing.

Initially, Attac started 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 organization, Action for a Tobin Tax to Assist the Citizen (ATTAC)? With the trade unions and the many social, cultural and ecological organizations, 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 two 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 organization. In each country, a slightly different organization was created, yet with the same overarching goals.

The entrepreneurial process was successful in attracting attention and numbers of people engaging during the preparation and the first six months. Some people called meetings in a very informal way and people, mostly young people, turned up in crowds. Launching meetings attracted hundreds and hundreds – in a time where other organization complained about young people’s decreased engagement. Attac Sweden was, and still is, a network like organization governed by direct democracy. There is still no office and for many years none received pay checks for their work. The website and a cell phone that was passed around in a small working group were used to coordinate the organization. The organization was, only six months after the formal launching, active during the demonstrations related to the EU top meeting in Gothenburg in 2001. Attac tried to organize dialogue between protesters and politicians at the meeting and succeeded to a large extent. Still there were fights between certain groups of protesters and the police. Even though Attac was not involved in this they were still, by some, associated to the protests and the organization went into a crisis. Six months later they had recovered to large extent and since then activities have found a more ordinary level. Still today a couple of thousand members continue the work for global justice.

Primary two sets of innovative aspects unfold in the case of Attac Sweden. One is related to the issues at stake. That is the attack on established economic order and the suggestions for “another world”. The other aspect is related to the formation of not only a new organization but a new kind of organizations in the Swedish organizational landscape. These two sets of innovative aspects have, in practice, emerged in a close interplay during the entrepreneurial process and since then constantly been renegotiated and reconstructed (Gawell 2006).

Both these sets of innovative aspects are not totally unique for Attac Sweden. Issues as stake are more or less shared with other organizations within the social movement for global justice that had a noticeable active phase at this time. Several of the actors within this movement also shared similar ideas about organizing action through networks promoting principles of a direct democracy and using relatively open internet based communication tools. Attac Sweden was one of the actors applying these organizational principals that many established organizations perceived as new in practice. Therefore Attac Sweden has been one of the forerunners that can, and has, been used as models for other organizations.

As for the issues at stake, there are again different aspects of innovation being elaborated on in this case. There is a protest against the state of the world. There is an analysis that the established economic system is a part of the problem as well as an analysis of issues within the economic system that is particularly problematic. There are furthermore suggestions of what can be done differently to at least contribute to the overarching aim of “another world”.

4. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP INITIATIVES - INNOVATIVE CHALLENGERS AND ADJUSTABLE FOLLOWERS

The studied cases contribute to a rather divers description of dynamic processes on personal, organizational as well as societal levels. It is not possible to say that any of the cases are uniquely innovative. As a matter of fact it is hardly possible to say that any single activity or form of organizing activities is uniquely innovative. However, each case has its own combination and construction which means that they more or less clearly contribute to small changes and potentially to dynamic changes in the organizational landscape and in society at large.

The dynamic aspects of these cases relate both to organized practices in civil society, civil society organizations’ role in society as well as to conceptualizations of people, organizations and systems of thoughts.

4.1. Constructing (new) organizational practices

Noticeable in all these cases are the construction of a focus. The focus is after some time conceptualized as an organizational mission. But at early stages it is far from clearly articulated. The narratives (re)constructed in documents as well as in interviews tell stories of affectionately concerns that are perceived as important and even necessary to act upon, and even act upon in a slightly different way than within established structures. In the case of Fryshuset and the initiatives for long time unemployed people respond to what they perceive as young people's or unemployed people's needs. In the case of Attac Sweden, people engaged refer to a perceived necessity to act to "change the world" (Gawell 2006). The case of CRIS expresses a slightly different story clearly referring to "helping oneself and helping others" as former criminals themselves started, developed and has run the organization since it was established. This bottom up approach is not unique in Sweden or in organizational initiatives in general. Organizations for people with disabilities have developed similar approaches during more than a century. However, looking into civil society organizations in general, and/or indicative studies of entrepreneurial initiatives it is far from common (see for example overarching studies of the non-profit sector done by Lundström and Wijkström 1997; studies on societal/social entrepreneurship Gawell, Johannisson and Lundqvist 2009; Gawell 2011).

In all the cases studied sensitivity towards people in focus combined with competence and engagement are pointed out as crucial success factors. The necessary competences differ a bit between the cases. But all in all references are being done both issues at stake and issues related to running an organization.

Participation and influence are highlighted aspects in all the studied cases. This is well grounded in the common Swedish narrative of popular mass movements, but also in other spheres in society. However, forms for participation differ. In the case of Attac Sweden an open direct democratic approach has more or less been taken for granted from start. In the initiatives for long time unemployed participation and influence on planning every day activities and to participate in organizational governance is pointed out. Even if many of the unemployed have influence because of the adopted working methods they do not really gain positions with formal influence, for example as co-owner in cooperative organizations, at least for a long time. In the case of Fryshuset there are also rather developed approaches to facilitate young people to participate and influence. However, the organization is run as a non-profit foundation without former influence for members/participants. CRIS is run as a membership based organizations where former criminals and people with former drug addiction can be members and thereby have a vote.

The engagement in (new) civil society organizations have been referred to possibilities to focus, to develop methods and to be able to provide an added value such as the person-to-person relation beyond professional duties.

4.2. (Re)negotiating roles in society

All these cases have emerged during a time when there has been a renewed interest in private providers of social welfare services. All, except Attac Sweden, provide services of some kind combined with advocacy. The initiatives for long time unemployed are the clearest providers of welfare services at the same time as they also have outspoken aspects of business activities (with reinvestments of profits).

The shift towards more public procurements, funding through sales of services rather than grant based funding of activities affects all the cases except Attac Sweden that in general hardly has any public funding. Some of the initiatives think this shift is positive. They even promote it. They refer to a decreased dependency of public grants. Others think that the shift is negative. They refer to decreased funding in general. Less dialogue in developing services and more centralized public decision making.

Less explicitly elaborated on is the issue of responsibility related both related to the public responsibility towards all citizens and taxpayers on the one hand, and civil society organizations and other private actors as service providers on the other hand. The increased use of private service providers means increased attention on these organizations responsibilities towards citizens in rather general terms as well as assessment of these organizations legitimacy as representatives for providing public services. The roles for cooperation for example public officials like social workers, employment officers or the police works in some cases well and in other cases it is less developed.

4.3. Articulating disclosive stories and creating new worlds

Beyond practices and roles in society the cases studied relate to aspects of how people, organizations and systems of thoughts are understood and conceptualized. In the case of Attac Sweden it was a matter of articulating their story about the state of the world, the established economic system role and that it was possible to change. Their stories were communicated and became part of the knowledge about the current globalization (Gawell 2006). As the organization was established this knowledge was to a large extent seen as alternative stories. Some of it has now days, a decade later, become part of public agendas and part of the common knowledge on globalization.

The other cases studied also relate to the creation of disclosive stories and new worlds. Most noticeable is the articulation of stories related to empowerment and the creation of socialized youth as well as working and constructively honest individuals in society. In some of the cases this is clearly related to citizenship. In other cases rather to functional people in society.

As some of these stories, articulated throughout the organizational process, become more or less taken for granted they become stories disclosing new worlds that affect how people, organizations and systems of thoughts are understood (Spinosa, Flores and Dreyfus 1997; Gawell 2006).

4.4. Concluding discussion

Civil society organizations are ascribed a complementary role in a welfare system that has been dominated by the public sector during the second half of the twentieth century (Svedberg 2005; Trädgårdh 2007). Historical descriptions, however, articulate an innovative role revealing also a civil society based entrepreneurial dynamic as one significant contribution to the emerging welfare society (see for example the historical description in Larsson 2008). Innovative and entrepreneurial aspects are however closely interrelated to other processes in society such as trends, macro level shifts as well as institutional pressure and retention (Aldrich 1999; Stryker 2000). Institutional theory, or theories based on institutional perspectives have not until recently significantly recognized innovative and entrepreneurial (Aldrich 1999; Garud, Hardy and Maguire 2007; Nicholls 2010). Whether this is related primarily to paradigmatic aspects of research, policy interest or empirical trends in civil society is currently unclear.

This study contributes to the understanding of dynamic aspects in and beyond civil society through, primarily out of an entrepreneurship approach, reveals how civil society organizational initiatives (re)construct their roles. Through constructing (new) organizational practices, (re)negotiating roles in society as well as articulating disclosive stories and thereby the creation of new worlds civil society organizations these initiatives contributes to dynamics on micro, meso and potentially also macro levels. To a large extent the studied civil society initiatives express adjustments to contextual conditions including different kinds of occurrences and trends. But when it comes to what has been constructed at core issues a more distinct and intense role can be distinguished. In some of the studied cases there are subtle differences to other initiatives for example of how to integrate long time unemployed. In other cases the differentiation towards other initiatives are expressed in more aggressive terms such as a non-fighting fight club (the case of Fryshuset) or attack on established structures (the case of Attac Sweden). Regardless of impact the study point out both innovative challenging roles and roles as adjustable followers.

Looking into the articulation of the issues as stake these initiatives varies as for the extent they differ from established structures. Initiatives aiming to integrate long time unemployed, youth and also former criminals can all be comprised within the established aims of an inclusive well functional society as well as an accepted opinion that there ought to be programs or initiatives targeting “excluded” groups to reach those aims. In this way they all act within overarching structures. However, in the case of Attac, also the overarching established structure, more specifically the economic system dominating the notion of development, is challenged. This initiative therefore illustrates not only dynamics within a given system, but a double challenge on a micro/meso organizational level as well as a macro level that in this case can be understood as an overarching discourse on the notion of development. This can be related to Schumpeter’s argument of entrepreneurship as radical innovations that in economic contexts even challenge equilibriums (1934).

As for the mobilization of resources the study shed lights on different strategies to a large extent adjusted to current conditions and trends. The case of Fryshuset, but also some of the initiatives with funds from the European Social Fund express arguments close to a more general line of argumentations that income generation grounded in sales express progress and leads less dependency. As for the mobilization of resources the studied cases connect to the Kirzner approach in which entrepreneurs are seen as alert organizers (1973).

This study has shed light on how civil society organizations (re)construct their roles and thereby civil society organizations dynamic role in society. Traces of the initiatives constructions can be seen in ongoing activities, shifts in documents or references and impact evaluations of different kinds. The latter are primarily evaluations focusing on specific goal-attainment and/or organizational outcomes. It is therefore difficult to draw conclusion on the impact of these initiatives on institutional structures without a more extensive study on institutional level including analysis of causes and effects. But ten years after the establishment of Attac, their arguments can be traced in the current public debate, on political agendas and even among people within established economic system.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, H 1999, *Organizations Evolving* London: Sage Publications.
- Amnå, E. (ed) 1999, *Civilsamhället, Demokratiutredningens forskarvolym VIII*, SOU 1999:84.
- Amnå, E. 2005, *Scenöppning, scenvridning, scenförändring* in Amnå, E (ed) *Civilsamhället. Några forskningsfrågor* Stockholm: Riksbankens Jubileumsfond i samarbete med Gidlunds förlag.
- Arthur, B. 1988, Self-reinforcing Mechanisms in Economics, in Anderson et al. (eds), *The Economy as an Evolving Complex System*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Bjerke, B. 2005, *Public Entrepreneurship – Marginal Made Central*, Paper presented at the Enterprise & Innovation Conference, University of Waikato, New Zealand.
- Berger and Luckmann 1967,
- Borzaga, C. and Defourny, J. 2001, *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*, New York: Routledge.
- Borzaga, C. Galera, G. and Nogales, R. (eds) 2008, *Social Enterprise: A New Model for Poverty Reduction and Employment Generation*, EMES/UNDP.
- Clemens, E. and Cook, J. 1999, *Institutionalism: Explaining Durability and Change*, Annual Review of Sociology Vol 25, p 441-446.
- Czarniawska, B. 1998, *A Narrative Approach to Organization Studies in Qualitative Research Methods Series 43*, Thousands Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- Czarniawska, B. 2004, *Narratives in Social Science Research* London: Sage Publications.
- Czarniawska, B. 2005, *En teori om organisering* Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- David, P. 1985, Clio and the Economics of QWERTY, *Economic History* Vol 75, p 227-332.
- Della Porta, D. 2007, *The Global Justice Movement*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. 1991, *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Friedland, R. and Alford, R. 1991, *Bringing Society back in: Symbols, Practices and Institutional Contradictions*, in DiMaggio and Powell (eds), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Garud, R., Hardy, C. and Maguire, S. 2007, *Institutional Entrepreneurship as Embedded Agency*, *Organization Studies* Vol 28 (7), p 957-969.
- Gawell, M. 2006, *Activist Entrepreneurship. Attaching Norms and Articulating Disclosive Stories* Stockholm University.
- Gawell, M. 2008, *Social Engagement and Entrepreneurial Action. Soci(et)al entrepreneurship and different forms of social enterprises in current Swedish debate*. Published in the EMES Conference Selected Papers (ECSP), www.emes.net
- Gawell, M. 2011, *Inte vilket entreprenörskap och företagande som helst. En fältstudie av 7 projekt med finansiering från den Europeiska socialfonden*. Stockholm: Tillväxtverket.
- Gawell, M., Johannisson, B. and Lundqvist, M. 2009, *Samhällets entreprenörer. En forskarantologi om samhällsentreprenörskap* Stockholm: KK-stiftelsen. A short version in English published the same year, *Entrepreneurship in the Name of Society. Reader's Digest of a Swedish Research Anthology*. Stockholm: KK-stiftelsen.
- Hjorth, D. 2001, *Rewriting Entrepreneurship. Enterprise discourse and entrepreneurship in the case of re-organizing ES*. Växjö: Växjö University Press.
- Hjorth, D, Johannisson, B and Steyaert, C 2003, *Entrepreneurship as Discourse and Life Style* in Czarniawska, B and Sevón, G (eds) *The Northern Lights. Organization Theory in Scandinavia* Malmö: Liber.
- Hvenmark, J. and Wijkström, F. 2004, *The Popular Movement Marinade. The Dominant Civil Society Framework in Sweden*. Stockholm School of Economics/EFI Working Paper Series in Business Administration No 2004:18.

- Johannisson, B. 1990, *Community Entrepreneurship – Cases and Conceptualization*, Journal of Entrepreneurship & Regional Development.
- Kirzner, I. 1973. *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Landström, H. 1999, *Entreprenörskapets rötter*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Larsson, J. 2008, *Folkhemmet och det europeiska huset. Svensk välfärdsstat i omvandling* Stockholm: Hjalmarsson & Högberg förlag.
- Laurelii, E. 2002, *Sociala arbetskooperativ*. Arbetslivsinstitutet.
- Lundström, T. and Wijkström, F. 1997, *The nonprofit sector in Sweden* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mair, J, Robinsson, J and Hockerts, K 2006, *Social Entrepreneurship*, Hampshire: Palgrave.
- 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 & Practice* Vol 34, Issue 4, p 1042-2587.
- Perrini, F 2006, *The New Social Entrepreneurship. What Awaits Social Entrepreneurial Ventures?* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Pestoff, V. 1998, *Beyond the Market and State: Social Enterprises and Civil Democracy in a Welfare Society*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Pestoff, V. 2009, *A Democratic Architecture for the Welfare State. Promoting citizen participation, the third sector and co-production*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Sarasvathy, S. (2001). *Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency*. *Academy of Management Review* Vol 26, No 2, p 243-288.
- Schoonhoven, K. and Romanelli, E. 2001, *The Entrepreneurship Dynamic. The Origins of Entrepreneurship and Its Role in Industry Evolution*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Schumpeter, J. 1934, *The Theory of Economic Development* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Seo, M. and Creed, D. 2002, *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Silverman, D. 2001, *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*, London: Sage.
- Spinosa, C, Flores, F and Dreyfus, H 1997, *Disclosing New Worlds. Entrepreneurship, Democratic Action, and the Cultivation of Solidarity*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Steyaert, C. 2000, *Creating New Worlds: Political Agendas of Entrepreneurship*, Paper presented at the 11th Nordic Conference on Small Business Research in Aarhus, Denmark.
- Steyaert, C. 2004, *The Prosaics of Entrepreneurship*, in Hjorth and Steyaerts (eds). *Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Steyaert, C. and Bouwen, R. 1997, *Telling Stories of Entrepreneurship. Towards a Narrative – Contextual Epistemology for Entrepreneurial Studies*, in Donckels and Miettinen (eds), *Entrepreneurship and SME Research: On its Way to the Next Millenium*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Steyaert, C. and Hjorth, D. (eds) 2003, *New Movements in Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Steyaert, C. and Hjorth, D. 2006, *Entrepreneurship as Social Change* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Styrjan, Y. 1996, *Sweden: The Emergence of Work-integration Social Enterprises*, in Borzaga and Defourny (eds.), *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*. New York: Routledge.
- Styrjan, Y. 2006, *The Practice of Social Entrepreneurship: Notes Toward a Resource-perspective*, in Steyaert and Hjorth (eds.), *Entrepreneurship as Social Change*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Stryker, R. 2000, *Legitimacy Processes as Institutional Politics: Implications for Theory and Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Vol 17, 179-223.
- Svedberg, L. 1981, *Ej till Salu*. Statens ungdomsråd.
- Svedberg, L. 2005, *Det civila samhället och välfärden* in Amnå, E. (ed) *Civilsamhället: Några forskningsfrågor* Hedemora: Riksbankens Jubileumsfond and Gidlunds förlag.
- Swedberg, R. (ed) 2000, *Entrepreneurship. The Social Science View*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swedberg, R. 2008. Schumpeter. Om skapande förstörelse och entreprenörskap. Nordstedts akademiska förlag.
- Tillväxtverket 2010, www.tillvaxtverket.se, www.sofisam.se
- Trägårdh, L. (ed) 2007, *State and civil society in northern Europe: The Swedish model Reconsidered* New York: Berghahn Books.
- Thörn, H. 2002, *Globaliseringens dimensioner. Nationalstat, världssamhälle, demokrati och sociala rörelser* Stockholm, Bokförlaget Atlas.
- Wijkström, F. and Lundström, T. 2002, *Den ideella sektorn. Organisationerna i det civila samhället*, Stockholm: Sober Förlag.
- www.attac.org
- www.attac.se
- www.esf.se
- www.fryshuset.se
- www.kris.a.se
- www.tillvaxtverket.se/tematiskgrupp