LUND UNIVERSITY

Constructing the 'social' in social entrepreneurship

A postcolonial perspective

Stevenson, Anna

2021

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Stevenson, A. (2021). *Constructing the 'social' in social entrepreneurship: A postcolonial perspective*. [Doctoral Thesis (monograph), Lund University School of Economics and Management, LUSEM]. MediaTryck Lund.

Total number of authors:
1

General rights
Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.
• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
• You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
• You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

LUND UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT

Constructing the 'social' in social entrepreneurship

A postcolonial perspective

ANNA STEVENSON | DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Lund Studies in Economics and Management | 152

Constructing the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship

A postcolonial perspective

Anna Stevenson

LUND
UNIVERSITY

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

by due permission of the School of Economics and Management, Lund University, Sweden.
To be defended at Ekonomihögskolan. Date: May 21 2021 at 13.00.

Faculty opponent
Martyna Śliwa

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Organization
LUND UNIVERSITY
School of Economics and Management

Author: Anna Stevenson</td><td colspan="2">Document name PhD Dissertation

Date of issue May 21, 2021

Sponsoring organization</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Title and subtitle
Constructing the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship: A postcolonial perspective</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Abstract
Social entrepreneurship is often depicted as the solution to the various problems we have in society today. In the mainstream literature, it tends to be presented as a site of empowerment, inclusion, morality and compassion. However, while much attention has been granted the ‘entrepreneurship’ part of the term, we know less about the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship. The meaning of the ‘social’ is largely left vague and open-ended, seemingly implying a neutral and universal form of goodness. Drawing upon a more critical stream of literature, which emphasizes the inherently political and ideological character of the ‘social’, I explore how the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship is constructed and upheld. In viewing this process through a postcolonial lens, I further address the power relations involved in shaping the ‘social’.

Through a qualitative study, I explore a social entrepreneurship initiative that took place on a small Danish Island. Facing challenges such as depopulation and a high unemployment rate, with many residents having to tackle various social problems and health issues, a group of actors initiated a project aiming to bring life back to the Island. The project, referred to as a strategy by some and as branding by others, went under the label ‘Sustainable Island’ and aspired to change the image of the Island from that of a rural society in decline to a sustainable society in the forefront of green technology. While receiving praise and support from an international audience, the project was met with protests and scepticism from the local community. To understand the power relations present in the local construction of the ‘social’ on the Island, I draw upon Bhabha’s (1994) concepts of Otherness, ambivalence and mimicry.

By considering both human and non-human actors, I analyze how the ‘social’ is held together. My findings highlight how the ‘social’ takes form as an idea of what is good for society and how it relates to an idea of what it means to be a good citizen. I argue that social entrepreneurship involves processes of Othering necessary to uphold an idea of the ‘social’ as well as the ‘entrepreneurial’. I further show how associations with ‘good’ objects facilitated the settlement of a certain idea of the ‘social’ on the Island. ‘Good’ objects as well as the discursive construction of the Other became important actors in upholding a certain meaning of the ‘social’ against resistance. Based on these findings, I argue that the relational construction of the ‘social’ involves parallel processes of exclusion and inclusion. While a variety of actors were necessary to construct the ‘social’, they did not participate equally in the conversation on what was good for society. My study thus adds to our understanding of how power relations shape the idea of what the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship means.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Key words Social entrepreneurship, power, postcolonial theory, Bhabha, Othering, inclusion, exclusion</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Classification system and/or index terms (if any)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Supplementary bibliographical information</td><td>Language English</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">ISSN and key title</td><td>ISBN 978-91-7895-845-0</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Recipient’s notes</td><td colspan="2">Number of pages 195</td><td>Price</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Security classification</td></tr>
</table>

I, the undersigned, being the copyright owner of the abstract of the above-mentioned dissertation, hereby grant to all reference sources permission to publish and disseminate the abstract of the above-mentioned dissertation.

Signature Date 2021-04-15

Constructing the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship

A postcolonial perspective

Anna Stevenson

LUND
UNIVERSITY

Coverphoto by iStock.com/elebeZoom (The shadow of Don Quixote cast on a windmill)

Copyright Anna Stevenson

School of Economics and Management | Entrepreneurship

ISBN 978-91-7895-845-0 (print)
ISBN 978-91-7895-846-7 (pdf)

Printed in Sweden by Media-Tryck, Lund University
Lund 2021

Media-Tryck is a Nordic Swan Ecolabel certified provider of printed material. Read more about our environmental work at www.mediatryck.lu.se

To my parents
Richard & Veronica

Contents

Acknowledgements **9**

1 Introduction **11**

A guided tour of the problematization process 13
The first visit to the Island 16
Pausing to take a critical perspective 17
Next stop: Social entrepreneurship as victimization 19
Chasing the 'Islander' 20
Finding constructions 22

Purpose of the study 25

Overview 26

2 The 'social' in social entrepreneurship **29**

The way we talk about social entrepreneurship 31
Themes of individualism 32

Problematizing the 'social' 39
Social entrepreneurship and power relations 42
Social entrepreneurial subjectivities 45

Summary 48

3 A postcolonial perspective **49**

Postcolonial theory 49
Representation, Otherness and mimicry 51

Postcolonial theory in management and organization research 54
Postcolonial theory in entrepreneurship research 57

Postcolonialism and the 'good' organization 58
Social entrepreneurship through the postcolonial lens 60

4 Methodology **63**

Social constructionism and denaturalization 64
Language and discourse 66
Anti-essentialism and representation 67
Interpretivism 70

Constructing empirical material 71
Conducting interviews 72

On 'being there', positionality and representation 76
Archival material 83
Analyzing the material 84
5 Constructing the Good Entrepreneur through Othering 89
The story of the Islander 89
The Islander as an Other 93
The story of the art museum 95
The ambivalence of the Other 97
Constructing the self through the Other 99
The conservative Other, the innovative self 99
The antagonist Other, the achieving self 102
The beneficiary Other, the moral self 105
Summary 108
6 'Good' Entrepreneurial settlement 111
A business take on the common good 112
How to not be an Islander: Consumption as demonstration of will 116
Consumption as imitation 120
Challenging the Good Entrepreneur through imitation 122
The (for some) unreachable goodness 128
Summary 131
7 Resisting good will 133
The story of the Disadvantaged Village 134
A history of resisting or A history of imposed objects 137
(Appropriately) Resisting 'good' objects 142
Upholding the 'social' 148
The 'social' as a discursive closure 150
Summary 156
8 On the inclusive/exclusive construction of the 'social' 159
The construction of the 'social' 159
Through the postcolonial lens 161
Summary of contributions 168
Understanding the 'social' in social entrepreneurship 169
Final reflections 172
References 177

Acknowledgements

There are many that I would like to acknowledge for supporting me in writing this thesis. First, I would like to thank my supervisors, Caroline Wigren-Kristoferson and Jens Rennstam. I feel lucky to have had the chance to take part of your knowledge and experience. Thank you for your endless support and for always showing enthusiasm for my writing. I am forever grateful for all the time you have put in carefully reading my texts and for all our interesting discussions that helped me develop as a scholar. I will surely miss our meetings.

I am further grateful to those who provided valuable input on previous versions of this thesis. Lena Olaison, Tommy Shih, Karin Berglund, Dan Kärreman, Saara Taalas and Jenny Helin served as opponents at my formal doctoral seminars. Thank you for providing helpful feedback and for guiding me in more fruitful directions.

I would also like to thank the foundation 'Entrepreneurship in Lund' for granting me the stipend that enabled me to initiate my PhD studies. This foundation has also been exceptionally generous in providing funding for conference participation. I truly appreciate the opportunities I have had to participate and present my research at international conferences.

During my time as a PhD student, I was lucky enough to receive the Hedelius scholarship from *Handelsbankens Forskningsstiftelser* (Jan Wallander's and Tom Hedelius' Foundation, Tore Browald's Foundation). This made it possible for me to spend six months in the Land of Enchantment (i.e. New Mexico) learning about antenarratives, storytelling and sustainability with Professor David Boje. I will remember our weekly coffees at Milagro's with fondness. Also, my time in New Mexico would not have been the same had I not met the amazing Mabel Sanchez. Thank you for the boundless hospitality you showed me and the friendship you offered.

Further, I am thankful to the people on the Island who participated in this study. Thank you for telling me your stories, sharing your opinions, inviting me to participate in meetings and conferences, offering me places to stay, and the list

goes on! Clearly, without your participation, this thesis would not have been possible.

The thing I have liked most about being a PhD student is all the fascinating and though-provoking courses offered at the Department of Business Administration in Lund. I have particularly appreciated the courses in qualitative method given by Jens Rennstam, Mats Alvesson, and Peter Svensson. These courses have certainly sparked my theoretical curiosity and enthusiasm for gathering and analyzing empirical material. Thank you to the aforementioned teachers for making my empirical journey more exciting.

I would also like to acknowledge the people at Sten K Johnson Centre for Entrepreneurship for providing a warm and welcoming working environment. A special thanks to Craig Mitchell for being a great colleague and a mentor in teaching. Moreover, I would like to mention the PhD community at Sten K and beyond. All the lunches, after-works, writing sessions, shared anguish and emergent friendships have definitely made these years better. A big thank you to all the great office mates I was fortunate enough to have throughout the years. Christin, Solomon, Tanya, Vivek, and Ziad, you undoubtedly made my days a lot more fun! I am further indebted to Christin Scheller and Jonas Cedergren for providing tons of emotional support as well as invaluable input on my texts. Thank you also Dan Stevenson and Camilla Civardi for helping me with the final editing work.

Last but not least, I am thankful to my supporting and understanding family and friends. I am deeply grateful to my partner, Eduard, for being my rock, for reading, for being curious and for discussing ideas with me. Things have certainly gotten more wonderful since you came into my life.

1 Introduction

> I think when you go to remote areas all over the world…a lot of places people have this…they don't believe that good things can happen. People move from remote areas, the young ones move away, they don't come back, there are a lot of elderly people, a lot of…in many places you have a huge unemployment rate and so…there are difficulties in remote areas, and I think you can see it in the way people behave. Do you know what I mean? (Freja, founder of Greenland, April 2016)

The Danish island that sets the context of this study is known as 'the sunny island' and receives around 400,000 tourists each summer season, which is a great contrast to its modest population of 40,000. While the tourism industry offers inhabitants plenty of work during high season, jobs are scarce during the rest of the year. High unemployment rates and especially a lack of qualified jobs have made the Island an unattractive place for young people, who would rather move to urban areas that offer university education and, subsequently, more attractive jobs. Migration of youths has led to an increasing depopulation, leaving the remaining inhabitants older, less educated, and to a higher degree unemployed than the country average.

The story goes that after the fishing industry fell in the 80s, the only choice remaining was that of relying on tourism. In addition to its diverse nature and long, hot summer season, the Island is known for its round churches and smoked herring. It has been said to ooze a kind of laid-back 'dusty' feel. Due to the special light of the Island, the place has become home to quite a few artists, mainly painters, but also potters and craftspeople. Since there have been few opportunities for employment, small-scale entrepreneurs are plentiful. This social clique of artists and entrepreneurs are mainly in-migrants settled in the trendy cities around the coastline. In many ways, this group is untouched by the issues resulting from urbanization. However, only a few kilometres inland from the coast, inhabitants face a different reality. Residents of the coast describe the in-migrants as poor, uneducated and suffering from both social problems and health issues. It is these areas of lesser privilege, sometimes

referred to as ghettos, and not the affluent coastline, that is implied when portraying the Island as a poor and dying society.

In order to initiate change, a strategic camp was organized in 2007 during which 48 people spent 48 hours together on one of the ferryboats that carry both commuters and tourists between the Island and the mainland. The 48 people invited to partake included local business owners, members of various local associations, and people involved in the energy and tourism industry. The ferry navigated in circles around the Island for 48 hours to allow participants the opportunity to privately discuss possible strategies for the Island society. The goal was to extend the tourist season in order to create more employment opportunities year around. Producing employment opportunities was seen as key to increasing the attractiveness of the Island as a place to live, and thus, to bring back its allegedly lost life. The outcome of this workshop was a new branding strategy named 'Sustainable Island'. This brand was to refer to both the great nature of the Island and to portray the Island as a forerunner of green technologies. What people remember from the original strategy today is mainly the goal of becoming CO2 neutral in 2025. Amongst the attempts to realize this, two initiatives stand out. One is the transition to fossil-free energy production. The other is a sustainable hotel- and conference centre named Greenland.

The idea of having a hotel so sustainable that it would become a 'reason to go' came up in one of the working groups of the strategy camp. The would-be founder of Greenland, Freja, participated in this group. Subsequent to the camp, she conducted a feasibility study for realizing the idea. Next, she acquired funds from both public and private sources. She then led the construction process of the hotel and, once finished, she became the hotel manager. During the process, she managed to establish an extensive international network, while drawing attention to the Island and initiating collaborations with well-known international actors. She was rewarded several international and national awards related to entrepreneurship and innovation. At the same time, local media produced stories questioning the project's feasibility, future profitability, and sustainability throughout the process. As she explains it:

> They said it. They wrote it in the paper. […] They actually had it in local television, they had […] half an hour only talking about…yeah, that I lied and that it wasn't true, it wasn't true what I said, things like this couldn't happen at the island, and I would never succeed in it. […] when we went out to buy milk for example or whatever groceries, people would stop me and say, "It is never

> going to happen", "How can you continue?" (Freja, founder of Greenland, April 2016).

This apparent paradox was what initially directed my inquiry. Why would citizens oppose a project meant for their benefit?

A guided tour of the problematization process

This thesis was initially meant to be about something else. In 2016, I joined a pre-existing research project meant to explore the role of context and embeddedness (see e.g. Granovetter, 1985; Polanyi, 1944) within the entrepreneurial process. Here follows an excerpt of the project description stated in the advertisement for the PhD position to which I was accepted:

> So far, in entrepreneurship research, we have assumed that resources at hand, which are often embedded in a local context (i.e. local networks, access to finance and knowledge), are of great importance when starting a new firm. That is to say, the embeddedness of the entrepreneur plays an important role in the entrepreneurial process. However, in contemporary society when people are mobile and move between geographical spaces and between professional careers access to a local context might be limited. In this research project the purpose is to shed light on entrepreneurial processes when the entrepreneur is entering into a venture process when the local context is new to him or her; that is to say either he or she is starting a new venture in a new geographical space or he or she is starting a venture in a new industry.

Thus, the research project was pre-specified to study disembeddedness (i.e. when an actor is not immersed in a context of some kind, e.g. geographical or social) and how it matters for the entrepreneurial process. Simply put, how this affects entrepreneurial performance. For my application to the PhD programme, I wrote a proposal suggesting a study of disembeddedness in the field of *social* entrepreneurship,[1] mainly because I thought this was more meaningful to study, since I figured that the emergence of social enterprises reflects a positive development in society. This means that when I selected my case, I had already made a first interpretation. I wanted the case to show that 'disembeddedness' had had some kind of implication for the social entrepreneur that I was to study. Hopefully, I would be able to say that

[1] Social entrepreneurship means that social issues are addressed through business methods (Roundy, 2014).

‘disembedded’ social entrepreneurs are more likely to create opportunities, be innovative and so on.

At a conference on social innovation that I attended at the very beginning of my studies, in March 2016, I found my ‘case’ in one of the keynote speakers. It was a woman (Freja) who had founded a sustainable hotel- and conference centre (Greenland) on a Danish island (the Island). This does not at first come across as a social enterprise, but I interpreted it as such for two reasons. First, it was to be ‘the most sustainable hotel- and conference centre in the world’. This meant everything from the material used in the building, to resource and energy usage, to water purification and a display of the various green technologies on site. Perhaps, some readers will think that this does not sound very *social*; is it not rather a case of *sustainable* entrepreneurship? For me, the two concepts are hard to separate. Sustainable entrepreneurship can be thought of as ‘focused on the preservation of nature, life support, and community in the pursuit of perceived opportunities to bring into existence future products, processes, and services for gain, where gain is broadly construed to include economic and non-economic gains to individuals, the economy, and society’ (Shepherd & Patzelt, 2011, p. 142). The creation of environmental values is closely intertwined with that of social values, which is why I, for reasons of simplicity, will stick to the label of ‘social entrepreneurship’. The second reason for this is that the purpose of the hotel was to enhance social welfare at the Island by promoting business tourism and creating jobs. The Island was at risk of decline with its ageing population and consistently high unemployment rate. Thus, the hotel had a clear intention of creating both social and environmental value, in addition to its economic mission.

What I found interesting about this case from the beginning was that even though the goal of Greenland was ‘social’, in that its reason for existence was to save the Island society from fading away, the initiative was met with opposition from citizens. There was an apparent conflict between this social enterprise and the community in which it acted. The hotel founder, Freja, told me stories of people approaching her when she was grocery shopping, prompting her to stop the construction of the hotel or even shouting names at her out on the street. The project was supposedly seen as being too big, too ambitious and principally unfeasible, and therefore, it brought up strong feelings.

At this stage, I started to form a first interpretation of what this case was a case of. This first idea was practically unchanged from the image I had formed of the empirical material before I had even done an interview. Interpretation always precedes data (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018) and at this stage my pre-

understanding had not yet been altered by the empirical material. My reasoning looked somewhat as follows: the founder had recently moved from the capital city of Copenhagen to the Island. In starting the hotel, she had also switched from one industry to something quite different, as she came from the banking sector. Thus, she had entered into a new context, both in terms of profession and geographical location. The Island was quite a bounded society in which the dominant narrative revolved around being disadvantaged compared to the rest of the country and being unable to do anything about the undesirable development. However, Freja was able to perceive opportunities due to the fact that she had not been socialized into the mindset of the Island residents (she was 'disembedded'). The citizens of the Island objected due to characteristics such as being conservative, sceptical towards outsiders, living by Janteloven[2] and so on. Thus, the conclusion of this would be that disembeddedness can be advantageous for entrepreneurs in that it allows them to 'think outside the box', but they may also be discouraged by community resistance if their ideas are seen as too controversial. Hence, at this point, the case was a case of a social entrepreneur as a disembedded innovator—doing good but facing opposition.

Empirical material is always a perspective-dependent interpretation, used to argue for a certain understanding (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018). Prior to any fieldwork, I was given a concept to apply, i.e. 'embeddedness'. Thus, there did not exist a state of interpretation where I had not already begun to consciously consider theoretical concepts. Not only did this first interpretation follow the expectations of the pre-defined project within which I was to work but also conventional assumptions in entrepreneurship research. The implicit (and sometimes explicit) aim of such research is to provide input for entrepreneurs in practice or for policy on entrepreneurship. Both of these aims rest on the assumption that research should promote entrepreneurship (i.e. bring about more entrepreneurs or help entrepreneurs become more successful), since entrepreneurship is assumed to create jobs and drive economic growth.

It is easy to initially end up in such dominant interpretive patterns. By drawing inspiration from critical theory, an alternative point of departure can be created, and it becomes easier to question the initial interpretation and to consider the empirical material from different perspectives (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018). However, the first step towards altering my understanding of the case was to spend time in the field.

---

[2] An expression used in the Nordic countries, often to describe a negative attitude towards individual effort and achievement.

The first visit to the Island

I visited the Island for the first time in the last week of May 2016. I was invited to stay at the sustainable hotel and conference centre called Greenland, at no expense, for five days. Greenland hosts 350 delegates, while the hotel has 64 guest rooms. This means that the hotel cannot host all conference guests if fully booked, and this is also the intention. The other hotels on the Island should also reap the benefits of an increased business tourism. My main intention with the visit was to try to talk to Freja as much as possible and to follow her in her work. The interviews revolved around her: what did she find surprising about ways of thinking and doing at the Island when she first came, what had been the success factors and challenges during the process, what kind of networking strategies had she used, and the like. On the first day, I participated in a meeting with Freja and a Red Cross representative regarding a collaboration on a refugee apprentice project. Through this project, recently arrived refugees had the opportunity to learn gardening by working with the hotel's permanently employed gardener. Later, I followed Freja and her husband to a meeting on tourism development. During the meeting, Freja introduced me to several people, whom I later interviewed. For the rest of the week, I continued to talk to people by recommendation of Freja: municipality representatives, people from various business associations, the energy company and so on.

I started to ask people what they thought was the reason for the opposition directed to Greenland, and they all gave me the same answer. People on the Island are sceptical; it has to do with them and not the hotel. After going through a bunch of local news clips, I found a person who publicly opposed the hotel, and after meeting him for an interview I learnt that he, and supposedly other people as well, did not believe that Greenland was a truly sustainable construction. This did however not seem to be the main reason for opposition, because at the same time, I was told by several people that the problem was that most people did not even care about sustainability.

By the end of the week, Freja invited me to accompany her to a conference in Copenhagen where she was giving a presentation. At the conference, Greenland was presented as a best practice example of the triple helix model, that is, when academia, industry and governments work together to reach an innovative goal. As we travelled there together, we talked about the various forms of opposition she had faced, and how she had managed to go on with the project regardless. When we later said goodbye at Copenhagen airport, she invited me to visit the Island again.

Pausing to take a critical perspective

Subsequent to my first visit, I started to see the Island as a narrative ecology (Gabriel, 2016), i.e. an ecology of narratives with a master narrative that forms a dominant story, but also counter-narratives that resist this dominant story. However, the voice of the resistance (the counter-narrative) was limited at this point, and I mainly heard people speaking *of* it but not actually representing it. In parallel, I started to consider my first interpretation, which centred on the 'disembedded' innovator, along with the assumptions generally made in entrepreneurship research. Not only are we, as researchers, constructors (of something 'out there'), but we are also constructions (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018). Thus, research is never neutral but charged with the researcher's political ideological context and the assumptions that pertain to it. Part of being reflexive is to show awareness of how one is constructed.

The ideological assumptions underlying entrepreneurship studies encourage researchers to pass on certain values in their texts. These assumptions are related to neoliberalism, which Harvey (2005, p. 2) explains as 'in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade'. What follows is that entrepreneurship often becomes uncritically portrayed as something that we need to promote and improve for the good of society. This relates to the performative intention that is present in management as well as entrepreneurship research. Performativity means 'the intent to develop and celebrate knowledge which contributes to the production of maximum output for minimum input; it involves inscribing knowledge within means-ends calculation' (Fournier & Grey, 2000, p. 17). The aim of critical research is to question performativity as a given aim, as well as to denaturalize what seems natural, and to practice reflexivity (Fournier & Grey, 2000). For me, this meant to question our knowledge of social entrepreneurship as an essentially good thing.

Entrepreneurship is associated with an inherent morality, which lies within the potential benefits it brings for society: the creation of jobs, technological development and so on (Anderson & Smith, 2007). It seems to have been given the status of an elixir with abilities to cure all imaginable societal issues (Lundmark & Westelius, 2014). Academic discourse constructs entrepreneurship as 'the story of creation for our times' (Berglund & Johansson, 2007, p. 82), which makes it hard to conceive of entrepreneurship as anything else than *good* for society. The task of a critical theorist is thus to

highlight that the assumptions surrounding the benefits of entrepreneurship are not naturally given but rather social constructions (Fournier & Grey, 2000). There is a dominant understanding that appears self-evident, but its fixity is in fact the result of certain interests and power practices. A way of shedding light on the unnaturalness of a given state of knowledge is to show its opposite through negation and lift other possible social conditions (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018). I started to question the apparent goodness of entrepreneurship in general and social entrepreneurship in particular. Reading critical (social) entrepreneurship research (e.g. Berglund & Skoglund, 2016; Dey & Steyaert, 2010; Dey & Steyaert, 2018; Hjorth, 2013; Lundmark & Westelius, 2014; Steyaert & Hjorth, 2006; Steyaert, 2007; Teasdale, 2011) helped me rethink my initial interpretation.

In this study, the interest lies with the type of entrepreneurship that has higher ambitions than merely meeting the demands of the market; entrepreneurship that wants to do something good for society. Even though there are many sub-labels, this type of entrepreneurship can be held under the umbrella of 'social entrepreneurship', which we may understand as 'an organization targeting a social problem using business methods' (Roundy, 2014, p. 203). Generally, research portrays social entrepreneurship as a practice promoting the common good and social entrepreneurs as 'a priori ethical' (Dey & Steyaert, 2016). The idea that the social entrepreneur is a societal benefactor who empowers the disadvantaged is widespread (Dey, 2006). So too is the notion that the local community gladly welcomes all social enterprises (Lindgren & Packendorff, 2006). Social entrepreneurs are, for example, said to 'creatively combine resources […] to address a social problem and thereby alter existing social structures' (Mair & Martí, 2006, p. 38). Likewise, entrepreneurship is seen as the saviour of depleted communities (Johnstone & Lionais, 2004); by combining social and economic goals, entrepreneurs have the possibility to resurrect societies (McKeever, Jack, & Anderson, 2015). The prevailing assumptions around social entrepreneurship are summarized in the metaphor of medical treatment (Dey, 2006). The social entrepreneur enacts the role of a doctor, an all-knowing authority with the ability to cure the patients who 'blindly give themselves into the healing hands of their "redeemer"' (p. 124).

Going back to the first interpretation of the case, i.e. the entrepreneur as a disembedded innovator, it is notable how it is angled in a way that places the entrepreneur in the centre of the text. It follows the general tendency to consider contextual factors that hamper or benefit the enterprise in order to produce new knowledge for policy to better promote entrepreneurship. Further, the resistance from the community is not problematized in any other way than

as a posed obstacle for the enterprise. However, challenging the assumptions in a given field may open up for more interesting problematizations (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011).

If the social entrepreneur is seen as a medical doctor with an extraordinary power to heal patients (Dey, 2006), the fact that a community opposes an enterprise that exists for the people's benefit seems quite paradoxical. But through negating dominant views, one can imagine a situation where social enterprises are not empowering, but rather disempowering. The resistance taking place on the Island may in fact be something else than a reaction to the grandness of the idea. Instead of reproducing uncritical views of the inherent goodness of social entrepreneurship, it might be relevant to empirically study how its presence is perceived in a given community. This insight led me towards a more interpretative approach that focused on what the hotel *meant* to the Island society.

Next stop: Social entrepreneurship as victimization

My first interpretation (the social entrepreneur as a disembedded innovator) did not problematize either the assumptions of the entrepreneurship field, or the assumptions of the research participants. I did not see the text *as* something else but merely presented it as it was told. Taking a more interpretative approach, I came to understand the resistance as a reaction to a story of individual agency, which rendered citizens passive followers. For years and years, they had been watching their society wither away while being unable to do anything about it. Then, an outsider suddenly comes in and shows that it only takes a little bit of creativity and effort to turn the development around. The entrepreneur was the proclaimed saviour of the Island. Allowing this salvation would mean to allow a victimization of the local community. If the entrepreneur is portrayed as a hero, the local community is deprived of agency, that is, powerless in a state of paralysis. Hence, the opposition became a way to display power and agency to own the right to tell the story of the Island and to reject entrepreneurship as the 'friendly face of capitalism' (Smith & Anderson, 2004, p. 126).

This interpretation does not accept the explanations of the people with whom I had spoken so far, as they would simply say that this type of resistance is natural for the conservative Islander. However, one aspect of my interpretation and these interviewees' reasoning is the same: it does not see the resistance as being related to the content of Greenland, the sustainable hotel and conference centre, but to something that is either innate to the Islander (their explanation)

or to the imposition of an undesired identity that portrayed the Islanders as victims (my interpretation). The basic line of both of these interpretations is that there is nothing actually wrong with social entrepreneurship; on the contrary, it is still perceived to be good.

Chasing the 'Islander'

I went back to the Island more than a year later, in the late summer of 2017. I borrowed a bicycle from the hotel and spent most of my days biking from one interview to the other. In general, there was a good atmosphere at the Island. Instead of complaining about a high unemployment rate, people talked about the lack of a qualified workforce. They talked about the fact that finally more people were moving to the Island than away from the Island, and how the region displayed the highest growth rate in Denmark. Someone told me that this is the way it is on the Island. In the summer, everyone has a job and a good income but come winter the hardship will reappear. I made a mental note to come back during wintertime.

It was around this stage that the part and the whole of the case changed. I had known before that Greenland was part of a greater project involving both public and private actors. What I started to realize now was that this 'whole' might also be related to the conflict. The project, referred to as a strategy by some and as a brand by others, went under the label 'Sustainable Island' and aimed to alter the image of the Island from that of a rural society in decline to a sustainable society in the forefront of green technology. I started seeing this sustainable transition as a case of social entrepreneurship. Usually, entrepreneurship is framed as an individual endeavour and the entrepreneur is seen as a special individual who gets awarded the status of a saviour (Sørensen, 2008). Inspired by Steyaert and Katz (2004), who argue for a broadening of the concept of entrepreneurship to include more sites and settings, my idea of what the case was a case of went from being about an individual social entrepreneur to becoming a case of a sustainable transition involving many actors. Entrepreneurship is not a person, but a practice (Steyaert, 2007), and for me, social entrepreneurship is the practice of applying business methods to social problems (Roundy, 2014).

On the Island, social entrepreneurship was not a practice undertaken by a single individual or enterprise. What I refer to as an instance of social entrepreneurship was the new project labelled 'Sustainable Island', a loosely structured organization that involved municipal as well as private actors and citizens, and that aimed to create social welfare for their shared society.

Whereas the Island's independent business centre had led the initiation of the project, in 2017 it had been decided that the municipality would become more involved. It was when speaking to actors within the municipality that I realized that the very concept of sustainability was under dispute. Specifically, whereas the municipality wanted an inclusive strategy/brand that directly addressed social issues, the business sector preferred it to remain within the boundaries of green technology. This was also around the time when I started to understand how segregated the Island was, as some interviewees alleged that the initiative was intended to foremost benefit an already well-off part of the community, and that its implementation had been undemocratic.

Shifting the focus from the individual social entrepreneur towards the collective initiative of the sustainable transition further encouraged me to dig deeper into how the initiative was perceived in the Island community. Usually, the communities in which entrepreneurs operate become framed as merely the entrepreneurs' contexts; something in the periphery that functions either to promote or hinder success. When it comes to social entrepreneurship in particular, which is supposedly *for* society, would it not be relevant to also explore how the initiatives implemented are received in a given community?

My second interpretation, social entrepreneurship as victimization, is one of several other possibilities, and perhaps it is partly 'true'. However, at this point I felt that I needed a better representation of the voice of the resistance. So far, I had mainly spoken to a fairly homogenous group, one that seemed to belong to an upper middle class in which people were either entrepreneurs or in high positions within the green technology sector. Basically, everyone that I talked to had the same image of 'the Islander', who was described as inherently conservative, always sceptical towards new ideas (especially of those coming from outsiders) and in general, slow to accept changes. What seemed more and more peculiar was that even though the people I talked to were island residents themselves, none of them identified with this proclaimed 'Islander' identity. At some point, I started to explicitly ask the people I was interviewing if they could direct me to such a person; someone who had opposed the initiative or someone who went by these Islander characteristics, but no one could.

I went back in October that year. The municipality organized a two-day public conference that aimed to revitalize Sustainable Island. 'Revitalize' basically meant to anchor the initiative within the community and to make citizens feel a part of it. Whereas the first strategy meeting had taken place in the closed setting of the ferry, sailing around the Island for two days, this meeting was located in the middle of the Island, and open to every citizen. I was only there to observe. In the taxi on the way to the meeting facility, I asked the driver if

he knew about the event and he reckoned that there might be a concert going on. Even as I explained what it was, he seemed clueless as to what I was talking about. As we approached our destination, we drove through a long street swamped with parked cars and, with a laugh, he said that apparently *some* people have heard of it. Later during the conference, some of the participants pointed out to me that the majority of the Island was not represented here. Of course, this was difficult for me to see. I had never met 'the Islander'.

After these visits, I decided to make an active attempt to find 'the Islander', the working class, the poor, the ordinary person or whatever you might want to call this always absent group of people. Although everybody was talking about them, they seemed invisible. I decided to go back in winter.

Finding constructions

In February 2018, I went back for a week to speak with people in various locations around the countryside of the Island. Some of these places were far from the nearest bus stops; so, to be able to reach them, I rented a car. Unfortunately, I had picked the week when the Island would be hit by heavy snowfall, which made many of the roads impassable. On my way to my accommodation for the week, a permaculture collective located in the forest, I managed to first drive the car into a ditch and then, immediately after it had been towed, I got it stuck in a snowdrift on an uphill road. This experience gave me a hint of what life is like on the rural part of the Island, and it brought to mind a quote by the director of the local art museum whom I had talked to the year before:

> in a relatively poor society eh everybody—where everybody hears so it's not enough money for this, not enough money for that, you can't have lights in the night in the city because we—they switch off the light at twelve o'clock eh they actually do during the winter time, only when the tourists are here we have street lights all night through and you can't afford to clean the roads for snow in the winter time and when you have the all these, not single issues but all these issues put together, we are a poor society we can't afford almost anything and then—but they afford to pay for a museum and they can afford to give money to a [Greenland] and then you have this […] this vox populi against the decision makers (Ejner, May 2016)

During the week, I met people from different citizen associations in five villages. Still, I repeatedly heard the same representation of 'the Islander' without encountering a single one. Eventually, people started to advise me to

go to the Disadvantaged Village.[3] This was a village notoriously known for its low-cost houses, the absence of tourist attractions, and the tragic close-down of all the businesses along the main street in town. Above all, it was known for its conservative and negative citizens.

However, I did not find 'the Islander' in the Disadvantaged Village either. What I found instead was people proud of their ability to resist a series of initiatives that always seemed to lead to their detriment. It became evident that the resistance that was deemed natural by most people due to the characteristics of the conservative Islander did in fact have something to do with the content of the different initiatives. For the sustainable transition to happen, the society had to make adjustments. Often, these adjustments meant sacrifices on behalf of places like the Disadvantaged Village, while the coastal tourist-dense areas could showcase shiny new green solutions. I had been trying to force some meaning upon Greenland that could explain the resistance, but it turned out that the hotel in itself did not *mean* that much to people. Rather, it became associated with the grand front yard of the sustainable transition in which some people of the Island could not be included.

Subsequently, I started to ponder about the meaning of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship. Who gets a say in deciding what is 'social' and for whom does it turn out to be 'social'? The literature generally presents the 'social' as a universal and neutral goodness, despite the fact that we all have different ideas of what a 'social benefit' entails (Ruebottom, 2018). The 'social' is in fact both political and ideological and thus, it promotes certain interests (Barinaga, 2013; Cho, 2006; Nicholls & Cho, 2006). As Dey, Schneider and Maier (2016, p. 1463) explain:

> A peculiar feature of the hegemonic articulation [of social entrepreneurship] is that it avoids spelling out the precise causes of today's most pressing ills. Turning a blind eye on issues such as power or class, the hegemonic articulation advances a rather frictionless image of change.

In the instance of social entrepreneurship that I studied; however, change did not seem to be frictionless. Given the resistance towards the sustainable transition taking place on the Island, I became interested in how the 'social' was constructed and upheld against this opposition. If a given idea of what is good for society promotes certain interests over others (Nicholls & Cho, 2006),

[3] I call this village 'the Disadvantaged Village' because of the way it has been described to me. It is not the label used by Island residents.

it becomes further interesting to explore how power relations shape the 'social'.

Eventually, I have realized that the point is not to find 'the Islander'; the point is the construction in itself. A certain type of power is practised when representations become fixed like this (Deetz, 1992). Often, 'the Islander' was used as a tool to distance oneself from certain characteristics ('not like me, I'm an innovator'), or it was drawn upon to neutralize resistance. I mentioned before that I went from centring on an individual social entrepreneur towards broadening my case of social entrepreneurship to involve an initiative including multiple actors from different sectors. Inspired by the relational framing, in which social entrepreneurship is understood as a relational process where a multitude of actors participates in the co-construction of reality (Friedman, Sykes & Strauch, 2018), I started to think about what other actors we might have neglected in our framing of social entrepreneurship (Dey & Steyaert, 2010; Steyaert & Katz, 2004). This broader perspective led me to reflect upon the role played by 'the Islander' in the relational construction of the 'social'.

I started to think about the construction of the Islander as a practice of Othering, i.e. the representation of a group of people as a homogenous mass, which is different from oneself and generally also lesser than oneself. The concept of Othering, often used in postcolonial works (e.g. Bhabha, 1994; Said, 1978), prompted me to adopt a postcolonial lens in my exploration of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship. The thought of this might seem absurd at first, but it is partly this bizarreness that can help us gain new perspectives on the phenomenon we are trying to understand (Morgan, 1980). If we view social entrepreneurship from a postcolonial lens, what will we see? In this thesis, it has encouraged me to repoliticize the 'social' (Barinaga, 2013) by attending to the power relations involved in its construction.

Seeing social entrepreneurship as only good may influence researchers to interpret empirical material in a way that renders entrepreneurship in a positive light. Therefore, rejecting the view of entrepreneurship as an 'elixir' may provide the field of entrepreneurship with more credibility (Lundmark & Westelius, 2014). We might think of this as looking 'to the "flipside" of dominant streams of research' (Shepherd, 2015, p. 503). However, the postcolonial perspective that I apply will, like the metaphor of 'elixir', also steer how I render social entrepreneurship in this study. Even though I strive to depict the ambiguities and complexities of social entrepreneurship, while allowing it to be 'a territory of contradictions and gray zones' (Ekman, 2014, p. 123), the image that I draw up will not be complete. The theoretical

perspective of postcolonialism will highlight certain things and hide others. Against the backdrop of the assumed goodness of social entrepreneurship, the postcolonial perspective will allow us to see its more problematic aspects.

Purpose of the study

My study can be seen as a response to the call to repoliticize the 'social' in social entrepreneurship (Barinaga; 2012; 2013; Cho, 2006; Nicholls & Cho, 2006). Although previous studies have added to our understanding of how social entrepreneurs make sense of the 'social' (Kimmitt & Muñoz, 2018) and the social entrepreneurial rationalities that may be adopted to address social change (Barinaga, 2013), we yet know little about the power relations involved in constructing a certain idea of the 'social'.

Taking into consideration the community resistance directed towards the sustainable transition on the Island, I aim to explore how the 'social' in social entrepreneurship is constructed and upheld, and how power relations take form in the process. I address these matters by considering the relational construction of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship through a postcolonial lens. Inspired by Latour (2005), I consider the connections that hold the 'social' together, by adopting a view that not only recognizes multiple actors in the construction of the 'social', but also acknowledges the importance of non-human agencies (Steyaert, 2007; Calás, Ergene & Smircich, 2018). In doing so, I wish to further our understanding of the relationality of social entrepreneurship (Steyaert & Katz, 2004; Friedman, Sykes & Strauch, 2018).

Through this approach, my thesis provides an empirically grounded exploration of an instance of social entrepreneurship, which considers both how matters of power take form and how 'polyvocal representations of the social' are expressed (Dey & Steyaert, 2010, p. 97). Surely, as I hopefully have demonstrated in this introductory chapter, there are many other possible approaches to the case at hand. With this thesis, I hope to offer an alternative image of social entrepreneurship in the broader academic debate, without making claims of being the only or the most accurate perspective.

Overview

In the next chapter, I review the literature on social entrepreneurship. I first present the most common assumptions made in the field by reviewing a few highly cited articles. Following this, I introduce the more critical streams of literature that question the aforementioned assumptions. Particularly, I highlight the studies that problematize the 'social' in social entrepreneurship and the literature on social entrepreneurship and power. Thereafter, I explain how I position my own study within these streams.

In chapter 3, I outline the postcolonial perspective that I adopt. After providing an overview of postcolonial theory, I summarize how it has been applied so far in organization and management studies, particularly in the fields of CSR and social entrepreneurship. I explain how postcolonial theory can generate new insights on social entrepreneurship and how the concepts of Othering, ambivalence and mimicry (Bhabha, 1994) can help us understand the power relations present in the construction of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship.

In chapter 4, I describe how I went about exploring the 'social' in social entrepreneurship. I first outline the social constructionist approach that I adopt, as well as my views on interpretation, language, discourse and identity, which underpin my methodological choices. I then explain how the empirical material of this study was constructed mainly through interviews and how I came to understand the interview accounts as part of the interviewees' identity work. I further elaborate on how I analyzed the material and how I used postcolonial theory as a puzzle solving tool to understand the power relations present in the construction of the 'social'.

Chapters 5 to 7 are empirical chapters. Overall, the three empirical chapters address the question of how the 'social' is relationally constructed and upheld. Chapter 5 outlines how the construction of the Islander is related to the 'social' in social entrepreneurship. I argue that social entrepreneurship involves ambivalent processes of Othering necessary to uphold the idea of both the 'social' and the 'entrepreneurial'. In chapter 6, I show how the 'social' has become settled as an idea of what is good for society and relatedly, what it means to be a good citizen. I argue that one may gain association with this idea of the 'social' by drawing upon one's possession of 'good' commodities. I interpret this as a form of mimicry (Bhabha, 1994), which involves both conformity and subtle opposition. In chapter 7, I show ways in which the idea of the 'social' was overtly resisted and upheld against this resistance. I demonstrate how the constructed character of the Islander as inherently

resisting, as well as objects, such as wind turbines and solar panels, became essential components of the 'social', and further, how these were important actors in upholding the 'social' against resistance.

In the last chapter of this thesis, I reflect on what we have gained from this illustration of how a certain idea of the 'social' became established on the Island. I summarize my findings and explain how we can understand the relational construction of the 'social' as involving parallel processes of exclusion and inclusion. While a variety of actors were necessary to construct this 'social', they did not have equal say in the conversation on what was good for society. I argue that these findings have implications for our understanding of the relationality of social entrepreneurship, and further, that they broaden the relevance of postcolonial theory.

2 The 'social' in social entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship has become the label that we put on most forms of innovative thinking and new forms of organizing. As Steyaert and Katz (2004) show, it is no longer limited to economic and commercial settings, but adopts a range of goals that exceed the market, such as goals of social change and societal transformation. We now see entrepreneurship taking place in various settings: in non-profit organizations (Eikenberry, 2009), in the public sector (Curtis, 2008), in the health sector (Tillmar, 2009), in universities (Etzkowitz, Webster, Gebhardt & Cantisano Terra, 2000), in the informal sector (Williams, 2012) and amongst artists and designers (Gill & Pratt, 2008). It takes the form of social entrepreneurship (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006), societal entrepreneurship (Berglund, Johannisson & Schwartz, 2012), community-based enterprise (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006), sustainable entrepreneurship (Dean & McMullen, 2007), environmental entrepreneurship (York, O'Neil & Sarasvathy, 2016), ecopreneurship (Dixon & Clifford, 2007), rural entrepreneurship (Richter, 2019), indigenous entrepreneurship (Henry, Newth & Spiller, 2017), mompreneurship (Croom & Miller, 2018), and the list goes on.

There seems to be a general trend that produces new entrepreneurships. The values they bring are no longer locked within the market, rather, they cross many areas of life (Berglund & Skoglund, 2016). Social entrepreneurship is an example of this trend, and perhaps one of the most well-established labels of an entrepreneurship that not only produces economic value, as it is often framed as a counternarrative to the traditional profit-driven entrepreneurship (Berglund & Wigren-Kristoferson, 2012). The empirical setting of the Island could also have been related to one of the other prefixes to entrepreneurship, such as rural entrepreneurship or societal/sustainable/environmental/eco entrepreneurship. However, I have chosen to use social entrepreneurship as an umbrella term to cover alternative entrepreneurships (Skoglund & Berglund,

2018) that aim to do good for society. Thus, I position my study within the field of social entrepreneurship.

The focus of this study follows the definition that poses the social enterprise as 'an organization targeting a social problem using business methods' (Roundy, 2014, p. 203). However, this is not the only way to define social entrepreneurship. Some definitions of social entrepreneurship are limited to include only non-profits, for-profits or public sector organizations, and some include all (for complete reviews, see e.g. Short, Moss & Lumpkin, 2009; Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010; Bonfanti, Battisti & Pasqualino, 2016). Calás, Smircich and Bourne (2009) argue that entrepreneurship is a much more complex phenomenon than simply an economic activity. It should rather be seen as a social change activity which may have both positive and negative outcomes. In this view, the term (social) entrepreneurship can also be applied to non-economic activity. As Barinaga (2012) shows, even initiatives that attempt to transform the capitalist system can be labelled social entrepreneurship. In these cases, the focus is rather on social change initiatives that are entrepreneurial (Barinaga, 2014), which means '(1) to seize on *a new combination*, (2) *push it through* in reality (3) and to do this *through sheer willpower and energy*' (Swedberg, 2006). The definition of entrepreneurship can be made even wider to include all forms of creative organizing (Johannisson & Olaison, 2007). These perspectives are quite different from the one that I take in seeing social entrepreneurship as the application of business solutions to societal issues. My reason for taking on this definition is not because I personally advocate this type of social entrepreneurship. Rather, I settle for this definition because it describes the empirical phenomenon that I am studying.[4] Thus, when I refer to social entrepreneurship in this study, I refer to the empirical occurrence of attempting social change through economic activity, rather than non-economic social change initiatives.

In this chapter, I review the literature on social entrepreneurship. I first outline the main assumptions within the field, which are characterized by managerialism, individualism and a performative intent. I then introduce the more critical streams of literature that question these assumptions. Specifically, I highlight the studies that problematize the way in which the 'social' in social entrepreneurship is presented, and the literature that treats matters of power in relation to social entrepreneurship.

[4] This also means that it is I who label the sustainable transition taking place on the Island as a case of social entrepreneurship, i.e. it is not presented as such amongst Island residents.

The way we talk about social entrepreneurship

In this chapter, I take as my starting point the perspectives of social entrepreneurship that seem to dominate the field. These are somewhat reflected in recent reviews of the literature. For example, Hota, Subramanian and Narayanamurthy (2019) depict the development of the field. In the early phase of social entrepreneurship studies, scholars focused on individual social entrepreneurs, their characteristics, abilities and inherent ethical motives. After 2006, the 'take-off' phase of social entrepreneurship began. Research struggled with definitional issues and conceptualizations of social entrepreneurship without settling for any mutual idea of what social entrepreneurship really is. During this time, scholars also increasingly focused on the entrepreneurial aspects of social entrepreneurship, such as opportunity recognition, resource acquisition and performance. Another theme during the 'take-off' phase was the institutional context and how it influenced the behaviours of social entrepreneurs. With the increased focus on the financial sustainability of social enterprises, the theme of hybridity gained more ground after 2010 (Hota, Subramanian & Narayanamurthy, 2019). Social enterprises were seen as hybrid organizations with dual goals, logics and identities. Another review categorizes the literature based on level of analysis (Saebi, Foss & Linder, 2018). On the individual level, the literature focuses on the intention to engage in social entrepreneurship, and how this intention is steered by a set of 'prosocial emotions' (p. 79) and previous experiences. The literature that deals with the organizational level treats the hybrid nature of the social enterprise and how this may lead to conflicts and tensions within the organization. Articles that explore the institutional level mainly outline the effects of social entrepreneurship in terms of institutional change (Saebi, Foss & Linder, 2018).

In order to outline the main assumptions prevailing in social entrepreneurship literature, I have chosen to delve into the ten most cited articles on the topic,[5] which are presented in table 1. With this overview, I wish to highlight that despite the existence of critical social entrepreneurship studies, there is a continued need for critique (Steyaert & Dey, 2018). Although this limited number of articles cannot represent the entire field, I believe that it can provide a brief overview of the perspectives of social entrepreneurship that have taken up the most space in academic debate. In order to illustrate the prevailing

[5] To arrive at these articles, I searched for 'social entrepreneurship' in the title, abstract and keywords of all peer-reviewed articles in the database Scopus in September 2020 and sorted the result list based on 'most cited'.

assumptions on social entrepreneurship, I highlight four themes that I believe stand out in the highly cited articles, i.e. opportunity, resourcefulness, innovation and the 'social'.[6] I suggest that these themes show the individualistic ideal and the performative intent (Fournier & Grey, 2000) that characterize social entrepreneurship literature, and that these assumptions encourage scholars to centre on the social entrepreneur and to place the societies in which they act in the periphery. Table 1 outlines the ten highly cited articles and their definitions of social entrepreneurship.

Themes of individualism

The most notable correspondence in how the highly cited articles view social entrepreneurship is the mention of a social mission. This indicates that the organization is to solve some kind of social problem, which should be seen as an opportunity to be discovered and exploited. The articles also emphasize the newness and the innovative nature in which social problems are solved. Another important aspect is the way resources are utilized. It is argued that the social entrepreneur is a bricoleur, which means that they make do with scarce resources. Next, I elaborate on these themes (opportunity, resourcefulness, innovation and the social) and how they provide insight into the prevailing assumptions of social entrepreneurship.

The term *opportunity* is present in the main part of the definitions. It is defined as an act of envisioning (Peredo & McLean, 2006) and as 'the desired future state that is different from the present and the belief that the achievement of that state is possible' (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006, p. 6). It also seems to involve some form of positive thinking. The lack of existing institutions (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010) as well as the market's failure to address social issues (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006) are portrayed as opportunities, instead of obstacles for social entrepreneurs. Thus, social problems become opportunities. However, it seems that not all social issues qualify as opportunities. For example, when a municipality addresses the issue of increased homelessness in their city, we do not say that they have acted on an opportunity. Seemingly, an opportunity implies that a social problem can

[6] These themes are also acknowledged in some fashion in recent literature reviews on social entrepreneurship (see e.g. Choi & Majumdar, 2014; Gupta, Chauhan, Paul & Jaiswal, 2020; Hota, Subramanian & Narayanamurthy, 2019; Sassmannshausen & Volkmann, 2018). As in the highly cited articles, these themes are commonly left unproblematized in the reviews.

Table 1. Definitions of social entrepreneurship in highly cited articles

Authors	Definitions
Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern (2006)	'We define social entrepreneurship as innovative, social value creating activity that can occur within or across the nonprofit, business, or government sectors'. (p. 2)
Mair and Martí (2006)	'a process involving the innovative use and combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyze social change and/or address social needs'. (p. 37)
Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum and Shulman (2009)	'social entrepreneurship encompasses the activities and processes undertaken to discover, define, and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner'. (p. 522)
Peredo and McLean (2006)	'social entrepreneurship is exercised where some person or group: (1) aim(s) at creating social value, either exclusively or at least in some prominent way; (2) show(s) a capacity to recognize and take advantage of opportunities to create that value (''envision''); (3) employ(s) innovation, ranging from outright invention to adapting someone else's novelty, in creating and/or distributing social value; (4) is/are willing to accept an above-average degree of risk in creating and disseminating social value; and (5) is/are unusually resourceful in being relatively undaunted by scarce assets in pursuing their social venture'. (p. 64)
Dacin, Dacin and Matear (2010)	'A social entrepreneur is '[a]n actor who applies business principles to solving social problems'. (p. 44)
Eikenberry and Kluver (2004)	'Social entrepreneurs are nonprofit executives who pay attention to market forces without losing sight of their organizations' underlying missions and seek to use the language and the skills of the business world to advance the material well-being of their members or clients (Dees, Emerson, and Economy 2001)'. (p. 135)
Alvord, Brown and Letts (2004)	'focus on 'social entrepreneurship that creates innovative solutions to immediate social problems and mobilizes the ideas, capacities, resources, and social arrangements required for sustainable social transformations'. (p. 262)
Mair and Martí (2009)	'for these actors – often referred to as social entrepreneurs – creating social value is the primary objective, while creating economic value is a necessary condition to ensure financial viability (Mair and Martí, 2006). For these entrepreneurs markets are not an end in themselves or a means to appropriate value; markets are viewed as an important social structure and a mechanism to foster social and economic development. Thus, promoting market participation by building, transforming and decomposing institutions becomes an important objective'. (p. 422)
Weerawardena and Sullivan Mort (2006)	'a behavioral phenomenon expressed in a NFP [not-for-profit] organization context aimed at delivering social value through the exploitation of perceived opportunities.' (p. 25)
Dacin, Dacin and Tracey (2011)	'a definition of social entrepreneurship focusing on the last factor—the primary mission of the social entrepreneur being one of creating social value by providing solutions to social problems—holds the most promise for the field'. (p. 1204)

be solved through an earned-income approach or a profit motive, i.e. it is an opportunity because the social entrepreneur can also get something in return.This combination of a social and an economic motive tends to be presented in an unproblematic manner (e.g. Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010; Dacin, Dacin & Tracey, 2011; Mair & Martí, 2006; Peredo & McLean, 2006; Zahra et al., 2009). Some draw attention to the fact that the social mission might constrain opportunity recognition (Weerawardena & Sullivan Mort, 2006). The opposite of this logic is seen in Eikenberry and Kluver (2004), who consider the marketization of non-profits deeply problematic for their ability to maintain a strong civil society. Overall, the highly cited articles paint a picture of social entrepreneurs as individuals able to discover/take advantage of/exploit/act upon opportunities.

Another recurrent theme in the articles is *resources*. The social entrepreneur is posed as someone who is 'unusually resourceful in being relatively undaunted by scarce assets' (Peredo & McLean, 2006, p. 64). Further, it is said that they '[decline] to accept limitations in available resources' (p. 56). In a similar way, Dacin, Dacin and Matear (2010, p. 49) conclude that 'social entrepreneurs rarely allow the external environment to determine whether or not they will launch an enterprise'. Several articles draw on the concept of bricolage (Baker & Nelson, 2005) to emphasize how the social entrepreneurs make do with the resources they have at hand (Mair & Martí, 2009; Zahra et al., 2009). This emphasizes the capacity of the individual to be self-reliant, i.e. to depend on market income rather than governmental grants. Sometimes, social entrepreneurs 'creatively combine resources—resources that often they themselves do not possess—to address a social problem and thereby alter existing social structures' (Mair & Martí, 2006, p. 38). Sometimes, they are thought to mobilize 'existing assets of marginalized groups to improve their lives, rather than delivering outside resources and services' (Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2004, p. 270). The resourceful social entrepreneur seems to be particularly able to make good use of existing resources as well as to solve social problems with little or no resources. This focus on self-sufficiency and self-motivation appears to enforce the individualist ideal of social entrepreneurship.

An additional key term figuring in the highly cited articles is *innovation*. This term is rarely defined, but from its usage we can at least establish that it is not enough to solve a social problem; in order for this solution to be categorized as 'social entrepreneurship', it also has to be innovative. Merriam-Webster defines the word 'innovation' as 'a new idea, method, or device' or 'the introduction of something new' (Innovation, 2021). The necessity of

innovation implies that social issues are difficult to solve, which is why we must try to solve them in new ways. In their comparative case study of non-profits, Weerawardena and Sullivan Mort (2006) conclude that social entrepreneurship involves innovativeness, proactiveness and risk management. The following is an interview quote presented in their study (p. 28).

> I don't want to run any service at the (Case E) that just every year do good things the same as they did last year. It is not enough.

There seems to be an assumption that social problems need to be addressed in new ways. The problem becomes 'the old way' rather than the fact that social problems perhaps are inadequately addressed or that not enough resources are directed to them. Thus, innovation seems to be an end in itself. Further, this newness is often written about in a grand and idolizing manner. It is, for example, emphasized how social entrepreneurs 'catalyze social transformations well beyond solutions to the initial problems', as they 'introduce new paradigms at critical leverage points that lead to cascades of mutually reinforcing changes in social arrangements' (Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2004, p. 262). In relation to this grandness of social change, social entrepreneurship is sometimes resembled to institutional entrepreneurship, i.e. the 'changing and giving birth to norms, institutions and structure' (Mair & Martí, 2006, p. 40). Dacin, Dacin and Tracey (2011, p. 1207) write that 'given that social entrepreneurs champion a variety of social innovations that are not widely known, it is likely that they will face a liability of newness in their attempts to introduce social change'.[7] When practicing this type of transformative entrepreneurship, it is not uncommon to experience resistance (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010) as there will be stakeholders who have an interest in maintaining the 'status quo' (Mair & Martí, 2009). In their study of BRAC, an organization that aims to empower and give voice to the poor in Bangladesh, Mair and Martí (2009, p. 428) describe the resistance to the organization.

> Perceived as an attempt to challenge the status quo, it is not surprising that these efforts encountered resistance from different members of the local rural communities right from the beginning. As archival and interview data reveal, this was not new for BRAC. In the 1990s some of BRAC's schools were set on fire by radicals who, making use of religious arguments, claimed that mixing boys and girls in class was going against the values and norms of Bangladeshi

[7] Take note of how these scholars, although arguing against the heroization of social entrepreneurship, still make use of phrases like 'champion'.

> society. Similarly, women who engaged in income [sic] income-generating activities were forcefully reminded by other villagers that by doing this they were breaking the norms of purdah. BRAC's female staff members working in the field were constantly attacked for using a motorcycle to visit villages. The motives for such opposition were varied, ranging from elites' fear of a reduction in the availability of cheap labor to the envy of other poor villagers who were not receiving comparable treatment. As several BRAC staff members explained to us, BRAC experienced similar reaction patterns across the different programs it launched and over time.

In the above quote, we learn that resistance to the implemented solutions to social issues is not anything unusual for BRAC. When one challenges the 'status quo', objections are rather customary. Such resistance is usually not problematized in any other way than as an impediment to the social enterprise. The question becomes how to strategically overcome resistance rather than its ethical and democratic implications; most likely because the values being implemented appear naturally good. However, resistance to social entrepreneurship also opens up for a discussion on the perspective-dependent nature of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship and how the goodness of an implemented project is not always agreed upon amongst people in the concerned communities. Conversely, the unfailing faith in ground-breaking innovations may encourage us to instead ignore such objections. Thus, the idea of *innovation* seems to legitimate the authority of social entrepreneurship to direct societal development, while placing the societies in which it occurs in the periphery.

This brings us to the last theme, i.e. the '*social'* in social entrepreneurship. While a social goal is prevalent in all of the presented definitions of social entrepreneurship, it is rarely elaborated on much. In some cases, the social mission seems to be related to the promotion of market participation (Mair & Martí, 2009), but most definitions rather revolve around the 'entrepreneurship' part of the term. For example, Weerawardena and Sullivan Mort (2006, p. 22) explain that not all non-profits are social entrepreneurs, only the ones who 'display certain behavioural characteristics', such as innovativeness and proactiveness, qualify. As mentioned, recurrent themes in the articles are social entrepreneurs' capabilities to exploit opportunities, acquire resources and to innovate. As Zahra et al. (2009, p. 522) underline, 'certain individuals with particular values, capabilities and skills will be attracted to social entrepreneurship, search for opportunities, and innovative organizational responses to create social wealth'. With few exceptions (see Dacin, Dacin & Tracey, 2011), we assume that social entrepreneurship brings positive

outcomes. For example, Alvord, Brown and Letts (2004, p. 261) write that social entrepreneurship has ‘long-term impacts on poverty alleviation and societal transformation’. However, some of the articles mention the difficulty in measuring produced social value (Mair & Martí, 2006; Zahra, et al., 2009). Yet, the social wealth created, and its assumed goodness are generally left unexplored and unquestioned in the highly cited articles.

Due to this assumed goodness of social entrepreneurship, the natural task of scholars becomes to develop success recipes. When scholars shift their gaze to the contexts of the social entrepreneurs, they generally consider the ways in which these contexts may promote or hinder success (e.g. Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006; Mair & Martí, 2006), rather than exploring the impact of social entrepreneurship on its surroundings. This continual spotlighting of the social entrepreneur relates to the performative intent (Fournier & Grey, 2000) of social entrepreneurship research. The purpose of this research then, becomes to map out the most beneficial environmental conditions to promote social entrepreneurship (Mair & Martí, 2006), to explore how context influences opportunity creation (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006) or to identify success factors (Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2004). An exception to this performative aim can be found in Eikenberry and Kluver (2004). They argue that non-profits are ‘more than just tools for achieving the most efficient and effective mode of service delivery; they are also important vehicles for creating and maintaining a strong civil society’ (p. 138). However, the main part of the highly cited articles tends to centre on the social entrepreneur in their analyses and conceptualizations.

Although most of the highly cited articles seems to portray social entrepreneurship in a positive and somewhat glorifying manner, there are some that partly question its goodness. These scholars address the fact that social entrepreneurship is heroized (Peredo & McLean, 2006) and that individual social entrepreneurs and their traits, skills and motivation are overly emphasized. To overcome this, it is suggested that we focus more on behaviours and processes (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010; Mair & Martí, 2006) and on both positive and negative outcomes (Dacin, Dacin & Tracey, 2011). I have chosen one of the definitions of social entrepreneurship to depict how scholars, who despite strongly opposing the heroization of social entrepreneurship, still continue to write about it with an admiration that furthers the ideal of individualism. It seems that even if attempts are made to avoid it, it is easy to yet end up in such celebratory depictions. Peredo and McLean (2006, p. 64) argue that:

> social entrepreneurship is exercised where some person or group: (1) aim(s) at creating social value, either exclusively or at least in some prominent way; (2) show(s) a capacity to recognize and take advantage of opportunities to create that value (''envision''); (3) employ(s) innovation, ranging from outright invention to adapting someone else's novelty, in creating and/or distributing social value; (4) is/are willing to accept an above-average degree of risk in creating and disseminating social value; and (5) is/are unusually resourceful in being relatively undaunted by scarce assets in pursuing their social venture.

These characteristics should be seen as roles potentially shared amongst individuals. However, acting on opportunities, innovating, taking risks, and being resourceful are all qualities that emphasize the capacity and self-reliance of individuals. We may also take note of the wording of this definition, which requires an acceptance of an 'above-average' degree of risk, and that the individuals are 'unusually resourceful', which furthers the notion of the social entrepreneur as a special kind of individual. Seemingly, the individualism in social entrepreneurship cannot be remedied by expanding our definitions to also include groups of people, as opposed to the previous focus on single individuals.

All in all, this brief review of the ten most cited articles has showed that even if the notion of the social entrepreneur as a heroic individual is rejected in a few instances, social entrepreneurship is still characterized by individualism. This is seen through the focus on opportunity exploitation and resourcefulness, which emphasizes the particular capacity and self-reliance of social entrepreneurs. It is also seen through the idea of innovation, which is assumed to be a desirable end in itself, and, if revolutionary enough, it is assumed to bring resistance. These themes follow a logic of economic rationality that is also found in conventional entrepreneurship literature (Calás, Smircich & Bourne, 2009). This literature tends to highlight the actors that practice social entrepreneurship rather than the communities in which they act. Despite the constant presence of the 'social', this term is neither elaborated on, nor critically scrutinized. The general idea seems to be that the 'social' in social entrepreneurship means 'good for all'. These assumptions relate to the metaphors of entrepreneurship as elixir (Lundmark & Westelius, 2014) and the social entrepreneur as a medical doctor (Dey, 2006).

The prevalence of these themes of individualism is interesting, given that social entrepreneurship is often posed as something meant to benefit the collective. In light of this, we may see social entrepreneurship as an anomaly and a disharmonic practice, instead of a natural win-win situation (Berglund & Schwartz, 2013). Seeing how the dominant perspectives in the literature

prioritize the managerialism and economic rationality that is also present in the conventional entrepreneurship literature (Calás, Smircich & Bourne, 2009), there is a need to further explore what the 'social' really means and how it is constructed.

Problematizing the 'social'

There are particular political worldviews immersed in the 'image of goodness' that pertain to our understanding of social entrepreneurship (Dey & Steyaert, 2012, p. 258). By elucidating the dominant representation of social entrepreneurship in academic discourse, Dey and Steyaert (2010) point to 'the political unconsciousness of social entrepreneurship narratives' (p. 87). The grand narrative of social entrepreneurship rests on the utopian faith in rationalist solutions to societal problems. Although we lack empirical studies to support the belief in social entrepreneurship as the most suitable approach to solve issues like poverty and social exclusion (Saebi, Foss & Linder, 2018), its legitimacy goes unharmed due to our prevailing pro-market ideology (Dart, 2004). Similar to the social entrepreneur solving social problems, the ecopreneur has been posed as the driver of environmental innovation. This is based on the assumption that 'capitalism's drive for innovation can be harnessed to realize environmental improvements' (Beveridge & Guy, 2005, p. 666). Thus, the way that entrepreneurship is posed as the one solution to both societal and environmental problems has both political and ideological underpinnings. The same goes for any idea of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship.

According to Oxford Lexico, the adjective 'social' is 'relating to society or its organization'. It may also refer to a need for companionship inherent in social beings who are best suited to live in groups and communities (Social, 2020). Latour (2005, p. 6) elaborates on the different meanings of the term in adding that 'the historical genealogy of the word 'social' is construed first as following someone, then enrolling and allying, and, lastly, having something in common.' According to Latour (2005), the meaning of the word 'social' has shrunk over time. One generally assumes that the 'social' is a distinct type of reality separate from other domains such as economics or politics. Thus, the 'social' has become a prefix to other phenomena, taking form as e.g. the 'social dimension' of the economy. Perhaps, we talk about 'social entrepreneurship' from a similar position that supposes an entrepreneurship which also involves a 'social dimension'. While there are plenty of definitions of social

entrepreneurship, the discussion seems to focus more on the entrepreneurship part of the term than the social part (Barinaga, 2012), leaving the latter as merely a weak prefix (Hjorth, 2013).

As we have seen, the literature generally does not elaborate on or problematize what may fall under the umbrella of the ‘social’. There is an assumption that ‘social’ equals ethical (Chell, Spence, Perrini, & Harris, 2016), which appears to be connected to the production of good outcomes (e.g. Zahra et al., 2009). Although it is clear that social entrepreneurship should aim to create social wealth or to solve a social problem, it is less clear what this social wealth really entails. The ‘social’ remains largely undefined and open-ended, with topics such as social change and social problems generally left vague and lacking of concrete meaning (Dey, Schneider & Maier, 2016). Similarly, while the concept of social innovation derives from connotations with socialism and social reform, recent developments of the term include ‘anything new or any invention in “social” matters’ (Godin, 2012, p. 21). The ‘social’ prefix seems to mainly imply an entrepreneurship that exists *for* society, which produces value that exceeds the economic. However, the lack of problematization of the term indicates a presumption that the ‘social’ is universally beneficial. In this way, the ‘social’ presents itself as an apolitical and neutral type of goodness.

However, the ‘social’ inevitably involves a normative perception of an ideal society that shapes the aim of social entrepreneurship. It remains a political construct that promotes a certain interest (Cho, 2006). Presenting the ‘social’ as a natural good is a way to depoliticize it, which ‘presupposes an unrealistic homogeneity of social interests’ (Nicholls & Cho, 2006, p. 106). Barinaga (2013) argues for a repoliticization of the ‘social’. She writes that both the way in which a social problem is addressed, and the chosen social goal one seeks to achieve, are framed by one’s political and ideological perspective. Hence, the social goal of social entrepreneurship may be seen as problematic in itself because there are different interpretations of the notion of ‘social benefit’ (Ruebottom, 2018).

A few studies have added to our understanding on the potential meaning implied in the ‘social’ of social entrepreneurship. For example, Barinaga (2012) provides a sociologically inspired social change matrix, which describes the different elements of the ‘social’, i.e. the structural and the individual level of social change, and its material and/or symbolic dimensions. Kimmitt and Muñoz (2018) outline how social entrepreneurs make sense of social problems through a lens of social justice. They develop a social sensemaking model that highlights two different approaches involving different ways of problematizing the ‘social’ and defining solutions. Further,

Barinaga (2013) also develops three social entrepreneurial rationalities (economic, discursive, community), which have implications for how the ‘social’ is understood. These frameworks can be quite useful for understanding how the ‘social’ is framed in different instances of social entrepreneurship.

Taking a different approach, Dey and Steyaert (2010) focus on the way in which we narrate the ‘social’ in academic literature and its implications. They find that three narratives are present: the grand narrative ‘that incorporates a messianistic script of harmonious social change’ (p. 85), counter-narratives which focus on critiquing the former, and ‘little’ narratives that highlight dimensions of power and social hierarchy within the construction of the ‘social’. In this study, I wish to contribute to the discussion on how the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship is constructed. However, I am more interested in the relational process by which a certain understanding of the ‘social’ becomes established, than outlining what the ‘social’ has been constituted as. Due to the community resistance ensuing the sustainable transition on the Island, my focus in this study is steered towards *how* the ‘social’ is constructed and upheld, as well as the power relations involved in the process.

For Latour (2005) the ‘social’ is not a separate domain or an adjective that we can add to phenomena. Instead, the ‘social’ is found in the associations between things that are not social in themselves. It can be seen as an assemblage of connections that hold the ‘social’ together. If we see the social as a ‘peculiar movement of re-association and reassembling’ (Latour, 2005, p. 7), what becomes interesting here is to consider the associations that hold the ‘social’ together, while bearing in mind the involvement of both human and non-human actors. Through a similar approach, Calás, Ergene and Smircich (2018) show how a cotton seed in a clothing company organized sustainability and enabled the ‘social’ to go beyond capitalism. In this study, I am more interested in how a certain idea of the ‘social’ is constructed and how it endures. This has meant to consider both how the ‘social’ translates into an idea of what is good for society, as well as how it relates to an idea of a good citizen. The understanding of what is good is inevitably formed through power relations, as power is involved in the production of knowledge, which, in turn, encourages certain ways of being (Foucault, 1980). In the following, I outline the studies that treat social entrepreneurship and issues of power, including its influence on individual subjectivities.

Social entrepreneurship and power relations

As Berglund and Wigren-Kristoferson (2012, p. 18) remark: ‘Aiming at betterment of society, as soci(et)al entrepreneurship does, implies that there are actors in power positions who can help and empower those who are not’. In view of this, it is surprising to find little research that explores the power relations between social enterprises and the people that they serve. When it comes to the topic of power, social entrepreneurship scholars have considered the power relations between social entrepreneurs and other industry members (Waldron, Fisher & Pfarrer, 2016) and the power asymmetry in inter-organizational relations (Nicholls & Huybrechts, 2016; Kwong, Tasavori & Cheung, 2017). Others explore how the powerful discourse of social entrepreneurship steers the behaviour of social entrepreneurs as well as how this discourse is defied (Dey & Steyaert, 2016; Nicolopoulou, Lucas, Tatli, Karatas-Ozkan, Costanzo, Özbilgin & Manville, 2015). Social entrepreneurship is generally seen as empowering and emancipatory (Henry, Newth & Spiller, 2017; Mair & Martí, 2009), even if the meaning of such empowerment is rarely specified (Daya, 2014). It is further seen as a solution to societal marginalization (Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2004; Richter, 2019) as well as a means to alleviate poverty (Bloom, 2009) and to promote social inclusion (Friedman & Desivilya, 2010). It is even argued that social entrepreneurship in itself addresses power imbalance in order to ‘enact social equality and justice’ (Chandra, 2018, p. 321). This means that social entrepreneurship is thought to give power to those who have little of it.

Perhaps due to this belief in empowerment, we rarely pay attention to the democratic outcomes of social entrepreneurship, i.e. how it impacts on economic inequality and differences in life opportunities (Eikenberry, 2018). Despite the best of intentions, social entrepreneurship may lead to unintended and undesirable outcomes. An often-used example of social entrepreneurship is the microcredit institution Grameen Bank, which, together with its founder Muhammad Yunus, received the Nobel Peace Prize in 2006 ‘for their efforts to create economic and social development from below’ (Nobel Media AB, 2020, n.p.). The social goal of the organization was to empower mainly women in Bangladesh by offering small loans without requiring any security. While this initiative certainly expanded the range of life opportunities for many women, it also had damaging effects. The Prime Minister of Bangladesh, Sheikh Hasina Wazed, has posed micro-lending as a way of nurturing poverty: ‘Micro-lenders make the people of this country their guinea pig. They are sucking blood from the poor in the name of poverty alleviation’ (Fund transfer allegations…2010, p. 1, quoted in Zietsma & Tuck, 2012, p. 514). Unintended

consequences of micro lending include the commodification of social relationships, and enhanced dependency, as opposed to emancipation, due to an inability to repay loans (Horn, 2013), as well as increased domestic violence (Schuler, Hashemi & Badal, 1998). Other examples of unintended outcomes can be seen in social enterprises that practice social employment, i.e. they hire people from disadvantaged and marginalized groups in society. Because of how employees are represented in external communication that highlights the social impact of the organization, the employees become more aware of their low status on the labour market (Lee, Shin, Park & Kim, 2018). As a consequence, they feel less worthy and experience reduced self-confidence and job satisfaction, whereby they become less likely to negotiate their wage or seek other employment (Lee et al., 2018). A similar case is that of a food justice truck in Australia, designed to provide low-cost nutritious food to asylum seekers (McKay, Lippi, Dunn, Haines & Lindberg, 2018). Because the offering was perceived as charity, the organization's aim to enhance dignity was undermined and instead led to increased feelings of shame (McKay et al., 2018). These examples show that, 'the very activity […] that can create enhanced social impact can also undermine it' (Islam, 2020, p. 4).

One of the few studies that explicitly consider the power relationship between the benevolent social enterprise and its beneficiaries is that of Daya (2014). This study focuses on social enterprises in South Africa that aim to empower craft producers. Despite the intention of empowerment, the discourse of social entrepreneurship was found to objectify craft workers, through accounts of 'saving' producers. As Daya (2014) writes, these accounts had 'the additional effect of commodifying more than the product being sold' (p. 127). In such narratives, differences between groups were enforced which reproduced polarities of North-South, black-white and healthy-diseased (Daya, 2014). Also, Flowers and Swan (2017) focus on the representation of beneficiaries in their study on a social enterprise selling ethnic food tours in a disadvantaged region in Australia, in order to reduce prejudice about the area and promote local ethnic food businesses. By selling 'racial difference' (p. 216), the organization ended up reproducing racialized and gendered stereotypes of the intended beneficiaries. Despite known examples of the potential unintended and damaging effects of social entrepreneurship, we still tend to take for granted that it will lead to empowerment (Horn, 2018) and rarely question who gets to define the 'social' and for whom it turns out to be 'social'.

Some scholars deem it problematic that social entrepreneurs, often being private actors, are granted the power to define societal problems and solutions. This authority, which has previously been assigned to the state, relates to their

potential to develop innovative solutions (Partzsch & Ziegler, 2011) and their possession of new ideas (Partzsch, 2017). The fact that social entrepreneurs are given this authority means that they take over public tasks and act independently of governments, which poses a democratic challenge (Partzsch, 2017). Even though the social entrepreneurs' perspective is often prioritized over others when creating social change, we rarely discuss matters of equality and democracy in relation to social entrepreneurship (Curtis, 2008). In light of this, several scholars call for more participatory approaches to social entrepreneurship (e.g. Gleerup, Hulgaard & Teasdale, 2020; Pestoff & Hulgård, 2016; Ruebottom, 2018). However, from the international development literature, we know that participatory approaches, fair as they may seem, often end up a façade covering up unjust power practices (Cooke & Kothari, 2001). Community involvement may be tainted with 'soft' power practices, which shape the perceptions of participants through culture, while concealing underlying political interests (Scaffidi, 2019). In addition, when suggestions are made to involve the local community, we are likely to picture a homogenous group of people who share the same interpretation of development initiatives (Clausen & Gyimóthy, 2016). In reality, local communities will include multiple understandings of the 'social', and within them we also find power relationships and inequality. This means that even when the 'local community' participates, the ability to influence the construction of the 'social' differs between community subgroups (Clausen & Gyimóthy, 2016).

Due to the authority granted to social entrepreneurs, which partly stems from the perceived goodness of their radical innovations (see e.g. Mair & Martí, 2009), community resistance is rarely problematized. As Sharir and Lerner (2006, p. 13) explain, '[s]ocial ventures that open up new areas of activity must often contend with an environment that does not recognize or appreciate their inherent worth or the contribution they are likely to make'. Seemingly, resistance to social entrepreneurship is considered a natural consequence of innovation (e.g. Swedberg, 2006). Although resistance is usually portrayed as something to be overcome by the social entrepreneur, Newth and Woods (2014) also emphasize its benefits. Among other things, they argue that meeting community opposition can enable the social enterprise to adjust their definition of the 'social' to the social values pertaining in its context. In this way, stakeholder resistance is assumed to ensure a democratic element in social entrepreneurship that reduces 'the potential for unintended negative consequences of an innovation, the implementation of unethical or culturally inappropriate innovations, or the risks of imposing paternalistic interventions on marginalized, minority, or indigenous populations' (Newth, 2016, p. 390).

In the scarce literature that treats resistance to social entrepreneurship, we learn that resistance is either framed as an obstacle to success or it is assumed that social enterprises will respond to the opposition and adjust their social mission accordingly. Thus, we still know little about the complexity of power relations implicated in the construction of the 'social' or how it is upheld against resistance.

So far, I have mainly written about the 'social' as an inherent good for all, i.e. an idea of the ideal society which steers the social mission of social entrepreneurship. However, turning our gaze from the individual social entrepreneur towards the construction of the 'social' also means to consider actors that have so far been neglected in the framing of entrepreneurship (Steyaert & Katz, 2004). This not only implies a focus on the experiences of the intended beneficiaries of particular social entrepreneurship initiatives, but also on citizens in general, and how they may be affected by the way we tend to talk about social entrepreneurship. Next, I discuss how the 'social' may take form as an idea of a 'good' citizen by referring to the literature that discusses how social entrepreneurship influences individual subjectivities.

Social entrepreneurial subjectivities

How does the way we talk about social entrepreneurship, as an inherently individualist project, affect people? One stream of research explores how the ideal of social entrepreneurship is enacted. Besides the notions of efficiency and self-reliance, the discourse of social entrepreneurship is characterized by compassion and morality (Berglund, 2018; Grimes, McMullen, Vogus & Miller, 2013) as well as ethics (Dey & Steyaert, 2016) and care (André & Pache, 2016). Dey and Lehner (2016) show that social entrepreneurship is narrated as an ideal subject, which offers individuals a sense of meaning and enjoyment. This portrayal underplays the fundamentally political nature of attempting social change, and the struggles and antagonism that might come with it. The identity of a social entrepreneur is thought to be connected to 'values of benevolence and self-direction, high entrepreneurship orientation, ability on taking perspective (empathy), a social motive similar to altruism, and career identity based on service and entrepreneurship' (Bargsted, Picon, Salazar & Rojas, 2013, p. 331). This largely glorified ideal of the 'social' is, to some extent, enacted by social entrepreneurs, and thus, it affects their practices. Dey and Steyaert (2016) contend that it steers the actions and behaviour of social entrepreneurs towards innovation and self-sufficiency. Mauksch (2018) adds that this discourse is embedded within the subjectivities of social

entrepreneurs. This means that the ideal of social entrepreneurship is enacted through practice and social interactions.

However, the discourse of social entrepreneurship is not necessarily sovereign. Social entrepreneurs may also enact the discourse differently (Parkinson & Howorth, 2008) or only partly (Mason, 2014). Parkinson and Howorth (2008) state that the discourse of policymakers and the like does not necessarily influence the ideology of practitioners or divert their focus from political engagement and collective action. With a similar emphasis on the agency of social entrepreneurs, as opposed to the hegemony of policy discourse, Dey and Teasdale (2016) show how third sector practitioners can engage in 'tactical mimicry' of social enterprise, i.e. they strategically act as social entrepreneurs to be able to attain the financial resources made available by the government. Hence, the grand narrative of social entrepreneurship may shape the way social entrepreneurs act, such as the case of an NGO starting to adopt business methods, but social entrepreneurs may also resist this discourse or strategically take advantage of it.

Going further in depth in exploring entrepreneurial subjectivities, Skoglund and Berglund (2018) outline two critical turns in entrepreneurship research. The first turn was a critique of 'the greedy, socially and environmentally irresponsible, to-be-retired conventional entrepreneurial self' (p. 172), which led to the emergence of alternative forms of entrepreneurships, such as social entrepreneurship and green entrepreneurship. On this topic, Gill (2014) found that entrepreneurship discourse differentiates people based on class, as it 'constructs a context in which an entrepreneurial hierarchy denies entrepreneurial legitimacy to lower or working classes based on assumptions that these classes are not creative, educated or motivated' (Gill, 2014, p. 62). Thus, entrepreneurship was seen as an exclusionary construct, applied mainly to heroic white males who reached business success through rational and innovative mindsets. To make entrepreneurship more inclusive, more people were invited into the construct. In the turn to alternative entrepreneurships, individuals who were previously seen as burdens to society were encouraged to transform themselves into entrepreneurs (Berglund & Skoglund, 2016). The second turn was a critique of the plurality of entrepreneurships and their effects on individual subjectivity. Berglund (2013) explains that '[t]he enterprising self can be seen as the invisible role model against whom individuals are judged, and judge themselves, in contemporary society. The recurrent watchwords for this subject seem to be 'Achieve more!' 'Perform!' 'Fight against all odds!' and 'Have fun in the meantime!'' (p. 730).

These promoted ways of being can be seen as a 'battle against the human' (Berglund & Skoglund, 2016, p. 57), which seeks to eliminate undesired behaviour, i.e. reliance on the state, and promote entrepreneurial ways of living, i.e. reliance on oneself. Under the umbrella of entrepreneurialism, the allowed subjectivities are consumers, competitors and employees (Hjorth, 2013). Citizens affected by societal problems are turned into consumers with needs to be met by the social entrepreneur (Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006). Here, individuals are responsible for their own future, and failing to take this responsibility, they are viewed as a threat to society. These alternative entrepreneurships have created a new form of the entrepreneurial self, now 'a subject who wishes to change their own or even others' worlds, fundamentally convinced about the freedom to bring about social change by taking on risks outsourced by the state' (Skoglund & Berglund, 2018, p. 171).

Thus, we know from previous studies that social entrepreneurship encourages a particular kind of subjectivity, often called 'the entrepreneurial self' (Bröckling, 2015), amongst social entrepreneurs but also amongst citizens in their surroundings. I wish to add to the literature on how social entrepreneurship encourages certain ways of being (Skoglund & Berglund, 2018) by placing particular emphasis on the relational process by which this way of being is constructed. Few studies have so far demonstrated how social and environmental entrepreneurs construct their identities by pointing to what they are not (Phillips, 2013; Yitshaki & Kropp, 2016). In this study, I try to understand how individuals involved in the sustainable transition on the Island construct themselves as good by drawing upon an Other, i.e. the Islander.

As I mentioned in the previous chapter, in this thesis I am inspired by the relational framing of social entrepreneurship, which focuses on the process in which a multitude of actors participates in the co-construction of reality (Friedman, Sykes & Strauch, 2018). Steyaert and Katz (2004, p. 192) describe this as a 'shift from a view of an elitist group of entrepreneurs towards a more encompassing, although anonymous, participation of all kind of citizens.' The works of scholars addressing the relationality of social entrepreneurship tend to be driven by a desire to transform social entrepreneurship from an economic and managerial construct to a more inclusive concept that is part of society (Friedman, Sykes & Strauch, 2018; Hjorth, 2013; Humphries & Grant, 2005; Steyaert & Hjorth, 2006; Steyaert & Katz, 2004). For example, Friedman, Sykes and Strauch (2018, p. 260) argue that we should focus on the relational processes through which social worlds are constituted, which may lead to an '[expansion of] the realm of the possible so as to make the world increasingly inclusive and conducive to the flourishing of people and their communities.'

In this thesis, I try to add to our understanding of the relational construction of social entrepreneurship by way of a different approach. I wish to understand the co-construction of the 'social', also with regards to how power relations shape the process. I consider the roles that different actors, human and non-human, take in the co-construction of the 'social' and how it is upheld against resistance. In order to do so, I adopt a postcolonial perspective, which I elaborate on in the following chapter.

Summary

In this review of social entrepreneurship literature, I have argued that four themes stand out among the highly cited articles, i.e. opportunity, resourcefulness, innovation and the social. I suggest that these themes show the individualistic ideal and the performative intent (Fournier & Grey, 2000) that distinguish the field. Moreover, I suggest that these assumptions encourage scholars to centre on the social entrepreneur and to place the societies in which they act in the periphery. I further conclude that there is a lack of problematization of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship, which is seemingly assumed to be good for all. Against this backdrop, I join scholars who call for a repoliticization of the 'social' (Barinaga, 2012; 2013; Cho, 2006; Nicholls & Cho, 2006). Although we have come to understand social entrepreneurship as a relational construct instead of an individual endeavour (Steyaert & Katz, 2004; Friedman, Sykes & Strauch, 2018), we still know little about *how* the 'social' is relationally constructed and how power plays out in the process. Thus, I argue that there is a need to further understand how the social is constructed and upheld.

In the sustainable transition taking place on the Island, the 'social' took form as a sense of what was good for society, as well as an idea of what it meant to be a good citizen. To understand the power relations involved in the construction of the 'social', I apply a postcolonial perspective. In the upcoming chapter, I explain how postcolonial theory can help us generate new insights on social entrepreneurship, and how the analytical tools of Othering and mimicry (Bhabha, 1994) have helped me understand the relational construction of the 'social'.

3 A postcolonial perspective

In this chapter, I explain why a postcolonial perspective is relevant when considering the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship, even when it takes shape in contexts that we do not usually consider (post)colonial. After providing a brief overview of postcolonial theory, I outline how it has been applied so far in organization and management studies, and how it can shine new light on 'good' organizations such as social enterprises. I finally elaborate on how the postcolonial lens guides this study, i.e. how it encourages a repoliticization of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship while drawing attention to the power relations in the constitution thereof.

Postcolonial theory

Colonialism refers to the 'physical conquest, occupation, and administration of the territory of one country by another' (Prasad, 2003, p. 5). *Post*colonialism is a critique of colonialism; it recognizes the legacy of past colonialism as well as the continuation of imperialist[8] and colonialist practices today, which may be referred to as neocolonialism. Postcolonialism deals with 'the West's relationship to its *others* —notably the peoples of its former colonies and the indigenous populations within its own geographical enclaves'[9] (Prasad, 2005, p. 262). By linking the colonialism of the past to the racism and ethnic discrimination of today, the postcolonial perspective shines light on how colonialism continues to shape our social realities (de los Reyes & Mulinari, 2005). This means that even after former colonized countries have gained independence, Western hegemony has been maintained through a relationship

[8] Imperialism refers to one nations' exercise of economic and political power over another without necessarily occupying the land (Prasad, 2003).

[9] The West means 'people and societies of European descent' (Prasad, 2005, p. 263) i.e. Europe, North America and Australia.

of economic dependency as well as cultural and ideological subjugation (Prasad, 2003).

We can discern four overall themes in postcolonial research (Slater, 1998). The first connects the postcolonial to the historical time period of colonialism and the power relations that characterize it. The second theme is similar to the projects of postmodernism and poststructuralism in being a form of critical inquiry, 'whereby notions of difference, agency, subjectivity, hybridity and resistance destabilize western discourses of modernity and emphasize the inseparability of colonialism and imperialism from the projection and introjection of Enlightenment values' (p. 653). The third theme deals with the interaction between the colonizer and the colonized and how they affect each other i.e. how these roles are mutually constituted. Finally, the fourth approach treats the power relations that surround the production of theoretical knowledge: 'who are the agents of theoretical knowledge, where are they located, for whom do they speak and how do they theorize?' (p. 653). Thus, postcolonial scholars acknowledge that the production of knowledge involves the legitimizing or questioning of current power structures (de los Reyes & Mulinari, 2005). Mir, Mir and Upadhyaya (2003, p. 56) add that postcolonialism strives to 'identify a space of activism for non-Western subjectivities' and 'to make a politico-epistemological case for the politics of representation'. This means that postcolonial writers seek to repoliticize knowledge (of e.g. the West and the non-West) that have been depoliticized. In this way, postcolonial research can be seen as an ethically informed critique, and it should be assessed based on its ethical and political consequences (Prasad & Prasad, 2003).

The writers who are perhaps most associated with postcolonial theory, sometimes referred to as the 'postcolonial trio' (Slater, 1998), are Said (1978), Spivak (1988) and Bhabha (1994).[10] These scholars, and many of the early postcolonial works, have roots in literary theory, and their focus has largely been to explore colonial discourse. Through an alternative reading of this discourse, Said, Spivak and Bhabha provide counter-stories aiming to challenge perceptions that naturalize unequal power structures. In line with the approaches of these scholars, the focus of postcolonial works has generally been on the effects of colonial discourse and language, on the colonized as well as the colonizers, rather than the materiality of physical domination and violence (Prasad, 2003). The latter category, focusing on history and

[10] Sometimes, Ashis Nandy is also mentioned as one of the most influential postcolonial scholars (e.g. in Prasad, 2003).

materiality, would fall under the field of ‘postcolonial criticism’ (Prasad, 2003). While there are many postcolonialisms (Prasad, 2005), in this thesis, I draw upon the one that centres on the subject of representation and how representation influences the culture and identity both of those who represent and those who are represented. This relates to the third theme outlined by Slater (1998), i.e. the mutual constitution of the colonizer and the colonized, as well as the ‘politics of representation’ (Mir, Mir & Upadhyaya, 2003). As de los Reyes and Mulinari (2005) conclude, to understand how the Other is constituted is essential to recognize and potentially alter established power relations. Thus, exploring how the Islander is constructed becomes a gateway to understanding how power plays out in the relational construction of the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship. In the following, I elaborate on the works of Bhabha (1994) and Said (1978), both pioneers in developing notions of Otherness and representation. For more complete overviews of postcolonial works, see e.g. Loomba (2015) and Prasad (2003).

Representation, Otherness and mimicry

One of the most well-known postcolonial works is Orientalism by Edward Said (1978). Orientalism shows how colonialism not only involves direct control, but also a form of mentality that allows for a certain way of imagining the Middle East. As Prasad (2003, p. 10) explains, Orientalism is ‘an attempt to explore the complicity of power and knowledge and, in so doing, to produce an understanding of colonialism/imperialism at the level of representation’. The stereotypical way of representing the Orient is found in academic texts as well as in fictional works and poetry. This means that: ‘Anyone who teaches, writes about, or researches the Orient […] is an Orientalist, and what he or she does is Orientalism’ (Said, 1978, p. 2). Thus, the system of knowledge that is Orientalism is produced and reproduced in, primarily Western, texts. It can be thought of as a ‘corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient’ (Said, 1978, p. 3). In sum, Orientalism can be seen as a colonial discourse that ‘refers to an entire way of seeing, thinking, and writing about colonized and/or formerly colonized people’ (Prasad, 2005, p. 271). It provides a form of ‘reality’ about the geographical area of the Middle East and the people who reside there.

However, Orientalism is not only knowledge about the Orient; it is also knowledge about the West. It creates a contrast between the Orient and the West which helps to define European culture and identity as superior (Said, 1978). We can think of Orientalism as a form of Othering, which means 'to treat or consider (a person or a group of people) as alien to oneself or one's group (as because of different racial, sexual, or cultural characteristics)' (Othering, 2020). Othering involves the construction of a distinction between oneself and Others, while simultaneously portraying these Others as all the same, i.e. a group of people with homogenous characteristics (Bhabha, 1994). This means that Othering is a practice through which a desirable identity can be achieved; when we are describing Others, we are simultaneously defining ourselves. In this way, representation through Othering can be seen as the social construction of differences.

The concept of Otherness lies close to that of the subaltern. The term subalternity comes from Gramsci (1971), wherein it refers to a group of people subjected to the hegemony of another class. Subaltern studies has become a subdiscipline within postcolonialism. Scholars within this field study the formation of subordination (in terms of e.g. class, gender or ethnicity), initially in the context of South Asia, and later also beyond its borders (Prasad, 2003). Today, 'the subaltern' has come to refer to any group being marginalized in society, especially because of gender and ethnicity (Young, 2016). In the case of the sustainable transition taking place on the Island, the local construction of the Islander raises questions regarding the possible forms of subalternity created in instances of social entrepreneurship.

Spivak's famous essay 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' (1988) problematizes the main assumption of Subaltern Studies, i.e. that scholars are able to give voice to the subaltern classes of society and, in so doing, to provide a counter-story to the official and dominant history. Spivak draws attention to the fact that 'the subaltern' is not a homogenous group so that 'they' can speak, and thus, she highlights the danger of Western scholars reproducing 'the subaltern' when speaking *for* them. I address the matter of giving voice to, and representing, the Islander in the methodology chapter of this thesis.

Bhabha (1994) follows the work of Said (1978) and his focus on representation, but further adds the dimensions of contradiction and ambivalence to the process of Othering. The Other or, as Bhabha most commonly writes, 'the stereotype', is a central aspect of colonial discourse. While the Other is constituted by its difference from the self (the one who articulates the Other), there is no difference between Others; they are denied individual identities. This means that the production of Otherness involves

both acknowledging and denying difference, resulting in a colonized people that are concurrently an Other and entirely knowable. In this way, colonial discourse fixes the identities of Others. But, despite the coherent and unchanging nature of the Other, the stereotype is constantly repeated in talk and texts, as if we would need to be reminded of it. For Bhabha, this repetition is what allows us to question the alleged fixity of the Other. Bhabha's text on stereotypes and colonial discourse is largely about highlighting instability in what is represented as stable knowledge. Central to this is his concept of ambivalence.

Colonial discourse was inherently self-contradictory in its claimed mission of civilization, for non-Western cultures were at the same time given an essence of savagery, leaving change, and thus, civilization, impossible. The ambivalence of the stereotype means that even though it is represented as homogenous and denied any difference, it may nonetheless involve contradiction. Bhabha (1994, p. 115) refers to this as 'a process of splitting and multiple/contradictory belief at the point of enunciation and subjectification'. Hence, the knowledge of the Other is not as stable and unified as it seems. In the context of colonialism, the colonial subject was one of concurrently mastery and pleasure, fear and desire; both rejected and required.[11] This enabled the colonizers to relate to the colonized in different ways. When necessary, violent domination could be legitimized by an image of the Other as primitive and dangerous. In other instances, the Other was exoticized and sexualized to warrant desire. This ambivalence is a sign that colonial discourse has failed to produce a stable and fixed knowledge of the Other, and thus, to establish complete authority. In this study, I draw upon Bhabha's ideas on ambivalence and Otherness to understand the construction of the Islander. Specifically, I explore inconsistencies in the narrated character of the Islander, and how these contradictions may serve a function in the construction of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship.

For Bhabha, Orientalism grants too much power to the colonizers while not leaving enough room for agency on the part of the colonized. The contradiction in Otherness shows that the binary categories of colonized/colonizer are not so

[11] In his reading of colonial discourse, Bhabha not only draws on Said but also on psychoanalytic works by Fanon, Lacan and Freud. His argument is complex, and, as my focus will be on Othering as a social construction of differences achieved in interactions amongst people as well as between people and things, rather than Othering as a cognitive process, I will not delve into its psychoanalytic workings. Rather, I will focus on the parts of Bhabha's concept of ambivalence that inspired my analysis and allowed for a better understanding of what was happening at the Island.

clear-cut as they seem, and it is this ambivalence that allows a subtle kind of resistance of colonial discourse. Bhabha exemplifies this through his concept of mimicry. Usually, the process by which the colonized start to imitate their colonizers is seen as a token of the colonizers' control. They do this, it is assumed, because they have been subject to a cultural kind of colonization which views the identities, values and behaviour of the colonizers as ideal. Thus, they strive to identify with their colonizer and adapt their behaviour accordingly. However, Bhabha's notion of mimicry highlights agency over structure. Mimicry involves not only repetition but also reinterpretation, i.e. in the imitation of the colonizers, a kind of appropriation takes place that may distort colonial discourse as it is envisioned by the colonizers. Imitation, Bhabha says, can become a form of resistance when it is done in an exaggerated manner. If the imitator becomes even more authentic than the ideal being imitated, the act of mimicry becomes a form of irony or even mockery in that it renders the ideal inauthentic, and in doing so, it destabilizes colonial authority.

The postcolonial perspective, and particularly two of Bhabha's texts, i.e. *The Other question* and *Of mimicry and man* (1994), enable me to explore how the 'social' in social entrepreneurship is relationally constructed, and how power plays out in the process. Specifically, these concepts allow me to consider how social entrepreneurship may constitute ideal and anti-ideal identity positions, which are relationally constructed and mutually constituting, in line with those of the colonizer and the colonized. It further allows me to explore how social entrepreneurship may encourage certain ways of being, not just amongst entrepreneurs and business owners, but also amongst citizens. Next, I outline how postcolonial theory has been applied in organization and management research, including entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship studies.

Postcolonial theory in management and organization research

As de los Reyes and Mulinari (2005) note, colonialism enabled the European understanding of modernity, characterized by the prioritization of scientific and technological advances, to become a societal model for all of humanity. Central to the discourse of modernity is a linear type of thinking, which puts capitalism and the market economy as guiding principles of societal and economical organizing. Terms such as 'human progress', 'economic growth',

and ‘societal development’ indicate our constant strive for change, where time becomes the obvious measure of development (de los Reyes and Mulinari, 2005, p. 71). On a global scale, there is an understanding that some countries are *further* on this linear scale of development than others. This enduring assumption of linearity forms a predetermined path for formerly colonized countries, namely that towards ‘development’, ‘progress’ and ‘modernity’ (Banerjee & Prasad, 2008, p. 92). The mission of ‘development’ seems as self-evident and rational as did the civilization mission in colonial times; yet, it equally remains a construct (Banerjee, 2003). Globally, we distinguish between ‘developed’ and ‘underdeveloped’/‘developing’ countries. These terms imply that low-income countries must follow the path taken by wealthier nations, to reach the desired stage of ‘developed’. It becomes the task of already ‘developed’ countries to help others reach the same (assumingly good) stage. Hence, ‘development’ has created ‘underdevelopment’ and related notions of ‘poverty’, ‘illiteracy’, etc. (Banerjee, 2003). As Gopal, Willis and Gopal (2003, p. 235) note, ‘[b]y substituting “development” for “poverty,” the west went from “exploiter” to “helper,” from description to prescription, writing in its own heroic role’.

The prevailing discourse of modernity may limit and simplify organizational research (Mir, Mir & Upadhyaya, 2003). Hence, postcolonial theory becomes relevant for management and organization research ‘because it offers a uniquely radical and ethically informed critique of Western modernity and modernity’s overdetermined accoutrements like capitalism, Eurocentrism, science, and the like’ (Prasad, 2003, p. 33). There are five points in which the discourse of colonialism meets that of euromodern[12] organizing (Mir, Mir & Upadhyaya, 2003, p. 49).

> (a) the linkages between colonialism and industrialization, (b) the creation of the colonial subject as a ground for the creation of the docile worker, (c) the relationship between colonial practices and organizing practices, (d) the convergence between colonial and organizational ideologies, and (e) the similarity between colonial regimes and modern international regimes as control systems.

Through these links between discourses, we see that the context of organization and management may not be so far from the colonial setting as it first appears, and thus, that it may benefit from the insights of postcolonial

[12] Refers to the modernity constructed in the European context, and thus, to the locality of modernity.

theory. For example, applying a postcolonial perspective may encourage us to defamiliarize ourselves from common understandings of organizational phenomena (Prasad, 2003). It can help us to outline the assumptions that prevail in management studies, and how these constitute representations that do things. Postcolonial theory may, for example, be useful for exploring how the knowledge constructed in management research furthers neocolonialism (Frenkel & Shenhav, 2006), such as in studies of cross-cultural management, which often gives a simplified notion of 'culture' (Kwek, 2003), or in the way that organization studies represent 'African leadership' (Nkomo, 2011). Further, it can shed light on the control imposed by information and communication technologies (Gopal, Willis & Gopal, 2003), on the measurement and management of African 'corruption' (de Maria, 2008) and on ideas of empowerment associated with action research in the field of organizational culture (Cooke, 2003). Other scholars have applied the postcolonial lens to the contexts of international management (Özkazanç-Pan, 2008), knowledge transfer in multinational corporations (Mir, Banerjee & Mir, 2008; Sharpe & Mir, 2009), transnational mergers (Risberg, Tienari & Vaara, 2003) and bureaucracy in Aboriginal affairs administration in Australia (Sullivan, 2008). In sum, the postcolonial perspective can be useful for understanding the role that academic scholars play in furthering a representation of the West and the East/South in line with historic ideas of colonialism. It can aid in understanding how management as a practice is tainted by its colonial past, and how it serves to reproduce this past in the form of neocolonialism, especially with regards to cross-cultural management, international management and MNCs. Largely, it is about breaking assumptions in management research that stem from imperialist and neocolonial ideas.

While these are all important insights, I mainly draw upon the studies that make use of postcolonial theory as an analytical toolbox for analyzing the mutually constituting relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. As Prasad (2003) concludes, such an analysis may be fruitful to further our knowledge of power and resistance in organizations. For example, Bhabha's concepts of ambivalence and mimicry can enrich research on workplace resistance by pointing to the everydayness of resistance and the potential of unconscious opposition (Prasad & Prasad, 2003). Here, one can draw a parallel between the ambivalence inherent in colonial discourse and the apparent contradictions in managerial discourse, seen in the latter's 'celebration of worker autonomy and empowerment, while it simultaneously seeks to inscribe further strategies of surveillance and control at the workplace' (Prasad & Prasad, 2003, p. 110). In exploring how US multinational enterprises influence the organizing practices

of actors in emerging markets, Sinha and Bathini (2019) apply the concepts of Otherness and mimicry. The American model of ‘best practice’ is interpreted as a form of neocolonization, which takes shape as the ‘Englishization’ and adoption of US work practices by an Indian fast-food chain. Seeing this adoption as an enactment of mimicry (Bhabha, 1994), local workers’ renegotiation of US practices was understood as resistance to neocolonialism. Others have used mimicry to explore Indian business scholars’ identity work in the context of business school globalization, including conformance and resistance to the ‘standard’ imposed (Kothiyal, Bell & Clarke, 2018). While studying the empirical context of the Greenlandic police force, and their attempts to include indigenous Kalaallit people in the organization, Dobusch, Holck and Muhr (2020) apply the ‘Bhabhaian’ lens in a similar way. They explore how police officers mimic Danish/Western culture and professionalism, and in doing so, how they both confirm and resist colonial stereotypes, resulting in a hybrid form of inclusion. As mentioned before, I use the concepts of Otherness, ambivalence and mimicry as analytical tools to understand how the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship is constructed and upheld. The concept of mimicry allows me to explore how a notion of the social becomes settled amongst citizens and how this idea is resisted in different ways.

Postcolonial theory in entrepreneurship research

A postcolonial lens may also bring new perspectives to the field of entrepreneurship. The mainstream discourse on entrepreneurship portrays it primarily as a male and Western process (Essers & Tedmanson, 2014). Adopting a postcolonial feminist lens, Essers and Tedmanson (2014) explore how the political discourse in the Netherlands constructs gendered Others and how this influences the identity positions taken by female Turkish entrepreneurs. Applying the concepts of mimicry and hybridity (Bhabha, 1994), the authors further found that the entrepreneurs partly internalized the dominant discourse by contributing to the Othering of their equals. Özkazanç-Pan (2012; 2014; 2017) also advocates a postcolonial feminist analysis of entrepreneurship. In exploring the context of high-technology entrepreneuring in the US, she finds that the ‘high-technology entrepreneur’ is a dominant subject position and that subaltern subjectivities such as the ‘woman high-technology entrepreneur’ take shape around it. By challenging the discourse and the practices that reproduce inequalities, the entrepreneurial environment can become more inclusive for women and immigrants (Özkazanç-Pan, 2014). Thus, we should be careful in assuming that entrepreneurship per se leads to

the empowerment of women. In countries transitioning to a market economy, entrepreneurship is often posed as a solution to gender inequality, in that it allows women to enter the labour market. Özkazanç-Pan (2012) concludes that entrepreneurship is presented as a kind of gendered neoliberal citizenship, which claims to empower women, but does little to alter any gender structures. The idea of entrepreneurship as a development tool and a means of empowerment leads us into the topic of organizations taking on the role of the 'good' actor and how postcolonial theory can help us better understand this phenomenon.

Postcolonialism and the 'good' organization

Terms such as 'corporate social responsibility' (CSR), 'sustainable development' and 'community engagement' imply an assumption that capitalism is able to take on and solve societal issues (Parsons, 2008). The widely used term CSR usually indicates that corporations have a responsibility that exceeds their financial returns, i.e. they are also accountable for the society and the environment in which they act. However, as Banerjee (2008, p. 52) argues, even though corporations assess the social and environmental impact of their operations, the discourses of CSR, sustainability and corporate citizenship continue to 'represent and construct the relationship between business and society based on corporate interests, not societal interests'.

Within these discourses, citizens have become 'stakeholders' to enterprises, which may lead one to assume that these stakeholders are empowered. By critically analyzing the discourse of 'community engagement' within the setting of mineral companies and Aboriginal communities in Australia, Parsons (2008) finds that community participation is inhibited by past colonial relations of power. On a similar note, Banerjee (2008) holds that the stakeholder theory of the firm is a form of stakeholder colonialism, which, instead of emancipating these stakeholders, works to control their behaviour. Thus, CSR may play a role in reproducing colonial relationships. By exploring the colonial epistemologies communicated and materialized in the CSR practices of a multinational oil company, Pearson, Ellingrod, Billo and McSweeney (2019) find that CSR produces forms of governance over indigenous populations which mirror neocolonial hierarchies. In a similar manner, CSR initiatives aiming to empower women run the risk of reproducing gendered neocolonial relations (Özkazanç-Pan, 2019).

Scholars applying a postcolonial lens in the field of CSR critique the idea of CSR and its application in the 'developing world' for primarily being based on Western values and beliefs (e.g. Melissen, Mzembe, Idemudia and Novakovic, 2018). Such Western-led CSR practices are more often than not perceived as a form of cultural and economic imperialism by local actors (Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011) and might be resembled to the civilizing mission of colonial times (Adanhounme, 2011). Formerly colonized countries thus continue their dependence on the West for the provision of social services, although now they depend on the CSR practices of transnational corporations instead of their colonizing nation (Vertigans, 2011). On this note, Khan, Westwood and Boje (2010) suggest adopting a post-colonial CSR perspective. This would mean shifting the gaze from problems that need to be solved in 'developing' countries, towards how the West actively produces and reproduces the very conditions of poverty and inequality that it desires to solve.

In the field of social entrepreneurship, the postcolonial perspective has been applied in a similar manner as within the field of CSR, i.e. it tends to focus on the power relations between the West and low-income countries. Some argue that the very concept of social enterprise is colonial, in that it is based on the Western development narrative and its imaginaries of possible economic initiatives (dos Santos & Banerjee, 2019). For example, women in low-income countries are often posed as the beneficiaries of Western-led social enterprises, where the facilitation of women's self-employment is assumed to bring women's empowerment (Clark Muntean & Özkazanç-Pan, 2016). However, if we broadened our idea of social entrepreneurship, we would see that women's activities in the domestic realm may constitute alternative political arenas, and thus, these women could be rendered social entrepreneurs themselves, instead of women in need of empowerment (Hillenkamp & dos Santos, 2019). Other scholars are concerned with how indigenous social entrepreneurship practices are influenced by the Western business model (Martínez, Pachón, Martín & Moreno, 2019; Morales, Calvo, Martínez & Martín, 2021). Here, Bhabha's concept of mimicry (1994) is applied to explore how the Western managerial discourse is imitated by social entrepreneurs in low-income countries (Morales et al., 2021), how non-profit organizations imitate social enterprises to attain financial resources (Calvo & Morales, 2016), and thus, how the construction of the social enterprise sector is shaped by North/South power relations (Martínez et al., 2019).

As we have seen, postcolonial theory is mainly used to understand how Western 'good' organizations, through CSR initiatives or social entrepreneurship, solve the social and environmental problems for a previously

colonized or presently low-income country. For example, de Lima (2020) explores the delivery of humanitarian aid in the Global South through a postcolonial lens, while Brännvall (2018) investigates how postcolonial attitudes influence the innovation process in social enterprises operating in low-income countries. Similarly, in the development literature, the postcolonial lens has been used to shed light on how 'development imaginaries' shape the subjectivities of people in the Global North (Baillie Smith, 2013), the representational practices of the non-West in tourism texts (Caton & Santos, 2009), and the colonial representation of 'Third World Women' in development organizations' publicity campaigns (Wilson, 2011). Likewise, McSweeney (2020) suggests applying a postcolonial lens to the field of social entrepreneurship (specifically the empirical context of sport-for-development and peace) to understand 'donor-recipient relations', unequal power relations and how local perspectives may differ from the global viewpoint.

In this study, I argue that postcolonial theory can be useful to understand the power relations present in social entrepreneurship, even in cases where the common North-South/Developed-Developing relationship is absent. The postcolonial lens can be extended to instances of social entrepreneurship that are not tainted with historic colonial relations, and thus, to cases that take place within high-income economies, such as Denmark, that sets the stage for this study.

Social entrepreneurship through the postcolonial lens

I am not the first to suggest that the postcolonial perspective can be useful to gain insight in empirical contexts that do not directly mirror the power relationship between the West and the Rest. For example, Sharpe and Mir (2009) compare the relationship between the headquarters and the subsidiary of a multinational corporation, where the former is Japanese and the latter is located in the United Kingdom, to the relationship between colonized and colonizing nations. They convincingly argue that 'the production of the colonized subject can be likened to the production of the organizational subject in the subsidiary' (p. 30) even when the subsidiary, as in this case, is located in the home ground of the former British Empire. Furthermore, Śliwa (2008) adopts a postcolonial perspective when studying a geographical context unrelated to historical colonialism. She does this by considering the spread of English, German and Russian in Poland and how these foreign languages influence socioeconomic change.

Like these scholars, I apply the postcolonial perspective in a new context, namely, that of a sustainable transition on a Danish island. However, this does not mean that I consider this context, which I pose as an example of social entrepreneurship, to be equal to past colonialism. But, viewing social entrepreneurship through the lens of postcolonialism may enable us to gain new perspectives on the concept, particularly when it comes to understanding the power relations involved in the construction of the 'social'. However, when applying a postcolonial perspective on phenomena that lie far from the conditions of historical colonialism, one must be mindful not to diminish the severity of colonialism and its repercussions. Indeed, colonialism brings associations of domination, violence, exploitation and slavery; things that have little to do with social entrepreneurship. Prasad and Prasad (2003, pp. 114-115) discuss this very topic below.

> Can it be claimed with sufficient reason, however, that postcolonial theoretic insights may have relevance even for examining power relations within a merchant bank's offices in London, or at an insurance company's headquarters in Mumbai, or in the offices of a government ministry in Beijing? Clearly, by no stretch of imagination can one responsibly claim that everyday power relations in these organizational settings *precisely* replicate those existing under colonial conditions. Nevertheless, postcolonialism's insights might be of use even in these organizational situations, in part because we inhabit a postcolonial world. […] While so doing, however, it becomes our responsibility—as ethical management researchers—not to collapse all organizational situations into the colonial ones, and to remain alive to the differences that might exist between the colonial theater and the arena of contemporary organizations, as well as to the heterogeneities across different organizational sites.

In line with this reasoning, I would not argue that the postcolonial lens is befitting just any organizational setting. However, I do maintain that there are reasons for conducting a postcolonial analysis of social entrepreneurship in particular, which go beyond how it has been applied so far in studies of both CSR and social entrepreneurship, i.e. mainly as a form of neocolonialism reminiscent of the colonial North/South dichotomy. Today, the notion of development 'has been de-politicized through the idea of entrepreneurship which thrives on the logic of persons who, qua being part of a community, carry the burdensome task of transforming societies using economic and managerial means' (Dey & Steyaert, 2010, p. 99). These days social entrepreneurs are increasingly given the role of agents in this depoliticised development (Chandra, 2018; de Lima, 2020). Thus, social entrepreneurship is closely related to our present understanding of 'development', regardless if

it takes form as a sustainable transition on a small island in Denmark or as a microfinance institution in Uganda. Since postcolonial theory seeks to repoliticize what has been depoliticized, applying it to the concept of social entrepreneurship means to highlight the political character of the ‘social’ and the power relations involved in its construction. Thus, comparing our assumptions on social entrepreneurship today to the perceived goodness of past colonial missions, may enable us to question what we take for granted about societal development.

4 Methodology

It is perhaps no surprise that I would choose a postcolonial perspective on social entrepreneurship, given my involvement in 'actual' postcolonial settings. Like the instance of social entrepreneurship that I write about in this thesis, I have myself been tempted to do 'good' for Others. After finishing my master's degree in Sustainable Management, I felt compelled to share my knowledge in an economically deprived context. I ended up going to a small village in the south of Kenya where I joined an organization working with women's education and capacity development. Once settled, I quickly started to question my justification for being there and the function I served. Although this surely was a rewarding experience for *me*, the phenomenon of Western people going to 'help' Africans (often without possessing any relevant skills to do so—at least this was surely the case with me) furthers an idea of the West as a superior saviour. Yet, when people I spoke to, in Kenya or in Sweden, learned that I was volunteering, they would usually commend me for being such a *good* person. Later on, I did an internship for a Swedish NGO, placed in their office in South Africa. The NGO redistributed funds from the Swedish International Development Agency to local organizations in southern Africa, which, in turn, worked to solve local socioeconomic and environmental problems. Even though this organization was, in my opinion, comparatively aware of its power position as a donor and acted thereafter, I eventually became uneased by the way in which beneficiaries were portrayed in fundraising campaigns, and how financial interests, rather than discussions on how to best tackle socioeconomic issues, were prioritized in strategic meetings. I asked myself: who is this organization really *for*? And here I am, asking the very same question regarding the organization of a sustainable transition at a small Danish Island.

Obviously, I did not initiate this research process as a blank sheet of paper. My preunderstanding, comprised of personal experiences, political views, values and interests, has inevitably coloured my overall research approach. In this chapter, I endeavour to remain transparent and explicit about the fact that all

knowledge is perspective-dependent and value-laden (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018).

So, how does one explore the construction of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship from a postcolonial perspective? In this study, I have put a particular focus on how people involved in the sustainable transition at the Island represent themselves and others in interview talk. The term representation can mean 'the action of speaking or acting on behalf of someone or the state of being so represented' or 'the description or portrayal of someone or something in a particular way' (Representation, 2020). However, representation is not just about mirroring an external reality, it can also be an attempt to essentialize, which further functions to construct and to control reality (Kwek, 2003). Social entrepreneurship in itself involves the act of representing, as it generally furthers an agenda to improve the life of someone else. In this chapter, I describe how I came to understand the power relations present in the construction of the 'social' by considering the representational practices of social entrepreneurship.

In the previous chapter, I presented postcolonial theory as my main theoretical perspective. However, there are still some theoretical matters to be resolved. In the following, I will describe the social constructionist approach that I take as well as my view on language, discourse and identity. After having described how I constructed the empirical material through an interview study, I also develop on how I have used postcolonial theory as a puzzle solving tool.

Social constructionism and denaturalization

This study takes an interest in social constructions. This means that I will not attempt to mirror reality; rather, I will explore how it is constructed. Social constructionism means that humans co-create what we collectively perceive to be real and true (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). For me, the point of exploring social constructions is to question what we take for granted and to show that the apparently self-evident can be made disputable. This endeavour relates to my interest in critical research, explained by Alvesson and Deetz (2000, p. 8) as

> the examination of social institutions, ideologies, discourses (ways of constructing and reasoning about the world through the use of a particular language) and forms of consciousness in terms of representation and domination. Critique explores if and how these constrain human imagination,

> autonomy, and decision making. Attention is paid to asymmetrical relations of power, taken for granted assumptions and beliefs.

This means that sometimes the knowledge we have about the world can limit the way we live our lives. Some things present themselves as natural and unavoidable, and critical scholars seek to denaturalize them by pointing to the possibility of understanding these things in alternative ways (Fournier & Grey, 2000). We may think of this as a frozen social reality (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000) and the task of the critical scholar is to unfreeze it, which can be seen as a form of emancipation. However, just as the emancipatory aim of the social entrepreneur can be seen as problematic, so can that of the critical scholar. How do *we* get to decide what is good for society? In my mind, we don't. As Deetz (1992, p. 3) explains:

> Organizational decisions, products, and practices have major effects on human development. Anything that influences the continued formation or deformation of the human character has ethical implications. While no one is in a position to define the social good or what the human character ultimately should be like, the full representation of differing people and their interests would seem to be fundamental to ethical choices regarding development.

This means that the point of showing that a certain type of knowledge has become fixed is to create space for alternative perceptions, and thus, to promote a broader participation in the production of meaning (Deetz, 1992). The introductory chapter of this thesis can be seen as an outline of how I came to problematize two types of such knowledge. The first is the knowledge about social entrepreneurship and how it is presented as an unproblematic win-win situation for business and society. This problematization led me to take a critical approach to social entrepreneurship and to question its supposed benefit to society. The second is the apparently fixed knowledge of the Islander. In the following empirical chapters, I will attempt to denaturalize another type of knowledge, namely that which is taken as 'good' for society. Rather than replacing such knowledge for another, I will highlight alternative interpretations construed by the research participants of this study; understandings that were seemingly not given equal space.

Before I go on to explain how I have constructed the empirical material presented in this thesis, I will highlight some of the main elements of a constructionist study as outlined by Svensson (2003). Next, I discuss how a focus on language as constructing reality, anti-essentialism and interpretivism relates to this study.

Language and discourse

Knowledge that becomes taken for granted, such as that of social entrepreneurship or that of the Islander, is to a large extent constituted through language (Deetz, 1992). Sometimes, language is seen as the means to transport the meaning of something, like objective facts or the narrator's subjective experience (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000a). But here, I see language as a social practice that does things (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Language 'constructs reality in the sense that every instance of language use is to some extent arbitrary and produces a particular version of what is it supposed to represent' (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000a, p. 142). This means that language constructs rather than mirrors social reality, and functions to stabilize and reproduce what appears self-evident.

Language can be seen as a system of distinctions (Deetz, 1992). For example, it creates distinctions based on gender, ethnicity, professional occupation, age, and so on. These distinctions are also valuations, which means that they produce hierarchies. Simon de Beauvoir's (1949) famous argument that a woman is constructed as second to man is an example of this. A system of distinctions that has become accepted as common knowledge tends to privilege some people over others. Thus, language use can be very powerful as Deetz (1992, p. 276) explains:

> *Power* exists in the "valuing"—the attending to this and not that—and *domination* in the concealment of valuing and freezing of the person/object in a set of articulations. The presumption of transparency completes the cycle by presenting the frozen person/object as naturalized and neutralized, as spontaneously there (see Clegg 1987). The person/object is presented as a real object in the world to be described, rather than its present description/constitution as being in need of exploration.

The type of power described in this quote is related to knowledge production (Foucault, 1980) rather than something that certain individuals *have* over others. It is located in every perception, which is why it can be both enabling and marginalizing. Thus, power lies in the fixing of representations of persons and objects. Although this fixing is not a deliberate undertaking of any individual(s), it can be seen as a strategic reproduction of meaning because it benefits some and not others (Deetz, 1992). Even so, it is not the researcher's task to replace one system of distinctions for another that would be 'better', but rather to make space for conflicting interpretations. A meaningful conflict, according to Deetz (1992, following Habermas, 1984; 1987), is one that enables a more participatory production of meaning (such as our knowledge

about what it means to be a black person or a white person). The opposite is termed a 'discursive closure', which implies that language use is arranged to suppress conflict. Alvesson and Deetz (2000, p. 180) refer to this as 'an interactionally determined reduction of certain experiences to other ones.' Processes of discursive closure involve a variety of discursive practices. These can take the form of e.g. disqualification, which means to deny certain groups the right to participate and express their interests by rendering them unqualified in different ways. It can further involve the processes of naturalization and neutralization, which involve the presenting of a subject matter as natural (the way that it *is*) as well as hiding the values that underpin the construction of this matter as the way that it *is* (neutralization). Other moves include avoiding certain topics or, on a broader level, to privilege a given discourse while marginalizing others.

'Discourse' can imply different things. In this study, I understand it as micro-level 'social text' i.e. as talk in a particular social context, rather than the 'large-scale, ordered, integrated way of reasoning/constituting the social world' (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000b, p. 1125). This includes spoken interactions and written text (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Nevertheless, I do see the two to be somewhat coupled. I think that contemporary ideas about (social) entrepreneurship as the saviour of our times (Berglund & Johansson, 2007), seen in both the academic and the public debate, are to some extent reflected and enacted by people on the Island. However, this is a 'finding' which I will discuss further in the empirical chapters of this thesis.

In sum, the notion of discursive closure is an overarching perspective guiding this study, which allows me to focus on how certain types of language use favour and construct a given social reality. This perspective encourages me to take note of suppressed conflicts when reading the empirical material, which has meant to look for signs of missing perspectives or closed-off discussions. Although this is not a study of discourse or a 'discourse analysis', it can be said to have a discursivistic orientation (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000a), which means that I keep in mind the productive nature of language use and that particular social realities can be hard to oppose, due to them being discursively closed. Next, I will outline how this view of language relates to an anti-essentialist stance.

Anti-essentialism and representation

In this study, I am interested in how language use plays a part in constituting reality, which means that language is seen as a social practice that does things.

One thing that language does is to construct representations of meanings, people and things. Here, I am mainly interested in the representation of people. Representation can mean the act of speaking on someone else's behalf, or in some way depicting this someone else (Representation, 2020). But it can also be a way of portraying oneself. However, representation is never neutral. It should rather be seen as a form of power practice (Kwek, 2003), which constructs social differences (Bhabha, 1994; Said, 1978). It can take a discursive as well as a material shape, i.e. one may find it in talk, texts and objects. The concept of representation is often used in postcolonial theory, which I elaborated on in the previous chapter. In this study, I explore the representations produced in the instance of social entrepreneurship taking place on the Island. By highlighting the constructed nature of these representations, I hope to make space for alternative interpretations.

As a reminder to the reader, the way that people on the Island talk about 'the Islander' can be seen as such a representation. Later in this thesis, I will address the complicated question of *who* is being represented, but for now, it is enough to say that it is not interesting to uncover a true essence behind a representation; what matters is the representation itself. As Alvesson and Kärreman (2000a, p. 137) posit: 'The statement A may or may not represent the thing T, but why is the statement A produced in the first place, and what does it accomplish?' Whether there is something factual hiding behind a representation, or whether one is 'misrepresented' is not the issue. What is interesting is what the representation accomplishes. Representations can become fixed. 'Fixed' implies that it becomes taken as true, i.e. the representation has gained the status of being 'knowledge'. A fixed representation does not hide the 'truth', but it can prevent other 'truths' from surfacing; 'truths' that, one may argue, could come to be more beneficial to society.

My view on representation is an anti-essentialist one, because it rejects the idea that there are inherent essences in things and people (Sayer, 1997). One example of this, which is also of importance in this thesis, is the matter of identity. Sometimes identity is seen as something pre-given and constant, as in the case of gender or ethnicity. That there would be fundamental differences given by nature between men and women or that there are cultural differences between people of different ethnic origins inscribed in their DNA are ideas rejected by anti-essentialism. Identity is not something that we are given; rather, it is something that we achieve (Clegg, 1989). What follows is that identities are fluid and changeable but that does not mean that they are constantly changing (Sayer, 1997), it means that we continuously have to work to maintain a certain identity to keep up an idea of ourselves as coherent and

consistent. While the anti-essentialist approach might imply an agential notion of identity (as if we can be whoever we want to be), it is important to note that we do not only construct ourselves, but we are also constructed by others. Critique of essentialist ideas 'opens up questions of who has the power to define and categorise in ways which fix and homogenise people, when they actually could be, and often are, different' (Sayer, 1997, p. 461). This means that when it comes to the categorization of people and things, including ourselves, some people may have an interpretive privilege over others.

As the reader by now knows, 'the Islander' is a central theme in this thesis. When writing about the representation of a certain group of people, and the social distinction it produces, one may run the risk of furthering the very essentialization that is highlighted as problematic. By using the category of 'the Islander', I may be guilty of reproducing an idea of a certain group of people as having homogenous traits and common interests. I try to solve this dilemma by referring to labels, such as 'the Islander' and 'the social entrepreneur', as identity categories, which should be seen as social constructions unrelated to the inherent properties of people, but as classifications that people have to relate to and draw upon when constructing their identities.

An anti-essentialist stance may imply to some that the world is completely free of essences, but that is not what I mean. Saying that some things do not have essences is not to say that this goes for all. Some objects have essential properties. I mentioned in the beginning of this thesis that I intend to explore how non-human agencies play a role in the construction of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship. This calls for a discussion on the agency of objects. To some extent, we can also talk about objects in an anti-essentialist manner. Objects are partly constituted by our understanding of them. But objects also have physical properties (essences) that are there regardless of our interpretation of them. In other words, the meaning that we can assign to an object is limited by its built-in affordances (Engeström & Blackler, 2005), i.e. by its material properties (Sayer, 1997). One can say that objects may resist our interpretations of them (Rennstam, 2012). Thus, objects can partly be seen as agents because they steer the way in which we can understand them. But they also do other things. They play a role in our identity constructions (Knorr-Cetina, 1997) as they represent relations of affiliation (Suchman, 2005). In doing so, they can also impact on and contribute to the stabilizing of social relationships (Latour, 1991). Later in this thesis, I will discuss the role that objects played in constructing the 'social' in social entrepreneurship and how objects can be seen

as reminders of social relationships. In other words, I will discuss how objects played a role in representation and hence, in producing social distinctions.

So far, I have identified the overall approach that I have taken in this study, i.e. an interest in how mainly language but also objects play a role in constructing social realities; particularly those that make out representations of people, and particularly those that have become fixed. Next, I will discuss my own role in constructing and interpreting the empirical material of this study.

Interpretivism

This thesis can be read as a study of the particular which means that it explores how things work for certain people in certain times and places (Stake, 2010). Consequently, I try to understand what is going on at the Island. I am concerned with 'the process through which shared multiple realities arise, are sustained, and are changed' (Morgan, 1980, p. 608). However, this text should not be considered a mirror of the Island and all that is going on there; rather, it is my reading of it. Interpretation can never be objective, but involves, as Watson (1994) writes, both skill and imagination.

Watson (1994) further emphasizes the importance of showing the researcher's hand in shaping the findings. I hope that the introductory chapter of this thesis has demonstrated the different ways in which I tried to make sense of the empirical material and how I tried to detach myself from my own pre-understanding. What follows is that I do not see empirical material as something objective to be collected and categorized, but something that can be interpreted in many different ways, and for that matter, something that is created in the interpretation process.

Rather than finding gaps in existing research, I have used problematization as method (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011). This means that I have tried to problematize assumptions that present themselves as unproblematic: those of the entrepreneurship field, those that prevail on the Island, and my own. This method of problematization also means that I have not considered the emic meanings of research participants as the end destination. Such emic meanings must both be presented and problematized. As Czarniawska (2004) highlights, the researcher has a duty to provide a recontextualization of empirical material, that is, a reading that is novel, interesting and credible. An interesting problematization gives weight to both the empirical material and the researcher's interpretation of it. Interpretation may be about imagination, but this imagination is guided and limited by the empirics (Rennstam &

Wästerfors, 2015). Thus, this type of problematization results from a dialogue between the researcher and the empirical material.

Although this research approach does not mirror reality, it can encourage new thoughts about a particular phenomenon. Novel perspectives can be evoked through a process of mystery creation (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2007). The different stages of interpretation that I write about in the introductory chapter of this thesis can be seen as breakdowns where I encountered things that did not make sense, and whereby I came to new understandings. The paradox that guided my search for answers from the beginning (why would people resist an initiative meant for their benefit?) can be given different explanations. The interpretation that I present here should not be seen as the arrival at a 'true' answer, but an interesting one, which hopefully can allow us to think about social entrepreneurship in new ways.

Constructing empirical material

The empirical setting of this study is a Danish island which, in response to a perceived societal decline, initiated a sustainable transition. This change was planned and undertaken by the municipality, the Island's energy company, business associations, tourism associations and civic actors. At the beginning of the study, my empirical focus was only on one of the activities that sprang from the sustainable transition: the hotel and conference centre Greenland. During the research process, my empirical focus expanded to include the initiative at large.

I started seeing the sustainable transition as a form of loosely structured and collaborative form of social entrepreneurship. In addition to the empirical focus, the 'case', i.e. what the case was a case of, also changed. Any case can be a case of many things, and it is up to the researcher to decide what is truly interesting about it. This means that cases are constructed by the researcher and cannot be found 'out there' (see Ragin, 1992). In this study, the understanding of what the case is has altered during the ongoing interaction with research participants as well as the literature. At first, it was a case of a disembedded innovator, who did good things but was met with opposition. Second, it became a case of social entrepreneurship as victimization. Lastly, I settled for it to be a case of social entrepreneurship and representation. Saying that it is a case *of* something implies that the empirical setting can exemplify something else. Even though I take interest in the particular pertaining to the

locality of the Island, which might term this an intrinsic case study (Stake, 2000), I also wish for the case to provide insight into something more than itself. I believe that it can increase our understanding of how social entrepreneurship impacts on matters of everyday life, which is why in some sense, one might resemble this research design to what Stake (2000) terms instrumental.

The sustainable transition was initiated in 2007 and is a long-term, still ongoing project. I conducted my interview study between March 2016 and March 2018. The material comprises 45 interviews with 33 individuals. The interviews are outlined in table 2. The main part of the interviews took place during my visits to the Island. I spent five days there in May 2016; five days in August 2017; two days in October 2017; and five days in February 2018. In between visits, I have conducted a few interviews by phone and Skype. Most of these scheduled interviews lasted around one hour; a few were shorter, and a few were longer. They were all recorded and transcribed. Interviews were generally conducted in English but if the interviewee preferred to speak in their mother tongue, I would ask the questions in Swedish, and they would respond in Danish. In these cases, the interviews were transcribed by a native Danish speaker and then translated into English by me.

In addition to the recorded material, I also had a set of more informal interviews and talks with various people, which I documented by taking notes during or after the conversation. I also participated in three meetings (one that lasted for 30 minutes, one that lasted for an afternoon, and one that lasted for two days), and accompanied one of the research participants on a day-long conference trip. Further, I read newspaper articles from local newspapers and watched local television reports that dealt with the topic of the sustainable transition.

Conducting interviews

There are reasons for mainly relying on interviews in this study, as opposed to, for example, observing natural talk or behaviour in situ. First, the sustainable transition that is studied was initiated in 2007, that is, almost ten years before I came into the picture. Therefore, I needed people to tell me what had happened so far. This means that, to some extent, I have treated interview accounts as information. I have used the interview accounts to better grasp the whole process of the sustainable transition and to be able to put together a coherent story for this thesis. I cross-checked the information provided in interview accounts by comparing the suggested sequence of events between

Table 2. Recorded interviews in chronological order

Name[13]	Role/Affiliation	Location of interview	Date
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Conference in Sweden	2016 March
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Phone	2016 April
Verner	Growth Forum	Island: conference on tourism	2016 May
Signe	Tourism organization	Island: conference on tourism	2016 May
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Island: Greenland	2016 May
Ejner	Founder of art museum	Island: art museum	2016 May
Kaj	Founder of green construction firm	Island: main city	2016 May
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Island: Greenland	2016 May
Robert	Marketing consultant	Island: Greenland	2016 June
Emil	Municipality	Island: municipality	2016 June
Sten	Local energy company	Island: Greenland	2016 June
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Airplane to CPH	2016 June
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Copenhagen: taxi drive	2016 June
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Copenhagen: café	2016 June
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Phone	2016 October
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Phone	2017 April
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Island: Greenland	2017 August
Sten	Local energy company	Island: Greenland	2017 August
Kaj	Founder of green construction firm	Island: construction firm	2017 August
Alvar	Permaculture collective	Island: his workplace	2017 August
Per	Energy association	Island: energy association	2017 August
Asger & Alma	Egg farmers	Island: their home	2017 August
Signe	Tourism organization	Island: tourism organization	2017 August
Eva	Municipality	Island: municipality	2017 August
Leila	Chairman of Greenland	Island: hotel	2017 August
Mona	Municipality	Island: municipality	2017 August
Karl	Island Business	Island: Island Business	2017 August
Freja	Founder of Greenland	Island: Greenland	2017 August
Bente	Employee Greenland	Island: hotel	2017 August
Mikaela	Employee Greenland	Island: hotel	2017 August
Bo	Food association	Island: hotel	2017 August
Dagmar	Citizen association	Island: her home	2018 February
Alvar	Permaculture collective	Island: the collective	2018 February
Lise	Permaculture collective	Island: the collective	2018 February
Kjeld	Citizen association	Skype	2018 February
Otto	Citizen association	Island: his home	2018 February
Edith & Anton	Citizen association	Island: their home	2018 February
Ludvig	Citizen	Island: his workplace	2018 February
Svend Erik	Citizen association	Island: his home	2018 March
Morris	Citizen association	Island: his workplace	2018 March
Tage	Farmers' association	Island: farmers' association	2018 March
Olga	Municipality	Island: municipality	2018 March
Mona	Municipality	Island: municipality	2018 March
Alvin	Citizen	Skype	2018 March
Sonja & Aksel	Citizen association	Skype	2018 March

[13] All names are fictional.

interviewees. I also confirmed the existence of some events by searching for them in the local media.

However, the informative part of interview accounts was not my main interest. Since the beginning of this study, I have had an interest in collecting stories. The purpose of eliciting stories is to let the interviewees take a step back and make sense of past, present and future situations. Gabriel (2004, p. 4) would term this '"story-work", a work of creative imagination which does not lose contact with events but always seeks to uncover a deeper meaning in them'. When people narrate their lives and experiences, the resulting stories do not mirror the actual events; personal narratives are edited and experience is filtered (Weick, 1995). But even if stories are not 'truthful' or accurate, they provide valuable insight into various organizational phenomena (Gabriel, 2015), and they produce a truth of their own. Thus, the point of narrative interviewing is not to find out what really happened but rather how narrators present their interpretation of events and, in this narration, provide past events with a new and deeper meaning (Gertsen & Søderberg, 2010). Collecting stories became a way to gather different perspectives and different understandings of events. But it was also a way to understand the stories that were repeated by several interviewees; those that apparently had become standardized on the Island.

In order to stimulate stories during interviews, I asked questions such as 'Do you recall the first time when…?', 'Tell me about the time when…', and 'What happened next?' I have strived to see the interviews as open-ended conversations without a pre-determined direction (Potter & Hepburn, 2012). In a narrative approach, there is no such thing as interviewees going 'off-topic'. Czarniawska (1997, p. 28) summarizes this nicely: 'This used to bring me to the verge of panic– "How to bring them to the point?"– whereas now I have at least learned that this *is* the point'. Whatever stories the interviewee chose to tell is what I wanted to hear. However, the questions I asked were on the broader topic of the history and development of the Island society, the sustainable transition, and related issues. Despite my interest in collecting stories, the interview material is also comprised of opinions, arguments, explanations and descriptions. Table 3 provides examples of interview questions, which can be seen as broad themes treated in the interviews.

My main interest in this study has been in what interview accounts do. I have mentioned before that I pay attention to the performativity of language (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). This means that I have tried to understand what is accomplished in the interview situation, particularly when it comes to achieving a certain identity or role (Baker, 2001). In this study, I have focused

Table 3. Examples of interview quesions

Interview questions
Tell me about yourself (background/your role in this organization/are you from the Island?)
How would you describe the Island to someone who is unfamiliar with it?
How is life on the Island now compared to how it used to be?
Do you recall the first time you heard about Sustainable Island/the sustainable transition?
What do you think Greenland/Sustainable Island means to people in the community?
What stories do people tell about Greenland/Sustainable Island/the sustainable transition?
Why do you think some people are opposed to Greenland/Sustainable Island/the sustainable transition?
Have you somehow been involved in Sustainable Island/do you feel like you are a part of it?

on the representations of self and others that arose in the interviews. In other words, I have studied how the interviewees constructed social distinctions in their talk (Bhabha, 1994). Thus, I am inspired by a view on the interview as a local accomplishment. However, this does not mean that I regard the roles enacted in interviews as completely isolated from the social reality external to the interview. To be able to speak in a certain way, interviewees use 'resources recruited from their memberships in other settings' (Baker, 2001, p. 777). In other words, the social context, which the interviewee is a part of, can imprint on interview accounts (Alvesson, 2003). This perspective goes 'beyond localism, but with caution', which means that there is no fixed or given relation between interview talk and the talk taking place outside of the interview (Alvesson, 2003, p. 29). Across my interviews, I noticed a pattern of representing oneself and others in a certain way. For me, this implies that there is a standardized way of talking on the Island which provides support for the connection I make between the identity work taking form in individual interviews, and the more aggregated ideal and anti-ideal identities that people on the Island seem to relate to. I will elaborate more on this finding in the empirical chapters of this thesis.

Further, I acknowledge the interaction that takes place in the interview situation (Baker, 2001), which means that I regard the interview as a conversation wherein I am just as much of a participant as the person being interviewed, and in which meaning is negotiated (Kvale, 1994). Even if I have made an effort to let interviewees tell stories as they like and refrain from interruptions, it is of importance to note that in narrative interviewing, stories are mutually constructed by both interviewer and interviewee (Gertsen & Søderberg, 2011). Since a narrative cannot be authored by a single person, it is co-created between the narrator and the listeners (Czarniawska, 2004). Pauses, facial expressions, even the smallest reactions and comments will influence how the interviewee goes on to tell her or his story (Boje, 1995).

The interviewees of this study include business founders, such as the founder/manager of the sustainable hotel- and conference centre, people from business associations, tourism organizations, the farmworker association, the energy company, municipality workers of different areas, people from citizen associations, small business owners, and people from a permaculture collective. When being interviewed, these people are in some sense asked to represent their category. This means that they will inevitably try to appear as qualified members of the category that I have assigned to them (Baker, 2001). Also, the category in which I placed myself had an influence on the interviews. I often introduced myself to the interviewee as a PhD student in entrepreneurship studies. Even if I did not ask questions specifically about entrepreneurship, this may have encouraged the interviewee to talk about the topic and perhaps even to enforce her or his membership in the category of 'entrepreneur'. Similarly, when addressing the topic of the sustainable transition on the Island, the interviewees may have sought to highlight their roles as sustainable actors. In sum, there is a lot going on in an interview that is not only related to the topics dealt with. Questions of concern in this study are: 'What kind of social world are the speakers making happen in their talk? and What kind of social world must speakers assume such that they speak this way?' (Baker, 2001, p. 793).

On 'being there', positionality and representation

Although this is an interview study, my time spent on the Island has enriched my overall understanding of the case and provided context to the interviews. To give the reader a sense of the context in which the empirical material was constructed, I will briefly describe the settings in which interviews and observations took place. I also try to elaborate on my positionality, i.e. the position from which I interact with the world, which produces partial perspectives (Rose, 1997). Just like the people that I interviewed took on different subject positions and assumed certain social worlds in their talk, I also adopted different roles in different settings. In the following, I describe the different empirical contexts of my study, how my identity position shifted as the context changed, and further, I try to shift the gaze from the representations created by research participants to the representations I myself create.

Initially, I spent most of my time on the Island at Greenland, the sustainable hotel and conference centre. I was invited there by Freja, its founder and manager, and it was also the place where I stayed. Greenland is located next to

a forest, lined with various walking trails that lead to a view of the open sea. Standing in front of the main entrance of Greenland, one is met with a large white building, shaped like a horizontal rectangle. The bottom of the two-story construction is covered by a glass façade, while the upper story shows a row of balconies with solar panel railings. The midsection of the hotel, which holds the main entrance, does not have a flat roof like the rest of the building. Four slightly elevated pointed sections placed next to each other mark its centre. The main entry section is but one story; thus, upon entry, one is struck by the incredibly high ceiling in the bright and spacious foyer, where a ceiling of skylights rests on glass walls. The construction is made with a special kind of daylight window that also generates energy through in-built solar cells. This, along with a high technology ventilation system for exceptionally fresh indoor air, makes the facilities particularly apt for full-day conference meetings when one needs to keep focus for a long time. Apart from these functional structures, the facilities also showcase green solutions for inspiration purposes. For example, one of the common areas displays a biological water purification system. Six large cylinder containers filter wastewater by use of algae, each having a different shade of green depending on its purification stage. The cleansed water is then used for irrigation of the great green wall, covered in plants, located on the opposite side of the cylinders, as well as the gardens outside.

At the backside of the hotel, some 50 metres away from the main building, lies a small apartment area with spaces available for rent in the summer. This is where I was given a room. In between the apartments and the main building, there is a wetland area from which all kinds of high pointing grass plants emerge, and across it a meandering wooden bridge that gets very slippery when it rains. The middle of the bridge offers a full view of the main building, as it emerges mightily with the garden as the foreground. From this angle, it does not look rectangular; rather, it is shaped like a half circle lying down with the round end towards you, and along it four sections stand out, each a huge glass façade with a frame formed like the classical drawing of a house. Getting closer to the main building, one is struck by an ocean of wildflowers; they are spread throughout the surroundings in a seemingly random way, as if nature put them there. Of course, I knew better than that. I knew that a prestigious garden architect had been hired to create this atmosphere. On the opposite end of this floral garden lies a kitchen garden. Sometimes when I passed by, I could see a female gardener and a couple of apprentices whom I knew to be recently arrived refugees on the Island. They received training in gardening while they were waiting for a decision to be made on their request for asylum.

If one chooses not to use the wooden bridge to reach the main building, there is also the option of taking a quite narrow walking path. However, instead of being made of the ordinary gravel, the path is made of small pieces of different coloured shattered glass, recycled and repurposed from a past life, perhaps as wine bottles or jam jars. The small pieces of glass are polished like the ones you can find washed up on the beach, but even though every glass fragment has a matte surface, the path glimmers of different colours in the sunlight. The sound heard when walking on it is slightly different than that of walking on ordinary gravel; it is louder and somehow more intense. I walked through this garden every morning on my way to the reception area where I was given a space to sit and work during times when I was not interviewing people. Freja and the other administrative staff had their office space behind the reception counter. I was offered to sit in a room at the opposite end, where customers could loan stationary computers and where the hotel's marketing consultant, Robert, worked. This setting allowed for several meetings with Freja as well as small talk with the other people working in the hotel.

I felt fortunate to be allowed to stay at the hotel for free, to eat from the generous breakfast buffet every morning, and to take part of the high-tech sustainable ooze of the hotel facilities. I developed a sense of gratitude towards Freja, which inevitably influenced the role I took on in our relationship: that of an ambitious and admiring student. Once, when I accompanied her to a conference in Copenhagen where she was invited to speak, she pointed to me during her presentation and said '…and now I have my very own PhD student'. One could read into this that I became somewhat of a symbol of her accomplishment. On another occasion when she partook in an interview I conducted with the chairman of Greenland, she complimented me afterwards for 'barely looking down at my notes'. In our relationship, Freja was clearly the adult. This made it a cautious matter to expand my range of interviewees, and to include people who had different views, where some of them had been in various conflicts with Freja and Greenland. My relationship with Freja initially made it difficult for me to take the leap into a critical stance. I tried to resolve this by being open about the fact that the scope of my study had changed to involve the whole sustainable transition at the Island, and that I was interested in understanding the resistance towards it.

When I was not doing interviews or hanging around at Greenland, I was writing notes or transcribing interviews at cafés, going to buy food in the different supermarkets, or taking walks. Being at the Island allowed me to experience its different contexts. Even when I was still only moving around the coastal villages, the interview settings varied greatly. During my second visit, a year

after the first, I borrowed a bicycle from the hotel and spent my days biking from one interview to the other. When I was at Greenland, I tried to dress according to the business casual atmosphere of the hotel. Freja always looked ordered and stylish in a business-like but feminine way. She always wears heels and holds her head high, her posture always straight and composed, when walking, sitting, standing; she never lets her back fall into a slouch. One time she told me that posture is a sign of character—and I tried to keep my back straight when she was around. Just a short bike ride away, as I was talking to a municipality worker wearing casual jeans and a college sweater, I regretted that I had 'dressed up'. While in some contexts I fell into the role of an admiring student, in other settings the label 'PhD student' accompanied with the 'business/entrepreneurship' stamp might have been intimidating. Thus, sometimes I tried to 'dress down', however arrogant this sounds.

Being at the Island also allowed me to participate in a few meetings. Due to my poor Danish, I have not been able to observe and analyze these meetings in detail. Instead, they became an opportunity for me to meet more people, make small-talk and schedule interviews. I joined Freja in two meetings, one between her and a person working for the Red Cross, and one meeting on tourism development where approximately 50 people participated. Once, I also travelled with Freja to a conference in Copenhagen. Travelling there together, by plane and taxi, gave us a chance to talk a lot. Further, I participated in a two-day public meeting aiming to revitalize the strategy of Sustainable Island and to create ownership amongst citizens. The meeting facility was a large wooden construction, located in the forest. The 200 people who joined the meeting were divided into working groups. I was assigned to one themed green energy. The structure of the meeting during the two days basically altered between presentations held by various people, such as the mayor, Freja and the moderator (a consultant of a company called Democracy Now). In between presentations, the working groups were allotted topics to discuss. The acoustics of the room were poor and with a lot of people speaking at the same time it was difficult for me to grasp the majority of conversations. I did however get a sense of the main topics presented (and the topics *not* presented), and I got to follow the process of 'creating ownership'. I also managed to have a few one-on-one conversations with people I knew from before but also with people that I had not met previously. These encounters led to subsequent interviews after the meeting.

The context changed more when I was moving outside of the coastal villages and started talking to people who lived in the more rural areas inland. The permaculture collective that I stayed at during a later visit can be seen as quite

the opposite of Greenland. The collective is located in a forest a few kilometres from the nearest village. It consists of two old-looking buildings, lined with red-painted wooden panel. Entering the main building, one has to cross an unusually high threshold to get through the front door, which is also lower than today's standards. I later found out that this means the house was most likely built in the 18th century. After crossing the hallway, another high threshold marks the entrance to the kitchen. There is a fireplace in the middle, a big table and an old-style cooking area. The floor is made of broad wooden planks, and the walls are covered with posters of different topics: vegan protein sources, how to build a co-operative, and some EU criticism. I was told that the collective hosts nine adults and four children, although during my visit there were only six adults and two children present. Alvar was there, whom I had interviewed before, and his 14-month-old daughter, Rakel, with her mother, Malena. I also got to meet Lise, who lives there with her son Bruno and his father Abel. There was also a third couple, Beatrice and Erik, present. The children wore home-knitted clothes and one of them was dragging around one of these human mannequins made out of wood that people use as models for sketching. Later in the evening, when I was invited to dinner, I was told that every day a different person in the collective is responsible for making a vegetarian dinner for the whole group. As we ate, I learnt that they had moved to the Island from Copenhagen aspiring for a simpler life with more free time. In all ways possible, they want to be self-sufficient. This group advocates a different type of sustainability, involving for example composting toilets, sparse consumption and in general, less comfort. As they all purchased the house together, they did not have to take out a bank loan, which, to them, means a certain type of freedom. They grow some vegetables and keep hens, but the dream is to start producing some goods at home such as honey and edible flowers. This would mean less dependence on wage labour and an even freer lifestyle, which would allow them to engage further in community projects.

Having spent some time with various activists in South Africa as well as in Sweden, I felt fairly comfortable in this environment. With this group, I somewhat took on the role as a left-leaning accomplice. Without expressing any leftist values, at least not explicitly, I think that both the members of the permaculture collective and I felt that we had a kind of mutual understanding of things. This group would also very much pass as 'intellectual', something that an academic like myself can relate to. That said, I was also very much of an outsider. I did not have the right shoes on to walk in the snow, my jacket was too thin for the cold weather; from my various mishaps on the way there, they knew that I couldn't drive well in the snowy forest (in fact, on my way

back I had to ask Abel to drive my car out of the forest, and after he dropped me off at the nearest road, he had to walk all the way back to the house—on a side note, he was then wearing traditional snowshoes). Even if I live in the fairly small city of Malmö, I felt a bit like a city person failing in the countryside; not accustomed to living by the changing shapes of nature.

My bed for the night was in the guest wagon, a separate small house on wheels located some 50 metres from the main house. The wagon was nicely decorated, cosy, and awfully cold. I slept fully clothed with a hat, scarf and gloves on, and hoped that I wouldn't wake up in the middle of the night in need of a toilet, as I then would have to leave the wagon and walk the 50 metres back to the main house in complete darkness. My somewhat dramatic description of this can perhaps serve as a testimony of my outsiderness. Alas, I could only stay one night at the collective due to the difficulties in driving in and out of the forest brought on by the ongoing snowstorm. The next day, I was back at the exclusive Greenland where I met with Freja for dinner. At this point, the contrast between the different takes on sustainability appeared very visible: the green technology approach of Greenland and the more modest low-consumption style of the collective.

Naturally, there were also other aspects that prevented me from belonging to the empirical settings that I studied. I was not from the Island or even from the country. Being from Sweden, I could understand most of the Danish language, but I could not speak it. This was obviously relevant not just in the permaculture collective but in all of the interactions I had on the Island. To create more closeness (Prasad, 2005), I could draw upon the category of 'business student' in professional, greentech and 'innovative' settings, while my personal involvement within the NGO sector perhaps made it easier to talk to people of the permaculture collective and some municipality workers expressing similar values. As McDonald (2013) notes, we do not only belong to one stable identity category; rather, our positionality is heterogenous and may shift during the course of research. In this case, my identity position*s* were useful in allowing me to navigate multiple empirical settings, although I cannot say that this was a deliberate strategy of mine.

As I take an interest in the representations that my research participants produce, a discussion on the representation that I myself generate might also be in order. In the introductory chapter, I wrote about my ambition to *find* the Islander. Due to how this character had been described to me, i.e. among other things, as a resident of one of the inland villages, I sought new research participants in the countryside. One such place that was associated with the Islander was the Disadvantaged Village, which I elaborate on in chapter 7. To

reach 'the Islander', I contacted the citizen associations of villages inland, and in this way, I got referrals to people who would be willing to talk to me. Although I have not fully outlined my argument yet, I have already hinted in various parts of this thesis that the Islander can be seen as a so called Other, a subaltern, and thus, a group in a not so favourable societal position. My ambition to 'find' the Islander can, ironically enough, be compared to old-fashioned ethnographic practices, where researchers of the West would travel into the unknown of the South, in order to understand 'natives'. I wanted to understand 'the Islander', a term that to me covered a vague idea of countryside residents who wanted things to be like it always had been and resisted any imposition of the new. If I had actually been studying 'natives' in, say, the Amazon, it would have been appropriate for me to reflect upon the categories that I belong to, such as being 'white', 'woman', etc. and how these positions shape the power relations in the research encounter. But when it comes to outlining my position in relation to the Islander, I am more hesitant. I could describe myself as being from 'a different world' than the Islander, or a different socioeconomic class, but then I would also be ascribing them attributes. I could define myself as 'liberal' in relation to their supposed conservativeness, but then I would run the risk of enforcing the very representation I seek to challenge. In the case of the Islander, and for reasons that hopefully will become clearer in the continuance of this thesis, I feel obliged to remain careful in furthering a depiction that may contribute to the production of social distinctions. This is also related to the fact that the construction of the Islander lacks a fixed referent, i.e. it does not always stick to the same group of people. Thus, my positionality in relation to the Islander will be left unarticulated, and I will instead reflect on what kind of representation I produce through my study.

In postcolonial studies, it is sometimes the ambition of the researcher to 'give voice' to the Other. The matter of whether the subaltern can speak (Spivak, 1988) is relevant here. As England (1994, p. 81) asks:

> In our rush to be more inclusive and conceptualize difference and diversity, might we be guilty of appropriating the voices of "others"?

Against this backdrop, I would like to emphasize that the Islander does *not* speak in this study. In part, they do not speak because of my inability to reach a vast part of the Island residents. I got in contact with people based on their involvement with the citizen associations. If the Islander exists in some sense as a poor, older generation, with little education and a suspicion against outsiders, they would not be amongst the people who volunteered to talk to

me. However, I did get a chance to talk to people who opposed the sustainable transition in various ways, and through these accounts, I believe that I got close enough to be able to challenge the prevailing representation of 'the Islander' and thus, to put forth alternatives to this knowledge that seemed set in stone. This is not a claim of having represented the real views and experiences of the Islander; in fact, fieldwork is not conducted on 'the unmediated world of the researched, but on the world *between* ourselves and the researched' (England, 1994, p. 86). That said, I draw from the experiences of 'the Islanders' that I did *find*, to be able to say something about the power dynamics present in the relational construction of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship. What I end up with should not be seen as a new understanding of the Islander, but as an interruption of the old one—a framing inevitably shaped by the partiality of my perspective.

In sum, visiting the Island, its different contexts around the coast and inland, in the summer and in the winter season, over a period of two years, gave me a better idea of what was going on there and how the sustainable transition was perceived by different people. It allowed me to recognize the contrasts between the various takes on sustainability and the idea of the common good, which besides being uttered in interviews, could also be glimpsed in physical structures and dress codes. Observations of meetings gave me a hint of the topics and the people included and excluded in the conversations on societal development. In this way, the construction of social differences that took form in interviews could also be related to the broader social setting of the Island.

Archival material

To learn more about the sustainable transition, and the events that had taken place before I started my study, I went through local media. I used The Media Archive (Mediearkivet) which is an archive of Swedish and Danish newspapers and journals. I searched for the terms 'Sustainable Island' and 'Greenland'[14] from 2006 until 2017. The search generated around 200 articles. Some of these articles had links to local TV channels, which lead me to also watch news clips and TV reports. This material has not been part of my analysis; it can be seen as something that served to broaden my understanding of the different events in the sustainable transition and how these were represented in the local media. It also allowed me to compare how events were talked about in interviews and how they were written about in newspapers.

[14] To maintain the anonymity of research participants, I use fictitious names.

Thus, it helped me to create a narrative of how the sustainable transition took place on the Island.

Some of the entrepreneurs that I interviewed also mentioned that there had been attacks in the media against them, which further induced my interest in local news. In fact, I found several research participants this way. One individual critiqued Greenland in a local TV programme, and after seeing it I contacted him for an interview. Another TV programme showed individuals who were sceptical towards Sustainable Island, which also lead to subsequent interviews. Sometimes I noticed the comments people had made on certain articles, comments that were sarcastic or objecting to what was written in the article. These comments were made through public Facebook accounts, and so, it was fairly simple to contact their authors. None of these latter contacts led to interviews, but several led to Messenger conversations with the commentators, who would clarify their views on the sustainable transition in text, and sometimes share links with me leading to new articles.

In sum, going through local media has provided information on the process of the sustainable transition, and it has led me to find and hear about more perspectives than I perhaps would have heard if I had simply let one interviewee lead me to the next.

Analyzing the material

My analysis can be seen as an exploration of what interview talk does in terms of identity production and representation. This focus was not predetermined, but something that surfaced as interesting when I was ‘hanging out’ with the material (Rennstam & Wästerfors, 2015). I spent time with the interview transcripts, I read them slowly and thoroughly, tried to draw out some sense from them, went back and reread them again. The analytical procedure of sorting, reducing and arguing (Rennstam & Wästerfors, 2015) was not a linear one, even if it will be somewhat presented as such here for reasons of simplification. For me, the key interpretations took shape in writing up this thesis, while reading new theory and continuously going back and rereading interview transcripts.

In order to sort the material, I categorized it based on its content, i.e. based on *what* the interviewees were talking about. I used the software tool NVivo to go through the interview transcripts one at a time and label chunks of texts. This was a way of organizing the material to create a better overview and to make

it easier to handle. Some of the categories that I found most interesting at this point were 'disregarding resistance', 'unimportance of local support' and 'creating social value'. One recurring label was 'the Islander'. The chunks of text that went under this label were descriptions of people on the Island. This category did not just appear to me in the coding process but was something that I had started thinking about more and more while still being in the field. Rather than reproducing the social categories created by research participants, I tried to problematize them. At this point, I tried out different theoretical lenses and eventually settled for Othering as a way of explaining the way that the Islander was described. The concept of Othering encouraged me to think about the relationality of identity (Clegg, 1989), and that, in narrating the Islander, the interviewees were simultaneously representing themselves. This led to an increased focus on the identities and category memberships achieved in the interviews (Baker, 2001). I started to think about not only what the interviewees were saying, but also *how* they were saying it. I went back to reread the interview scripts again and looked for how the interviewees were talking about themselves and others. As it turned out, they drew not only on other people when describing themselves, but also on objects. Thus, I started to pay more attention to the role that objects took in the narratives within interview accounts. This method of moving back and forth between what is said and how it is said can be referred to as analytic bracketing (Gubrium & Holstein, 1997; Rennstam & Wästerfors, 2015). In this approach, 'what' involves the categories and interpretive resources that exist in the social world of the interviewees (in this case, 'the Islander' as an Other), which condition the 'how', i.e. the activities that constitute their social reality. As I will elaborate on in the empirical chapters, the Othering of 'the Islander' serves an important role in the construction of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship.

In reducing the material, I had to leave out many of the categories that had been developed in relation to my earlier interpretations, i.e. 'the disembedded innovator' and 'social entrepreneurship as victimization' (see introductory chapter). I continuously reduced the material as I wrote by putting aside the content that became excessive to illustrate my empirical points. In a way, I have used stories as a principle of reduction. I do not mean that the reduced material now only consists of complete stories with beginnings, middles and ends, but that I have focused on stories that seemed to have become standardized in the Island society. They are made out of snippets that I have put together from many interviews. The Islander is such a story, and the story of the art museum and that of the Disadvantaged Village are others. These stories are performative (Jørgensen, 2020; Riessman, 2008), i.e. they *do* something, perhaps not only in the interview situation—perhaps they also

influence the way that life on the Island takes shape. In this thesis, I try to understand how they contribute to a way of talking about and carrying out societal development; a way that produces social differences between people.

The next step in the analytical process was to argue for my empirical points. This argument mainly takes place in the three empirical chapters of this thesis, which will follow shortly. Before ending this chapter, I will explain how postcolonial theory served as a puzzle solving tool to arrive at these arguments.

As I mentioned in the previous chapter, the postcolonial perspective facilitates the repoliticization of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship, something that usually presents itself as apolitical and neutral. To explore ideas of the 'social', I have turned to the concepts of will and willfulness (Ahmed, 2014). To be willing means to follow the right path, while willfulness implies a deviation from this path. The question then becomes: what is 'right'? To be willing has meant different things in different times. In colonial times, we followed the path of 'civilization'. Today, we adhere to the path of 'development'. Will comes to be taken for granted as something that is good, natural and unavoidable. Anything that deviates is considered willful. If the colonized should resist the civilization mission, or if the Islander resists the project of societal development, they are put in the box of the willful, which also means to be rendered problematic. In this study, I relate the notion of 'will' to the 'social' in social entrepreneurship. I have come to understand what is 'social' by turning to what is not, i.e. to what is rendered willful. Questioning how will and willfulness are constructed thus contributes to my goal of denaturalization. I will use these concepts throughout the thesis to highlight how the 'social' is relationally constructed as an understanding of what is good for society and as an idea of a good citizen, by referring to what is not good.

Overall, the three empirical chapters address the question of how the 'social' is relationally constructed and upheld. To begin with, I argue that social entrepreneurship needs an Other to become 'social' and to become 'entrepreneurial'. Bhabha's (1994) conceptualization of Otherness has directed my focus towards the mutually constituting relationship between the self and the Other, which in this study takes form as the Good Entrepreneur and the Islander. The central theme of ambivalence in Bhabha's writings has guided my attention towards the inconsistencies inherent in the discourse on social entrepreneurship. This has helped me to understand how the Islander is constructed as one thing, and yet, several contradictory things. I write about this, and how it relates to the construction of social entrepreneurship as an idealized identity category, in the first empirical chapter.

In the second empirical chapter, I discuss how social entrepreneurship can be seen to encourage certain ways of being also among citizens. I refer to this as a *settlement,* which can be compared to a cultural kind of colonization (see e.g. Bhabha, 1994; Said, 1978; Fanon, 1963). In everyday language, it is sometimes referred to as a 'colonization of the mind'. However, in this thesis, I am not concerned with 'the mind' but rather the colonization of values and beliefs. In the organizational context, Deetz (1992) uses the term *corporate* colonization to describe how values and personal identity, to some extent, are steered by the commercial corporation. Here, I use Bhabha's (1994) concept of mimicry to understand how citizens may approximate the ideal identity of the social entrepreneur by establishing themselves as 'good' consumers. However, in mimicking this ideal, they could also partly reinterpret it. Thus, this chapter outlines how the 'social' translates into a notion of a good citizen which becomes settled through associations with objects, particularly 'good' commodities, and how this understanding may be subtly opposed.

In the third empirical chapter, I explore how the 'social' is opposed in a more explicit manner and how it is upheld against this resistance. I depict the stories told of those who opposed the sustainable transition. In doing so, I hope to make space for new and different understandings of the Islander. The idea of the Other denotes a meaning that has become fixed; one meaning among many others possible. Instead of imagining that there is something 'real' behind the Other, my endeavour will be to create space for other meanings and alternative representations (Deetz, 1992). I show how the identity category of the Islander was enacted by inland residents through their opposition of 'good' objects, and how this resistance could be disregarded by referring to the inherently resisting character of the Islander. I further outline how others, not labelled Islanders, more directly opposed the idea of the 'social' as approached through production and consumption. I then show how the 'good' objects of the sustainable transition became important actors in upholding the 'social' against this resistance. In sum, the postcolonial lens allows me to explore the relationality of social entrepreneurship, and how power plays out in the construction of the 'social'. Seen through this perspective, we may come to understand social entrepreneurship in new ways.

5 Constructing the Good Entrepreneur through Othering

In this chapter, I describe how the construction of social entrepreneurship is accomplished through the Othering of the Islander. As I mentioned in the introductory chapter, I came to understand the Islander, not as a specific group of people, but as a construction that served a function in realizing the desirable identity category of the Good Entrepreneur. At first, the Islander reminds of a stereotype with apparently fixed and homogeneous characteristics. However, at a closer look, one finds accounts of different and sometimes contradictory characteristics of the Islander. As I will show in this chapter, the construction of the Islander could be tweaked in order to accentuate the different but necessary parts of the Good Entrepreneur. Thus, the construction of the Good Entrepreneur depends on the construction of the Islander as an Other. To demonstrate this, I draw on Bhabha's (1994) concepts of Otherness and ambivalence.

The story of the Islander

An outsider might perceive a paradox in the fact that an entrepreneurial initiative with a social purpose provokes community resistance. However, this opposition did not come as a surprise to anyone living on the Island. Rather, it has been and continues to be brushed away by locals who explain that opposition is to be expected due to the nature of the general Islander. To describe the mentality of the Islander, many refer to Janteloven (the law of Jante), which is said to permeate social norms on the Island.

> The stereotype of an Islander? Do you know about Janteloven? I usually say that it is Janteloven times two! (Rosa, Growth Forum, May 2016)

The term Janteloven originally derives from the novel ‘En flykting krysser sitt spor’ (A fugitive crosses his tracks) by Norwegian-Danish author Aksel Sandemose, published in 1933. In the novel, Jante is a fictive small town in Denmark where citizens live by the following social rules (translated by the author from the Swedish version listed on Nationalencyklopedin, Jantelagen):

1. You shall not believe that you are anything special.
2. You shall not think that you are as good as we are.
3. You shall not think that you are smarter than we are.
4. You shall not live by the illusion that you are better than we are.
5. You shall not think that you know more than we do.
6. You shall not believe that you are superior to us.
7. You shall not believe that you are good enough for anything.
8. You shall not laugh at us.
9. You shall not think that anyone cares about you.
10. You shall not think that you can teach us anything.

These commandments are meant to reflect a small-town mentality characterized by jealousy, where the ‘we’ and ‘us’ refer to the collective, from which the individual should not aspire to stand out. Robert, an in-migrant on the Island, explains how he perceives the mentality of Jante.

> when I came to the Island, I drove a Mercedes and I was told by people I knew on the Island ‘buy a new car! buy a smaller car!’ I did not and it was okay and now everybody is driving Mercedes and so that has changed. But the rich people don't show it; they are very humble and there is a very rich man in [Coastal village] who owns eh fishing boats, [he is] fishing shrimps in Greenland and he is very rich and he's not showing it; he's helping the society, he's buying companies from going under, he helps them and he does a lot of things to show he's a good person...so maybe, he is a good person but...I think that's because of all his money, he has to show that he's one of the locals still... (Robert, marketing consultant, June 2016)

Although the possession of expensive cars appears to have been normalized, most likely due to the fact that the middle class has become wealthier, this wealth should not be displayed unless used for the good of the collective. Janteloven is an expression often used in the Nordic countries in order to describe a negative attitude towards individual achievement and success; you are not to think that you are better than anyone else. On the Island, it is used to explain the resistance towards the strategy, Sustainable Island, and the sustainable hotel, Greenland. According to the founder of Greenland, these

new initiatives displayed too much grandeur and individualism to belong within the mentality of Jante that persisted on the Island.

> So, we are used to that here at the Island, small companies doing very good. But saying that you want to have the most innovative conference centre in the world, that is too big. Believing that you can actually gather almost 100 million Danish kroner, most of them grants, that you can actually get people to invest in a remote area in the tourism sector, I think that is…that's too much [laughing]. It's dependent on the size. I think actually there are many very innovative people here at the Island and many creative people and [they have been here] for hundreds of years. Some of the most famous painters in Denmark come from this Island; all have been here during their life because of the beautiful light we have here. When you are in that scale, people think that a lot of things are possible. But not when you're [saying] that you can [make] a difference within the world, then it starts to be too much. (Freja, April 2016)

Thus, one explanation for the resistance is that the project of Greenland became too much of an individual endeavour of Freja, who received multiple innovation awards for her accomplishments, and too little acknowledgement was granted to the collective society of the Island. The project made too many claims of impact on a too broad scale and did not fit within the culture characterized by Janteloven, which strictly forbade the individual to distinguish herself from the collective. However, the nature of the Islander involves further dimensions. It is also said to include a suspicious mind that makes the Islander instinctively sceptical towards all things new, something that the representatives of Growth Forum and the Island's tourism organization explained during a meeting on tourism development in 2016.

> To begin with, people are sceptical. They don't believe in, you know, the high-level ambitions eh they say that you cannot do it, everything has been tried before and etcetera etcetera. They just have to overcome that, it's part of it that the locals seem to be a bit sceptical but whenever there is a success, then they're there [laughing]. (Verner, Growth Forum, May 2016)
>
> I think it's it's often so, that when new things are being built, people are a little bit sceptical eh…they want to see it, they want to see, you know, is it going to work, is it eh they [are] a little bit sceptical…so, it takes time and it takes time especially on islands I think because it's small communities eh so, I think that in some years, you will see that people are proud of that place [Greenland]. (Signe, tourism organization, May 2016)

While people on the Island seem to be sure that the resistance will come, they are perhaps even more certain that it eventually will stop. The Islander will remain a sceptic and await proven success or will simply require the passage of time. Islanders will turn around; they must only be waited out. Even though this is an accepted fact by most residents, it is not a characteristic that is believed to be unique to Islanders. Rather, it is thought to be a very normal thing, which can be found in most remote rural areas. Within this perception of the Islander as a sceptic lies also the idea of a conservative and risk-aversive character. Hence, the Island is not a place to welcome innovations and ground-breaking entrepreneurial initiatives.

With the suspicion of new things comes the suspicion of new people. It is generally assumed that the Islander holds a particular cynicism for outsiders relocating to the Island, which makes it difficult for in-migrants to become integrated in the community. Ejner, an in-migrant who has lived on the Island for more than twenty years but still experiences an enduring feeling of distance to the local community, states:

> this is an Island, you shouldn't forget that this…special mentality of the Island which I think is based from back to almost medieval times; everybody who came from outside they were either judges or tax men or some or priests, all the educated people who came to the Island and made all the evil things to the people, were coming from outside and that's, you have a little of the same notion because I wasn't born on the Island and still I shouldn't try to speak the local tongue here, then they would feel it as if I'm […] trying to be part of something that I'm not part of. (Ejner, art museum, May 2016)

Historically, men from the Island would travel to other Danish Islands such as Jutland or Zealand to find themselves a wife to bring back to the Island, as outsiders were needed to promote genetic variability. This immigrating wife would then come to be called a førder, a word implying that she had been brought from outside. Today, this label has come to cover all new settlers on the Island, which means that it is a term that points out the outsiders. Such categorization of insiders and outsiders seems to reflect a cohesive and somewhat closed society. Several new residents testify to the difficulties in penetrating the insider group.

> in the beginning, I used to call it a—what do you call in Sweden?—we have a name for [immigrants] people from, mostly Islamic people […] a racist word called perker […] yeah and I felt like a white perker when I started here on the Island. (Robert, marketing consultant, June 2016)

Robert describes the distance between in-migrants and the local community by using the negatively charged analogy perker. The founder of Greenland makes sense of the resistance she felt from the local community by way of referring to a similar distance.

> Even though I say good things, they kind of won't believe it. Because it can it's too good to be true and she's from Copenhagen and she doesn't know what she's talking about and she will see this can't happen here and she will be…more clever one day, she will see that you can't make things happen here at the Island because that is part of the history…

These interviewees make sense of their present experiences of, for example, feeling excluded from the community or having their initiatives met with resistance, by referring to historical anecdotes that represent the local community as 'the Islander'. In their reasoning, the perceived distance between in-migrants and the local population is understood as a consequence of the characteristics of the typical Islander, who is most commonly said to be sceptical, careful and conservative. In this line of thinking, people who do not conform to the unpretentiousness and simplicity required of Island residents get frowned upon. What follows is that attempted changes of the Island society, particularly those seen as unconventional and particularly those initiated by outsiders, are expected to be resisted.

The Islander as an Other

The story of the Islander is constructed by both insiders and outsiders. The characteristics of the Islander are not something that can only be seen by the outsider, as in the case of the stranger who travels to a new place and, by this very estrangement, is able to perceive oddities and peculiarities about the ways of living and thinking in this previously unknown culture. Rather, the Islander is constructed by other Islanders, and strangers who relocate to the Island tend to adopt this local way of reciting the story of the Islander. What's more, Island residents do not see themselves as 'the Islander'. The Islander is always someone else, while the person in question describing the Islander identifies her or himself as being very different from this depiction, an opposite even. As of yet, I have not met an Islander. However, it has become clear that the distance between oneself and 'the Islander' is an important part of many residents' self-image.

In other words, the Islander is rendered as an 'Other'. When a group of people is categorized as an Other, that is, someone who has qualities that is directly in opposition to the characteristics of the self, and who further is treated as a homogenous mass, we may speak of a process of Othering. An example of this can be found in Edward Said's work Orientalism (1978), which explains how the Orient has been constructed in relation to the West. Portrayed in a negative light, the constructed Orient makes the West appear more impressive. Another example of Othering is illustrated in de Beauvoir (1949), who argues that a woman cannot be defined by herself but only as relative to the man. Othering involves the articulation of an essential difference between the self and the Other, at the same time as individuals within the Other group are disallowed any differentiation (Bhabha, 1994). The Other constitutes a fantasy of a social group with coherent and fixed characteristics. Partly due to the impossibility of this uniformity, the stereotype of the Other needs to be constantly repeated (Bhabha, 1994). It is this very necessity for repeating the characteristics of the Other that calls into question its declared fixity.

The story of the Islander was, with few exceptions, produced when Island residents were asked about the proclaimed opposition towards Greenland and Sustainable Island. From the very beginning, I found the story within the business circles. Thereafter, as I made efforts to reach other contexts, such as environmental groups, the municipality, and the 'ordinary' working person, I heard the story reiterate in almost every interview. This broadly displayed necessity of repetition indicates that the story of the Islander serves a function that needs to be maintained. In telling the story of the Islander, the narrator achieves a favourable effect. The practice of categorizing the Islander as an Other does something: it facilitates the creation of a coherent and desirable self. Keeping up such a notion of the self requires work, which involves the continuous recital of the story of the Islander.

The custom of constructing the Islander as an Other is related to power of the kind that is used to fix representations of meanings and thereby decide what is normal and what is true (Clegg, 1989). Identities are imaginary constructions and 'the politics preferring one type of image over others precludes the conflict and dialogue among them' (Deetz, 1992, p. 136). When Island residents construct the Islander as an Other, they perform an act of valuation. The promotion of a certain set of distinctions over another type of distinction is always political (Deetz, 1992). The point of this chapter is not to go beyond representation to reveal the genuine essence hiding behind a certain representation because the 'truth' of subjects such as 'the Other' is not

attainable (Mills, 1997). The point is rather to shed light on the fixity of meaning in order to open space for alternative representations.

Before going into what the Other did for the self, it is important to elucidate the construction of the Islander in more detail. According to Bhabha (1994), what distinguishes Othering from mere descriptions of groups and individuals is the ambivalence central to its process. This means that the Other, while being depicted as a homogeneous group with equal characteristics, also holds contradictory elements. Next, I will further elaborate on the apparent ambivalence towards the Other, as seen through the story of the art museum.

The story of the art museum

The opposition to the new initiatives that were intended to bring forth a change towards a sustainable society is explained through the depiction of the Islander. This reasoning assumes that resistance has not been a response to the content of any initiative, but a natural aversion to innovation. To demonstrate this, people tell the story of the art museum.

> you see on [the Island] and I think in many other places people are often sceptical about new things eh...what could I say, yeah at the art museum here on [the Island], [it was established] 25 years ago, people were very much against it but now everyone likes it so...so, I don't think one should [draw] that much attention to [the opposition towards Greenland], no I don't think so. (Emil, municipality, June 2016)

> Actually [Ejner] faced some of the same difficulties. He started an art gallery and people were really against it. And it was the same here, people were really against it and then it turned out to be successful and it was as if people had forgot. It is another example of the importance of one person with an idea. (Rosa, Growth Forum, May 2016)

In 1990, Ejner received a state grant of one million Danish kroner to launch an architectural competition where the winner would get the honour to design an art museum on the Island. After a design was elected, the state granted another 40 million Danish kroner to build the museum. Then, as voiced by Ejner, all hell broke loose.

> because of course, as everywhere in the world people don't see the reason for investing in art and so, of course, half the population was against it and…it was really really fierce everywhere you went, when I went to my local [shop] in my little town, there was protest lists lying in the shop and […] [the newspaper]

> was fiercely against it, the use of money for such stupid things; they of course, there's the usual argument that you can use it on healthcare or as you hear everywhere and then, there was this protest movement who gathered more than half of the voters' [signatures] on the petition to stop the building…(Ejner, May 2016)

In the midst of this turmoil, Ejner got called for a meeting with the mayor who informed him that the promised grant would still be paid out on two conditions. The first was that the budget could not be exceeded by a single Danish krone. The second was that the art museum had to be finished and opened before the next election campaign would begin. The mayor wanted to ensure his own re-election and did not see this as likely to happen had there still been a construction site instead of a completed art museum.

> but it was a terrible period last week up to the opening of the museum, eh, I had a police guard 24 hours a day; during the night there were police cars outside my house and [laughing] because there had been threats against me […] they said that there were people who wanted to get me off the Island in some way so…(Ejner, May 2016)

Despite protests, the construction of the art museum continued. It was finished in good time before the election and its opening was honoured by the presence of the Queen of Denmark. After seeing the project's materialization, protests faded. Three months after the opening, one of the leaders of the protest movement came to the art museum with hundreds of signed petition stacks and buried them on its grounds as a symbol saying, 'we lost this fight'. After this, Ejner felt that the art museum was accepted within the local community. However, he still has encounters with people who vow to never visit the museum.

The story of the art museum emphasizes the resistance in itself rather than the content of the initiative being resisted. When requesting an explanation for the resistance directed towards Greenland or the Sustainable Island strategy, this story is usually told to make the point that any such opposition has been nothing in comparison. In the case of the art museum, the majority of the population signed a petition for its cancellation; yet, their protest was not recognized. The story of the art museum, which eventually became accepted despite such fierce protests, paves the way for new initiatives that do not gain popularity amongst citizens, such as Greenland or Sustainable Island. It supports the view that resistance is a tendency of the Islander and thereby unrelated to the content of any new project. This reduces the need to justify an

initiative that is not well received. While the art museum became a benchmark story for Greenland, it in turn also had a point of reference to measure against:

> Everybody came to me when this full protest was against the museum and said oh don't worry, don't worry that's how the people of the Island [are]; when we made the new library ten years ago, there was the same fuzz about that. So, I think it's very typical for a small community and also this is an island… (Ejner, May 2016)

The ambivalence of the Other

The story of the art museum provides an additional element to the image of the Islander, which stands in contradiction to what we have seen so far. According to Bhabha (1994), the stereotype of the Other will inevitably be ambivalent. In fact, it is this very ambivalence that makes it a stereotype: 'For it is the force of ambivalence that […] produces that effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which, for the stereotype, must always be in excess of what can be empirically proved or logically construed' (Bhabha, 1994, p. 95). As I will try to show, it is the ambivalence of the Other, that is, the contradictory elements assigned to the Islander, which enables the construction of a coherent and desirable self.

The general portrayal of the Islander emphasizes its traditional and conservative traits: The Islander is a sceptic and holds a negative attitude towards change and innovation. This image produces an Other that is passive in the greater picture of societal development. However, in the story of the art museum, a new image of the Islander arises. Suddenly, the Islander gains the status of a ferocious antagonist and a collective agent. Islanders who are fighting for their cause so strongly that their adversaries need police protection cannot be said to be passive. Rather, this story bears witness of agency and a potential to impact the direction of societal development. This means that at the same time as one expects inertia and the associated non-contribution of the Islander, one also anticipates the Islander to act as an obstacle, which must be overcome in the quest for societal development. The construction of the Islander as an Other thus involves two very contradictory elements: passivity and agency.

Such inconsistency is not uncommon in processes of Othering. The colonial subject involves the articulation of forms of difference from the self, which become perceived as a fixed totality, or, if you will, a stereotype (Bhabha, 1994). The stereotype functions as a discursive strategy, which constitutes the

main point of subjectification for both the colonizer and colonized. This means that the stereotype not only influences the identity of the one spoken of, but also of the one who is speaking. However, this representation of a wholeness may yet involve ambiguous beliefs. Within the scene of colonial discourse, the colonial subject involves the contradictory elements of being simultaneously racial and sexual (Bhabha, 1994). This means that the colonizer simultaneously feels attraction and repulsion towards the colonial subject. I do not believe that these particular feelings relate to the construction of the Islander. Rather, what I draw from this is that the ambivalent process of articulating a colonial subject is also transferable to dissimilar settings of Othering. Thus, there is an ambivalence to the character of the Islander, which involves its contradictory characteristics. This can be interpreted as a failure to fix the Islander as a stable and homogenous object of knowledge. However, the circulating stories of the Islander conceal and normalize such contradiction. The power of common-sense knowledge, such as that of the Other, is its ability to appear self-evident despite its fundamental inconsistencies (Deetz, 1992). The incongruity within the stereotypical representation of the Islander as a resisting character, who is both passive, in halting change, and active, in instilling change, goes unnoticed.

In sum, what I draw from Bhabha (1994) is the fundamental ambivalence inherent in processes of Othering, and the productive character of such ambivalence. As I will argue in the following sections, the ambivalence of the Islander played a significant role in enabling a desirable self-representation as the Good Entrepreneur. As a reminder to the reader, what I refer to as 'social entrepreneurship' in this thesis is a collective initiative of undertaking a sustainable transition. This means that when I write *the* Good Entrepreneur, I am referring to an identity category drawn upon by the various people involved in the project of Sustainable Island, and not a particular individual. Henceforth, I will elaborate on how the Islander plays multiple (sometimes contradictory) roles in the construction of this identity category. Two of these are already mentioned, that is, the passive and the active part of the Islander. While the former aids the idea of an innovative self, the latter functions to emphasize the achieving self. The third role of the Islander is that of acting as the beneficiary and the social purpose to the social entrepreneurial initiative, which furthers an image of the moral self.

Constructing the self through the Other

In the following section, I demonstrate how the Good Entrepreneur needs an Other to achieve a social entrepreneurial identity. The Other, that is, the Islander, has a split character and has been given multiple and contradictory roles to aid the perception of a coherent entrepreneurial self. The Islander is simultaneously conservative (passive), antagonistic (active) and the beneficiary of the entrepreneurial initiative. Without these traits assigned to the Other, the Good Entrepreneur would have a hard time appearing innovative, successful and moral.

The conservative Other, the innovative self

The contradictory building blocks of the Islander serve important functions when it comes to constructing the identity category of the Good Entrepreneur. As we have seen, the Islander is first portrayed as a passive actor in the undertaking of societal change, and one who does not admit to the inevitability of development. In contrast to this, the self is presented as both a seeker and a driver of change.

There are other ways of understanding the opposition of Sustainable Island and Greenland than as a reaction to their innovative nature. For example, a common trait of many of the opposed initiatives involves the use of public funds. In a rural society, with a proclaimed self-image as a disadvantaged part of the nation, it seems likely that spending the tax income on matters perceived to be excessive instead of basic social services would be a natural cause of annoyance. A discussion of this is displayed in the following excerpt from an informal conversation (that I eventually started recording) with Robert, who was, at that time, the marketing consultant of Greenland, and with whom I shared a working space during my first visit to the Island. It starts with Robert showing me a screen dump that he took of the comment section of an online newspaper article that addresses the negative turnover of Greenland. The comment reads 'What else could you expect in such a fantasy project. Ecology is a new form of religion. Amen!' By showing me the comment, Robert wanted me to better understand the nature of the typical Islander. We then go on to discuss the reasons for such hostility.

> Author: So then I don't know if you can say that it's having something against new ideas—being negative towards new ideas—maybe it's just eh a sensitivity to how public funds are used.

> Robert: Yes but...no. It's also the new ideas and the new thoughts, yes. We made a—when I started on the Island we made a magazine, a real magazine called [Island magazine], and it was stories about crazy people on the Island, not everyday people but a little crazy people with funny stories and we made a magazine with these people and...there was so much resistance for this magazine because the normal [Islander] didn't like those people, so why make a magazine about them? and why, they said to me, why do you come here and make everything turn around? Why do you come with new ideas, we don't like it, they said directly to me.
>
> Author: Oh, they did?
>
> Robert: Yes and ‘it's typical for you from Copenhagen coming to this island’ and we have a name for people moving to the Island called førder…

It is only in comparison to others that one may appear innovative. The example above, a magazine with stories about crazy people, would probably not strike most people as an innovation, if they were not also informed about how the magazine was received. The traditional Schumpeterian notion of innovation involves the so-called creative destruction, that is, the breaking down of old structures to make room for new developments (Schumpeter, 1934). This means that in order to justify that something in fact is an innovation, we would need to refer to an old structure from which this innovation breaks free. This old structure is provided by the Islander. Whereas the Islander is conservative and favours a stagnant society, the Good Entrepreneur is driving change. In this context, change is almost exclusively seen as something positive and progressive. It is related to the idea of development, which in itself has a connotation of economic growth. The founder of the art museum (himself an innovator) explains his view of the Islander below.

> I would say there is generally, there is more…more suspicion towards any new things eh everybody wants it like it has always been and eh if it was good enough for my parents, it is also good enough for me and it’ll also be good enough for my children. So, I’d say there is very little openness to innovation and to new thinking. (Ejner, May 2016)

The Islander stands as the conservative and passive part of society from which Good Entrepreneurs can differentiate themselves. While the Good Entrepreneur has a passion for development and makes sure that ideas are turned into action, the Islander is not a believer; she or he does not have faith in the achievability of ideas. According to the founder of Greenland, this scepticism exists in every society.

> when we went out to buy milk, for example, or whatever groceries people would stop me and say, 'it is never going to happen', 'how can you continue?' and 'is it really true that you now got 50 million?' and 'do you actually think that you will start?' And when we started to dig, they started to say 'are you actually really sure they can be finished [in time]' and now some people, of course, there are still some negative, what do you say… [they] speak about it and they say 'you can never make money out of it' and you can't change those people. They will always be there in whatever society. (Freja, April 2016)

In this view, there appears to be a division between groups of people in society. Those who are able to perceive opportunities and act on them in a way that carries society forward, and those who are not even looking for opportunities. Sten, who works at the Island's energy company, further elaborates on the role of the Islander as a spectator rather than an actor.

> I think this is normal Danish behaviour […] even more for [Island] people, but I think this is a normal way for most of the Danish; they await what is going to happen and [they are] a bit sceptical in the start, so [when] something new [has] comes up and somebody [is] having great visions eh, I think most Danes will say: yeah, let's see what's going to happen, you know, [they are] being a bit sceptical eh and they have to be proven wrong sometimes, and [then] they will actually also turn very fast towards being very positive. (Sten, May 2016)

The Islander gains the status of a sceptical spectator, that is, they represent the passive and reluctant part of society. The role of the Islander as a passive actor enables the 'great visions' to stand out. Hence, the innovative part of the Good Entrepreneur is aided by the conservative part of the Islander. Previous studies on entrepreneurial subjectivity touch upon this Otherness. For example, in her study of female musicians, Scharff (2016) found that becoming entrepreneurial means to present oneself as hardworking in comparison to others who are posed as lazy. The self is based on how it differs from and exceeds the Other; it needs the other to exist. Any identity is achieved and not given, and it can only be defined in relation to what it is not (Clegg, 1989). Thus, it is no surprise that social entrepreneurs also construct their identities through identification and disidentification (Jones, Latham & Betta, 2008; Yitshaki & Kropp, 2016). As explained by Hearn (1996, p. 614), based on a different context, '[w]hiteness may only be known because it is not blackness; and "white people" may only know they are white because they are not black'. The Good Entrepreneur knows that she or he is innovative because the Islander is not. Thus, articulations that produce stereotypes function to fix identities, both of those who speak and of those who are spoken of (Bhabha, 1994). This means that the construction of the Islander enabled a certain identity for the

constructors, one that involved characteristics that stood in contrast to those of the Other. It supported a conception of the self as a vehicle of change in the greater picture of societal development.

The antagonist Other, the achieving self

While the passivity of the Islander rendered the self an agent and a vehicle for change, its agential counterpart, intrinsic to the very same character, also served a function in the construction of the self. Here, the Islander takes the role of the antagonist who actively resists, as explained by the founder of Greenland.

> They said it. They wrote it in the paper. They made a… what do you call that? They actually had it in local television, they had a show […] They had half an hour only talking about… yeah, that I lied and that it wasn't true, it wasn't true what I said, things like this couldn't happen at the Island, and I would never succeed in it. (Freja, April 2016)

The antagonist that jeopardizes the materialization of entrepreneurship is essential in evaluating the accomplishment of entrepreneurial endeavour. Success is ascribed to the entrepreneur for the 'overcoming of difficulties, disadvantage and obstacles, usually by dint of effort and perseverance against adversity' (Smith & Anderson, 2004, p. 132). The accomplishment would be deemed greater the more hardship one had to overcome, and this hardship was provided by the Islander.

> I think even just meeting resistance from the locals, I can, I can actually relate to what she's saying, what [Freja] is saying […] if you talk to an old style [Islander], they'd just say like yeah yeah that's people, fancy people coming from Copenhagen, fancy ideas, they last two seasons—boom—they're out again eh and that that tells you a lot about like both demographics of course and culture, but [it] also tells you something about the entrepreneurial environment if you want eh and I think she's been able to do something interesting in kind of pushing through with a project that wasn't...definitely wasn't in the tradition of [the Island]. (Alvar, the collective, August 2017)

Many times, the antagonist that might threaten such accomplishment is said to be the state. Bureaucratic regulation of the market is the usual villain in the drama of entrepreneurial success. In the case of the Island, the antagonist cannot be framed as the state, because the municipality was one of the initiators of the sustainable transformation. However, another opponent could be found

in the Islander, who steps out of the role as a sceptical spectator and steps into the role as a fierce antagonist. Here, I wish to remind the reader of Ejner's story of opposition directed to the art museum.

> …it was really really fierce everywhere you went, when I went to my local [shop] in my little town there was protest lists lying in the shop and […] [the newspaper] was fiercely against it, the use of money for such stupid things they of course there's the usual argument that you can use it on healthcare or as you hear everywhere and then there was this protest movement who gathered more than half of the voters' [signatures] on the petition to stop the building…
>
> … I had a police guard 24 hours a day, during the night there were police cars outside my house and [laughing] because there had been threats against me […] they said that there were people who wanted to get me off the Island in some way so…

Through the story of the art museum, I mean to show how the portrayal of the Islander enabled a non-recognition of resistance, legitimized by the fact that it in any case does not mean anything; the resistance bears no relation to the object of resistance but rather to the subject who resists. This is because the subject is resisting by default. But, when necessary, this contrasting category of agency and struggle can be drawn upon to show that the resistance does in fact mean something, that is, when the self can attain a meaning from it. This happens when the opposition is used to portray the self as an achiever, to enforce the idea of success despite resistance. In this way, the resistance offered by the Islander is at the same time silenced and shouted out loud. It is discarded as meaningless yet, flaunted with pride. In other words, the topic of resistance is avoided when one wants to divert attention from whatever is being contested, and it is emphasized when one wants to draw attention to the self as a successful entrepreneur who persisted even when faced with opposition.

In the light of stories that depict the Islander as a long-known resistor, the opposition towards Greenland and Sustainable Island became a mere confirmation of the innovativeness of the enterprises. These initiatives went against conventional practices and the conservative modes of thought that prevented the society from developing. However, the founder of Greenland believed in her idea, enough to follow it through despite facing resistance from the Islander, and paradoxically, she did it for the benefit of the Island society. A member of Growth Forum highlights the important components of resilience and morality in the story of entrepreneurship:

> you know, it takes trial and error; they probably have to go through a number of failures before they hit, I wouldn't say stardom but, why is it that they continue despite the early failures and difficulties and obstacles or whatever? in contrast with so many others who die and after they die the first time they give up—*they* don't give up. So, they have this resilience or robustness that they continue, they learn from their failures, they learn from their successes, but basically they have this ability to internalise learning from what they go through, be that failures or successes, and build that into their future, you know, the future; their new attempts […] another thing which I think is important is [that] the prime motivation is not money, it's not even material rewards! It's the realisation of a dream or a vision and it's also a characteristic that this vision is, you know, is well up the bar, is very high uhm and it's not, it's not driven by, it's sort of—it's internally driven—it's not externally driven, it's not status, it's not money, it's not fame, it's something different. […] There is no doubt that their dream is not only based on their own being or well-being but also you know, they have this vision of bringing their [Island] to another standard as well. (Verner, Growth Forum, May 2016)

It becomes clear that entrepreneurs could not maintain their high status had it not been for all the obstacles they managed to overcome along the road to success. On the Island, it is the Islander who embodies such obstacles by doubting and actively resisting change. The duality of the Islander, as passive and agential, aids the perception of a coherent and desirable self. While the passive element of the Islander was necessary to produce a self, marked by drive, innovation, and change, its active element, i.e. resistance, became essential in evaluating the struggle faced by the Good Entrepreneur, thus elevating the accomplishment of the enterprise, and enforcing her or his moral character. Professional identity is constructed not only through the exclusion of certain groups but also through the inclusion of them (Ashcraft, Muhr, Rennstam & Sullivan, 2012). Without being able to contrast and compare oneself to Others, many professions would cease to exist. In this case, the Islander was needed to create the Good Entrepreneur, both as a passive subject to differentiate against, and as an active subject to compete against. Similar tendencies have been found amongst ecopreneurs, who narratively position their identities against groups posed as villains (Phillips, 2013). This can be seen as a 'process of distancing through deflection onto supposed others of perceived negatives that could threaten a purported moral and competent self' (p. 812). In the case of the Island, opposition is disregarded at the same time as it is necessary to construct an entrepreneurial identity. Based on this, it seems that resisting actors are essential in the articulated story of social entrepreneurship, but they will remain excluded from actual influence on societal development.

The beneficiary Other, the moral self

The third role that the Islander takes in the construction of the Good Entrepreneur is that of the beneficiary. Social entrepreneurship needs a social problem to address; on the Island, one mainly refers to the challenging situation of the Islander. The whole purpose of bringing back life to the Island is to address the prevalent socioeconomic issues, as explained by the project manager of Sustainable Island.

> if you look at [socioeconomic] numbers, we're, you can compare [the Island] with [other regions], we are really scoring very low in education and human, social welfare, this is really a, there's a lot of struggling families here […] where they live? eh I think I don't have the statistics in my head, but I'm quite sure a lot of them are concentrated in smaller villages in the middle of the Island. […] I think if you look into the number of kids who have, who are known by the system, if you put it like that, we are...ranking very high in Denmark. […] and that's an indicator that we, yeah, we have a lot of families who are unemployed, and low-educated and... like drug abusers and... yeah. (Eva, August 2017)

Social entrepreneurship, in one way or the other, always connotes societal change for the better. For the conventional entrepreneur, achievement implies innovation, technology and economic growth. However, for the social entrepreneur, the goal is greater, the incentive is nobler, and the good of the outcome is rather undisputable. Thus, the goal is not a selfish one; it is one that benefits all—development. This gives the entrepreneur a moral character (Anderson & Smith, 2007), whose goodness is strengthened by the personal sacrifices she or he makes for the collective, as exemplified by the founder of Greenland:

> My doctor […] said to me at the time ‘shouldn’t you stop? I think it would be best for your health if you stopped now. It’s too stressful, it’s a huge press against you.’ […] but I think I just…from the beginning, and I still believe that it is *such* a good idea. I really think that I can make a difference. This doesn’t…this is not about having the most sustainable hotel in the world, which we have at the moment; it is not a goal in itself. What really drives me is to create jobs at the Island. I actually want to make a difference. I want to have more people into work. (Freja, April 2016)

The moral character of the Good Entrepreneur is further enforced by the perseverance demonstrated when she or he will not be stopped by any obstacles faced along the way. As I mentioned before, the Islander has both an agential element and a passive element. Here, I would like to discuss how the agential

part, in particular, relates to morality, by drawing upon Ahmed's (2014) concepts of will and willfulness.

The agential part of the Good Entrepreneur, in creating development, and that of the Islander, in resisting development, may appear similar, but they are in fact cut from altogether different cloths. While one is drawn from will, the other suggests willfulness (Ahmed, 2014). Will is what drives society in the right direction, thus carrying the whole. On the other hand, willfulness represents a 'wrong bent' of the will that may jeopardize the order of the whole. The Good Entrepreneur displays a will for change and action towards the undisputable good of development, whereas the Islander directs its will(fulness) towards the halting of development. Ahmed (2012) explains the relationship between the part and the whole by drawing on the analogy of the body. All parts of the body: feet, legs, arms, etc. must collaborate in order for the whole of the body to function according to its general will. If a foot acts according to its particular will, the general will of the body cannot be performed. Thus, the part has a duty to act in a way that furthers the general will of the whole. The Islander is the foot attempting to disrupt the general movement of the body, i.e. society, by causing imbalance to satisfy its particular will.

> To be a thinking member of a body thus requires you remember you are part of a body. Willfulness thus refers to the part that in willing has forgotten it is just a part. The consequences of such forgetting are shame; the part that is ignorant of its status as part would compromise the preservation of the whole. (Ahmed, 2012, n.p.)

The categories of the Good Entrepreneur and the Islander thus represent a distinction between two parts; one that is willing and one that is willful. Although willfulness is an inherently negative disposition (it could not, for example, be compared to the tendency of entrepreneurs to go against the grain and refuse conventional practices since this behaviour is widely agreed upon to be aligned with the good of the whole), the character of the Islander is not narrated with enmity. Granted, the Islander is often spoken of with a certain dryness of tone that attests to an exasperation of simplistic thinking, narrow-mindedness or whatnot. However, and perhaps more often, the Islander is described with laughter and almost a hint of endearment, as in 'they will come around!' or 'whenever there is a success, then they're there! ha ha'. Of course, part of this affection may be related to the times when the Islander is reproduced with pride, to serve as an obstacle to one's accomplishment ('they said that there were some people who wanted to get me off the Island…ha ha').

But mostly, the narrator reminds of a parent jokingly telling the story of children who are mildly acting up. In the story, the children are certain to learn, or have perhaps at this point already learnt, what is good for them. Willfulness can always be straightened out to become aligned with the general will (Ahmed, 2014). In a similar way, the willfulness of the Islander can be adjusted by waiting out the resistance. Meanwhile, the Good Entrepreneur must take a rather patriarchal attitude towards the Islander in deciding what is good for the willful children until they come to grasp the inevitability of the general will. Such a patriarchal stance towards beneficiaries again reminds of the colonial setting. A parallel can be drawn to the so-called white man's burden. In 1899, Rudyard Kipling wrote the poem *The White Man's Burden: The United States and the Philippines Islands* to encourage American colonization of the Philippines. The poem was used to portray colonization as a mission of civilization. The white man's burden is 'the alleged duty of the white peoples to manage the affairs of the less developed nonwhite peoples' (White Man's Burden, 2019). The importance of reaching the stage of civilization was sometimes not grasped by residents of the colonized country, which resulted in resistance movements, of which the Mau Mau in Kenya is but one of hundreds of examples. Hence, the burden of the white man was to continue the mission of the common good, without thanks or reward, but simply because of their duty as more knowing individuals. Here, will meant to further the quest for global civilization, and willfulness meant acts to disrupt this quest. In the scene of the Island, the Good Entrepreneur is the more knowing individual, who continues the quest for societal development without thanks or reward. The accepted burden of carrying out the will of the whole contributes to the idea of the Good Entrepreneur as a moral actor.

The point I am trying to make by drawing on the concepts of will and willfulness is that the so-called general will, that is, what is considered good for society, or the 'social' in social entrepreneurship, is best understood by referring to its opposite. On the Island, the 'social' came to be related to an idea of development that necessarily entails technological progress and economic growth. The Good Entrepreneur utilizes her or his agency to contribute to the good of the whole, and whatever stands in the way of this agency is rendered willful. The morality of the Good Entrepreneur is drawn from the Islander in two ways. First, the socioeconomic situation of the Islander gives the enterprise a social purpose. Second, the Islander provides acts of willfulness that highlight the will of the Good Entrepreneur. In achieving a moral stance, the Good Entrepreneur allots the Islander an immoral position.

Thus, we see that there exists a mutually constituting relationship between the Islander and the Good Entrepreneur, similar to that between the colonized and the colonizer (Bhabha, 1994). The Good Entrepreneur appears as an ideal identity category, and in relation to this, the Islander attains a lower rank. Thus, we may see the identity category of the Islander as a form of subalternity[15] created in relation to the instance of social entrepreneurship taking form on the Island. In the field of entrepreneurship, Özkazanç-Pan (2012; 2014) has concluded that 'the high-technology entrepreneur' can be seen as a form of dominant subjectivity which creates subaltern entrepreneurial subjectivities related to gender and ethnicity. Here we can see that it is the Islander who is assigned a marginalized position in society, while taking on several roles, i.e. as the beneficiary, the antagonist and the conservatist, all aiding the construction of the 'social'.

Summary

In this chapter, I have argued that the Good Entrepreneur needs an Other to construct an identity as good and entrepreneurial. Thus, we are beginning to see how the 'social' in social entrepreneurship can be relationally constructed by drawing on Others. In the Island setting, the image of the Good Entrepreneur was achieved by drawing upon various characteristics of the Islander. The Islander as an Other is portrayed with a certain ambivalence, which enabled an idea of the Islander as simultaneously a passive spectator, and an active antagonist. These contradictory characteristics were used to portray the Good Entrepreneur as an innovator driving change, and a victor overcoming obstacles. Further, the passive and active parts of the Islander also strengthened the morality of the Good Entrepreneur. The Islander as a non-contributor to societal development and as a contestant in the quest for such, enabled the Good Entrepreneur to take on the responsibility as the sole creator of the future. The entrepreneur gained the additional attribute of 'good' by portraying the socioeconomic situation of the Islander as the social purpose of the sustainable transition. In sum, the Islander had multiple roles to play in the construction of the Good Entrepreneur.

The identity categories of the Good Entrepreneur and the Islander are circulating in stories on the Island and thus, they are upheld by various people.

[15] Broadly refers to subordination and marginalization of certain societal groups based on e.g. class, ethnicity or gender (e.g. Gramsci, 1971, Prasad, 2003; Young, 2016).

As we have seen, the representation of the Islander is powerful in that it appears as common-sense knowledge. The reader may now wonder who it is that falls subject to this Other-representation. Sometimes, the Islander became associated with the poor in society, sometimes with the older generation, sometimes with the uneducated or unemployed, and sometimes with the inhabitants of the non-coastal areas of the Island, sometimes with everyone and sometimes with no one. As it turned out, there was no fixed referent to which 'the Islander' was assigned. This seems to have enabled a more flexible interpretation of the character, which relates to its inherent ambivalence and contradictory characteristics. The Islander can therefore be seen as a situation-specific interpretation that varies, depending on what part of the self that one wants to emphasize at the moment.

On the Island, the 'social' in social entrepreneurship is constructed in relation to an Other. More specifically, the Good Entrepreneur and the Islander mutually create each other. In this chapter, I have discussed how the Good Entrepreneur became associated with will, as entrepreneurial initiatives were thought to drive society in the *right* direction, while the Islander was rendered willful. Seemingly, the elements of innovation, achievement and morality signify a linear idea of societal development, where we must constantly move forward through technological advances and economic growth. This means that the Good status gained by the Entrepreneur is further related to what is considered good for society.

To make sense of what is going on at the Island, I have drawn upon postcolonial theory. Mainly, I have resembled the Othering of the Islander to the Othering that takes place within colonial discourse (Bhabha, 1994), which essentially involves the differentiation between people, based on their ethnicity and geographical origin. However, what goes on at the Island is the very opposite of such nationalism. It is not about differentiating between insiders and outsiders or looking to the past in nostalgia, it is rather about distancing oneself from tradition and history. One does not strive to be associated with the culture of the Island, but with the values of the market. In the following chapter, I show how the identity categories of the Good Entrepreneur and the Islander have also become settled in non-business contexts of life. More specifically, I show how the 'social', in addition to being relationally constructed through an Other, is assembled through associations with produced and consumed objects.

6 ‘Good’ Entrepreneurial settlement: The Islander as a collective non-identity

The idealized role of the Good Entrepreneur is attributed to a few local business owners that are almost regarded as heroes. These are mainly people who started enterprises that have become well-known to people outside the Island. In addition to Greenland that has gained international recognition, some of the restaurants and food products originating from the Island are nationally known. So far, we have seen how the construction of the Islander enabled a superior identity of a contrasting nature: that of the Good Entrepreneur. However, the constructors of the Islander were not all entrepreneurs. Rather, various actors given a chance would apply this standardized depiction of the Islander. It appears that people on the Island tell the story of the Islander as a collective, with the effect of gaining membership in the progressive group of society. As I will show in this chapter, the construction of the Islander shows both the self-conception of business owners and founders, and the Good Entrepreneur as an ideal identity category that extends beyond the business scene.

So far, we have seen how the ‘social’ is relationally constructed through an Other, resulting in the ideal identity category of the Good Entrepreneur. In this chapter, I show how the ‘social’ becomes settled. I use the term ‘settlement’ to create associations with colonialism, as in when a place or region is occupied by settlers. Only when applied to the Island, the term does not imply the domination of physical land and its inhabitants, but relates to what Deetz (1992) terms a corporate colonization of the life world. Deetz illuminates how the commercial corporation has overshadowed previously dominant institutions such as the state, family, and community, to the point that it steers our personal identity and conception of values and self-interest. In this case, the colonizer is not the corporation but rather the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship. As shown in the previous chapter, the Good Entrepreneur is

seen as a creating individual who shapes the future: innovative, achieving and moral. In this chapter, I will show how the Good Entrepreneur settled as a symbol of progression and societal development; an ideal identity with which non-entrepreneurs also strived to gain an association.

I have already touched upon how the idealization of the Good Entrepreneur is related to an idea of what is good for society. Here, I elaborate on how the ‘social’, in this sense, reminds of the so-called ecomodern narrative (Wright, Nyberg, Rickards & Freund, 2018), which portrays market and technology as the mechanisms through which the common good is achieved. I demonstrate how this notion of the ‘social’ becomes settled among citizens as they draw upon consumed objects to establish themselves as good and to approximate the ideal identity category of the Good Entrepreneur. Viewing this as a form of mimicry (Bhabha, 1994) allows me to reflect both on ways of conforming to and ways of resisting this idea of what it means to be a good citizen.

A business take on the common good

The sustainable transition taking place at the Island is sometimes referred to as a brand and sometimes as a strategy. Regardless of which label is put to use, Sustainable Island is typically framed through the language of business. The Island was to be internationally renowned for its green solutions and sustainable living. This would put the Island on the map for something different than its round churches and smoked herring, to make people see that this was a place of innovation and revolutionizing entrepreneurship. Creating new business and developing the green industry would not only attract more business and investors, but the new jobs would also draw new residents. Young people growing up on the Island might be more inclined to move back after getting a degree, and in this way the depopulation trend could turn around. The sustainability concept would also be an attractor for both business tourists, who would have meetings and conferences at the hotel called Greenland, and individual tourists with an interest in, for example, locally produced organic food and the caretaking of nature. Thus, besides creating a new green industry on the Island, the strategy would lead to an expansion of the already quite flourishing tourism industry. The initiators of Sustainable Island imagine an island where people come to not only learn about, but also experience, sustainability. A gastronomic centre with the possibility to engage in outdoor activities bringing you closer to nature, all framed by the greenest possible

infrastructure. Below the chairman of Greenland, Leila, shares her vision for the Island.

> There's so many things you could do to make this the Disney World of the sustainable world [so] that people would travel from all over the world to see this island...all the farming over here could be organic; there's so many things they could do to make this world—I mean famous in the whole world […] I think within five to ten years—within ten years, I'm sure we are there, we have a new Iceland. But if we are not careful, the other parts of Denmark will run with this idea and make a region that will be sustainable. (Leila, August 2017)

In this line of reasoning, the Island needs to be alone in its agenda to have the desired effect, that is, to attract tourism and to create economic growth. Sustainable Island is thus seen as a business initiative competing on market conditions. If other actors will compete with the same 'product', the Island will not gain a competitive advantage. To reach its vision of economic prosperity, the Island must be the first mover. Like all products on the market, the Island needs a well-defined and unique brand. This narrative underlines a complexity in the merging of business and sustainability: a global sustainable transition would not benefit the local context of the Island. The Island society will reap the most benefits if other regions remain unsustainable, which is why the notion of sustainability as a brand becomes inherently paradoxical.

Seen from this angle, the sustainable transition is not an end in itself, but a tool to compete and to attain economic growth. In turn, growth will bring social welfare in the form of jobs, and it will generate more tax money to be distributed on matters such as infrastructure, health care and education. Thus, the means to reach the 'social' of this social enterprise is a sustainable transition with an environmental focus, and the goal of this 'social' is economic growth, which is understood as having an inextricable linkage to social welfare. From this follows that in order to provide a social value, the sustainable transition must be related to business. The director of Island Business demonstrates the line of thinking that connects sustainable business success with social welfare.

> If you take a company such as [Laundry House] which is a washing enterprise here on the Island, they have a lot of wastewater, and they have invented a method of reusing this wastewater […] suddenly, there is this green idea that: Wait! There is both money and jobs in this…so, the industry often has an interest in making sure that there are technological solutions that will make their world better, and at the same time that makes…everyone's world better. (Karl, August 2017)

Different organizing narratives influence our understanding of the Anthropocene (Wright et al., 2018), that is, the epoch in which human activity started having a significant impact on the planet's geology and ecosystem. The business perspective taken in Sustainable Island has been framed within the so-called ecomodern narrative, in which technology and the market share the role of the hero solving environmental challenges (Wright et al., 2018). In this perspective, profits and environmentalism form a 'win-win' situation for all actors involved. There is no need to restructure either the social or the economic sphere, rather 'enterprise and corporate capitalism are championed as the optimum means of delivering the innovation that will guarantee our lasting prosperity' (p. 461). A municipality worker depicts the win-win perspective of the ecomodern narrative below.

> [The mayor] really wants to see how we can commercialize the resilience thought. How can we make businesses take this into their...so they make green businesses, so that we can attract other green businesses, so that we can put money into the tax uh yeah the whole money box, so that we can make better institutions so that we can make better healthcare. (Mona, February 2018)

If Sustainable Island is a brand for the Island, then the Island can be likened to a product for sale, competing with other products on the market. The aspiration is not to sell this Island-product to local residents, but to global consumer segments. This means that the recognition deemed the highest will be that of an international audience as opposed to that of local citizens, as explained by the municipality worker Emil.

> it is not a smaller success because they, because people don't recognize it...it is eh a great success, but it has to be measured in the right areas and forums eh...so [Greenland] received prizes, eh international prizes and that's the most important thing...it's better with an international success and a local failure than the opposite [way] around. (Emil, municipality, May 2016)

Not only have local protests been disregarded because they were thought natural for the Islander, but also because local support was judged unnecessary for the success of the initiative. Sustainable Island depended on international support and recognition, and with this achieved, local citizens would reap the benefits of the project whether they liked it or not.

However, ten years into the Sustainable Island project, the municipality started emphasizing the necessity of including local citizens. It was now stated that a fully sustainable society could not be achieved if every citizen would not take

active ownership and responsibility for it. As the municipality worker Eva put it:

> if [Sustainable Island] should succeed, we need to get the...consumers in a way […] we have the municipality, the businesses on [the Island] and civil society, [all three of them] should be taken into this strategy development. (August 2017)

Resources were allocated to a new administrative position, tasked to lead the project of Sustainable Island, and to organize the so-called revitalization of the strategy. The latter involved setting up new strategy camps, open to all citizens, where participants were to agree on new goals that would constitute the vision of Sustainable Island. From being an initiative that belonged to politicians, business leaders and the municipality, it thus turned into a societal project to which everyone was invited, even the ordinary Islander. Mona from the municipality explains that even though Sustainable Island has become increasingly anchored in the agendas of many of the political parties, the municipality has deliberately taken a step back.

> Maybe, there is also some different thinking about what should the municipality actually do here? So, how much resources do we need actually? 'Coz the political and the administrative, in the chief's opinion, we should lessen the municipality part of it, we should, you know, we should just try to get things moving...we should not be a very big part of it...and in that order, we do not need many resources here. That's one perspective which I partly agree with actually. I mean you need to make things work uhm, you need people to take responsibility for the agenda; you cannot as a municipality think that you can drive the the—you can't make the revolution in the society—you must depend, you must uhm you must inspire, you must invite society to put in their resources, you cannot uhm make it all happen, I mean... (Mona, the municipality, February 2018)

The role of the municipality shifted from being one of the main drivers of Sustainable Island to that of a facilitator and inspiration source, inviting society, i.e. businesses and individuals, to put in their resources and get things moving. The decreasing part played by the municipality can be seen as an indication of a transferring of responsibility to solve societal issues; from the state and onto the market and individual people (Harvey, 2005). Thus, this notion of the common good prevailing on the Island can serve as an illustrative example of how the 'social' in social entrepreneurship is both ideological and political (Cho, 2006). The ecomodern take on the 'social' frames the concept of sustainability through the language of business: strategies become brands

and regions become products. As will be seen in the next section, an important role in this story is played not only by the Good Entrepreneur but also by the 'good' consumer.

How to not be an Islander: Consumption as demonstration of will

It is not only entrepreneurs and businesspeople that differentiate themselves from the Islander. People from various contexts, such as countryside residents, municipality workers, from citizen associations, etc. also reiterate the story of the Islander, whom the reader by now should recognize as a bit of a backward-striving troublemaker. People tell the story of the Islander to show that they are not these things (conservative, narrow-minded, etc.), i.e. to show that they are not willful. As a reminder to the reader, willfulness entails a so-called wrong bending of the will that stands in opposition to what is considered good for society (Ahmed, 2014). To be willing, on the other hand, means to use one's agency to drive society in the 'right' direction. The notion of will is related to the business approach taken to reach the common good, and thus, to what is considered 'social' in the sustainable transition. Telling the story of the Islander shows that one is a member of the progressive and willing part of society. The following quote by Anton, a local carpenter from a village inland, explains this point further.

> It is very typical on [the Island] that you have a short-sighted perspective. And I have, as a carpenter and in other capacities, become really outed on the Island, and I have really travelled a lot. So we may have a bigger perspective than 'oh, going to Copenhagen? That's a full day trip!' You know, I'll go to Copenhagen and I'll return home on the same day. You know, that's nothing. I have held lectures on politics, I've done—I've been to Stuttgart. We just head down there and then we go back, you know. And I think here, your horizon is not that far away that you would be able to think 'oh well, the world might be bigger than this'. That is my experience anyway, that when you listen to a discussion and the problems posed, you're just thinking 'ah, why won't you try to see a bit further?' That, I think, is the general Islander. It is a bit more nuanced than that, but still, that's how it is. (Anton, citizen association, February 2018)

In this quote, Anton stresses his unconstrained worldview, his open mind, implicitly in relation to development, by differentiating himself from the Islander. The latter is constrained both in terms of physical mobility (it is

implied that they rarely leave the Island) and in terms of perceptual frame (they cannot think outside of their box). A connection is made between being well-travelled and being conversant with new ideas and trends. This relates to the previously mentioned tendency to portray the Island as being associated with the global market, instead of the local culture and traditions. The international (ideas, recognition, etc.) is favoured over the local. By living by the rules of the market, one becomes a progressive individual who participates in societal development.

Since the sustainable transition that represents the new development path of the Island requires the promotion of a green industry, the contributing individual will be a sustainable consumer. The market offers various identity positions that people can attain through product acquisition (Arnould & Thompson, 2005). In this way, what is being purchased is not always the function of a product, but rather its meaning. The product becomes a symbol for something else (Levy, 1959). In this case, I argue that sustainable products can be seen as symbols of will, signalling the progressiveness of their owner.

On the Island, progression is demonstrated through consuming commodities that are more or less agreed upon to be ‘good’. Citizens adapt to this in varying degrees. Some settle for choosing the more expensive organic tomato at the supermarket, while others go further and install solar panels in the household, replace their old oil burner for the more sustainable heat pump or connect to the district heating system. Since these seemingly selfless investments are made with individual capital, they represent a personal sacrifice and become a display of commitment to societal development.

> But, of course, if you want [a] CO2 neutral society, it it it's not easy for the the local household as a single family to do eh to make a difference [...] some got the solar cells on the roof but, I did it myself, but it was an investment of more than hundreds of thousands of crowns; so in the long run it's a good investment, but in the short term [laughing] hundred thousand is eh hundred thousand! (Emil, the municipality, June 2016)

On the Island, the residential house became one of the most straightforward arenas for demonstrating will. In the following quote, the owner of a green construction company, Kaj, explains the increase in demand for their services.

> four years ago when we started [the green construction business], no-one wanted to pay for the good windows that were made in Denmark by Danish carpenters, painted with organic paint, but today people want to have it and pay for it and they can afford it, and if they can't uhm, many choose to maybe just

> not [exchange] all the windows in the house but maybe half or some[thing]. They take it in steps, and I think it shows that we are thinking more about quality... (Kaj, August 2017)

For those with limited capital, creating a sustainable home takes time. As Kaj explains, one replaces one window at a time instead of waiting until all the windows can be replaced at once. This can be interpreted as a certain eagerness to express will, seen through the swiftness to adapt to societal changes. This becomes even more clear in the quote below, where Anton, a resident of a village inland, shares his perspective of the relation between Sustainable Island and individual citizens.

> [The important thing with Sustainable Island is] to launch innovative ideas in people's minds. You don't necessarily have to connect to [Sustainable Island's] energy strategy, but that you do something yourself so that…I mean, that is the most important thing. The most important step of the transition is that you yourself will take initiative to reduce the carbon footprint and do something sensible. What I'm thinking is that [Sustainable Island] is more of an overarching structure provided by the municipality […] That's how I see it, but on the other hand, we had installed our system [of solar panels combined with a heat pump] before all of this came to the surface. Before the [Sustainable Island] strategy even started, I mean…it was a reasonable thing to do, seen from the perspective of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, from an economical perspective, and just from the perspective of my gut feeling! [laughing] (Anton, citizen association, February 2018)

Here, Anton shows that he is not only part of the progressive group based on the sustainable products he purchased and installed in his home, but that he has a particular will, seen through his behaviour as an early adopter. Note also how he stresses that his gut feeling is in line with global trends. Similar to the Good Entrepreneur, the 'good' consumer does not hesitate to make adaptations for the sake of progression.

The more I talked to Island residents from the various regions, the more I realized the importance of the residential house in displaying one's commitment to sustainability. Some people even contacted me themselves, asking to be interviewed. This eagerness to express the sustainable (and hence, progressive, willing) self is shown in the following excerpt from an interview I did in the house of Svend Erik during the snowstorm of February 2018.

> Author: You wrote me an email saying that you were interested in talking to me. Is that because you are involved in the citizen association?

> Svend Erik: Well, I am involved in the citizen association. But there was an email from them, that you were looking for someone to talk to, about [Sustainable Island] and so on and…and the reason that I contacted you is that I have a heat pump, and I have had it for 11 years, and I am very happy with it, and the last four years I have been self-sufficient in energy […] so that is basically the main reason…

Svend Erik went on to tell me about the solar panels he installed and how quick he had been to replace his old oil burner for the heat pump. The 40-50 square metres of solar panels installed behind the house cost him around 115,000 Danish kroner. But with the associated tax reductions, he feels it was an investment, beneficial for both his personal economy and the environment. These investments are compared with the non-investments of his nearby neighbour, who still utilizes an oil burner.

> At the end of this street lives a married couple that are around 80 years old. They don't want district heating, they don't want anything, they keep their oil burner and are well satisfied with that […]. He is too old to change things. He doesn't want to change anything; things just have to remain the same for him.

Similar to the Othering process displayed in the previous chapter, where one needs to compare oneself with an Other, i.e. the Islander, in order to become the Good Entrepreneur, this comparison to Others as non-participants in the sustainable transition also poses the self in a more desirable light, i.e. it aids the idea of the self as a 'good' consumer. Constructing oneself as willing entails comparing oneself to those who lack initiative and fail to express responsibility for the environment through consumption.

> I just take a tour in the supermarket, see what they pop into their baskets, it's a lot of...it's in all of Denmark, but I always look when I'm in line, are they taking the [organic produce] or are they taking the cheap things? (Kaj, August 2017)

Individual responsibility seemingly translates as the possession of 'good' commodities, such as organic groceries, the heat pump or the solar panel. Supermarkets as well as residential houses are examples of arenas that spotlight the difference between the willing and the willful. However, while some of these products are easily displayed, such as the car one drives or the solar panels on one's roof, other products are less palpable. The heat pump is usually hidden away in the house, and there are few natural social situations where it may be exhibited. Therefore, the heat pump must be brought up in conversation for it to signify the progressiveness of its owner (hence, the eagerness of Svend Erik to be interviewed). Demonstrating purchased things

that have been constructed as sustainable, physically or as objects of conversation, becomes a way to ensure one's social surroundings that one is willing. However, in doing so, one also points to those who are willful. I see this differentiation as an expression of how the ideal of the Good Entrepreneur, and the practices of Othering that comes with it, have become settled in other, non-business, contexts of life.

Consumption as imitation

There are plenty of similarities between the Good Entrepreneur and the 'good' consumer. In addition to the Othering practices that seem to be necessary to achieve both identities, they also demonstrate self-initiative, whether it is to consume or to produce. This self-initiative is related to keeping an open mind for new ideas and solutions, as well as the early adoption of these. Both identities are action-oriented, that is, they undertake concrete action to deal with social and environmental problems. Additionally, both roles make sacrifices for the collective. For the 'good' consumer, it is the investment of personal capital. For the entrepreneur, not just financial capital but also engagement, time and energy are sacrificed for the good of society. In this way, both of them end up on the willing side of society; the one that is striving for the future.

I interpret the similarities between the two roles as an idealization of the Good Entrepreneur. This means that I assume that it is the 'good' consumer who resembles the Good Entrepreneur, and not the other way around. This assumption is partly based on the way that these roles are talked about in interviews. The Good Entrepreneur is lifted to the skies by both non-entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs (see previous chapter). There seems to be an overall agreement as to how important these creators are for societal development and a gratitude for their work. But the 'good' consumer is mainly mentioned when it is the interviewee who adopts this role. That is, one talks about oneself as a 'good' consumer, but one does not feel gratitude for the consumption practices of others. This may be because consumption is understood as an individual responsibility rather than an individual accomplishment. Furthermore, the assumption that it is the 'good' consumer who resembles the Good Entrepreneur is also based on the qualities that they share, i.e. self-initiative, alertness to new ideas, self-sacrifice, etc., which are most commonly associated with entrepreneurs. I therefore understand the identity category of the Good Entrepreneur as the ideal, and the 'good' consumer as a form of reproduction.

An ideal is ‘often taken as a model for imitation’ (Ideal, 2020). If the Good Entrepreneur is an ideal, it is likely that others will be encouraged to aspire for it; even those who are not business founders may want to be associated with entrepreneurial traits. Being a ‘good’ consumer produces the opportunity to become categorized as willing and progressive, just like the Good Entrepreneur. The settlement of this ideal in contexts that are seemingly unconnected to it can be likened to what Deetz (1992) refers to as a colonization of the life world, or the kind of cultural colonization that Bhabha (1994) indicates, when describing how local ways of being become replaced by a new behaviour that is imposed without being experienced as such. It is in these situations that the colonized may start to imitate their colonizers, a process which Bhabha (1994) refers to as mimicry. Such imitation is not undertaken deliberately. In a way, we constantly engage in imitation to help us understand what we should want and desire; by imitating the desires of a ‘model’, i.e. by wanting what our ideal wants, we hope to resemble this character (Girard, 2008). Hence, the act of imitation can be interpreted as quite a natural social process. What is peculiar about the Island setting is that the imitation of the Good Entrepreneur is recurrent, that is, it seems to be a ‘model’ for quite some people. On the Island, the narrative that favours an ecomodern development of society gives an idea of how one should act to fit in. Hjorth and Bjerke (2006) and Hjorth (2013) have previously noted that social entrepreneurship limits the range of allowed subjectivities and that citizens may be transformed into consumers. Here, we have seen how such a transformation may come about, i.e. as a form of mimicry of the idealized subjectivity associated with social entrepreneurship.

In the context of colonialism, imitators can never become exact replicas (Bhabha, 1994). Bhabha writes of how the British colonizers wanted to create a type of mediator people who were almost like them in order to make the colonized population more manageable. At the same time, the British needed to maintain an idea of themselves as superior. Mimics must be ‘a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite’ (p. 122). For the Good Entrepreneur to remain an ideal, that is, a distinct and desired identity category, and one that is located at the top of the hierarchy of social identities, it is necessary that Others[16] remain mimics. Mimicry of the Good Entrepreneur

[16] In the colonial context, the colonized and the Other are represented by the same character. In the previous chapter, I drew a parallel between the Other and the Islander. This may cause the reader to think that it is the Islander who is imitating the Good Entrepreneur. However, there is an important point on which the context of colonialism and the context of the Island differs: in the former, the Other is an ethnic and geographical group, while in the latter, the Islander is not directly associated with a certain group of people. Thus, in the context of the

takes form as a related but subordinated category, that of the 'good' consumer. Both strive for the same goal, progression, and both agree on what it takes to reach this goal, i.e. enterprising and consuming, but the former is clearly granted the more esteemed role of the creator, while the latter remains a supporter. Hence, mimicry can never result in a clone; it will always entail a subject who is similar but slightly different.

Although there are many differences between the context of the social entrepreneurship on the Island and the context of colonialism, a comparison of the two enables a better understanding of the workings of apparently fixed identity categories. In the context of colonialism, with the British Empire as an example, occupied regions were exposed to the new ideal of British manners, culture, language, etc. At the same time, the colonized were informed of their own inferiority. One may assume that this led some to adopt the ideal of Britishness, while others did not. In either case, the colonized (and the colonizers) had to relate to the valued category of the White Saviour and the less valued category of the Uncivilized (Bhabha, 1994). This means that they had to position their identities in relation to these categories. The same goes for the Island context. The role of the 'good' consumer should not be interpreted as representing the general population on the Island; rather, it should be seen as an example of how people may relate to the established identity categories. While some engage in this apparent imitation of the ideal, others may not. Yet, the categories prevail in the Island society which means that they, in some sense, are considered in people's self-representations.

Challenging the Good Entrepreneur through imitation

So far, I have argued that the identity categories of the Good Entrepreneur and the Islander have also become settled in non-business contexts. By this, I mean that people who are not actors in the business scene also idealize the Good Entrepreneur. This settlement can be seen as a form of colonization, as there is

---

Island, it would be difficult to claim that it is the group being Othered that starts to imitate their colonizer/superior. Instead, people seem to imitate the Good Entrepreneur to avoid being placed in this inferior category. Hence, when I draw parallels to 'the colonized' in this chapter, I not only refer to people who have resisted various initiatives which led them to become reduced to 'the Islander', but also to other groups in the Island society who in their self-representation demonstrate influence of the introduced values of the Good Entrepreneur.

a similarity between the ideal of the Good Entrepreneur and the ideal of the colonizer. Both can be said to represent a form of 'outside' influence, and the cultural values connected to it come to be perceived as preferable to domestic ways of being (which are embodied by the Islander). When Emil from the municipality said that 'it's better with an international success and a local failure than the opposite around' or when Anton from one of the citizen associations said 'I've been to Stuttgart' to emphasize the difference between himself and the Islander, they both performed a valuation that positioned what is outside of the Island at a higher rank. Although some of the entrepreneurs who tell stories of resistance from the local population have moved to the Island from Copenhagen or the like, what I refer to when comparing the Island setting to the context of colonization is not this kind of in-migration. Instead, what I refer to is the introduction of values that raise a globalized mindset and self-initiative by market participation to the skies.

The notion of an imposed ideal that colonizes people's minds may give the reader an idea of a mindless population that adopts whatever it is fed. Since colonialism is usually seen as 'a practice of domination, which involves the subjugation of one people to another' (Kohn & Reddy, 2017, n.p.), this connection is not unexpected. However, mimicry is not only an expression of subdual, but it may also constitute a platform for the practice of agency (Bhabha, 1994). Just like the content of a text in a way is produced by the reader's interpretation, colonial discourse is both read and rewritten by the colonized, which results in imitation with a difference (Huddart, 2006). This difference can be interpreted as a form of resistance towards the very image that is being mirrored.

On the Island, the ecomodern narrative (Wright et al., 2018) frames the idea of the 'social', i.e. it guides the understanding of the common good and the idea of what it means to be a 'good' citizen. As we have seen, this narrative idealizes Good Entrepreneurship and 'good' consumption. In the following, I will demonstrate how this ideal is both imitated and challenged. As I will argue, the 'social' is subtly resisted through disputes regarding the goodness of certain products. In the following, I will describe a conflict between two business founders, Freja and Kaj, which regards the choice of insulation product in the construction of Greenland. Since the conflict regards the goodness of products, their roles as entrepreneurs merge with their roles as consumers.

During the construction phase of Greenland, a certain type of glass wool insulation was left visible outside of the building. Glass wool insulation is made from fibres of glass and have a texture similar to wool. One day, Kaj, the

owner of what is labelled the green construction firm, happened to drive by the construction site and spotted the insulation material.

> me and [Hans] were just driving by and there was a lot of insulation outside the house eh…when you are building green, many people have different opinions. I know that, but when you are building green in our firm and in my head you have to use very green materials, you cannot use all the common things in a building like that so…we just, we have a Facebook page for our firm […] we took photos and eh of all the insulation glass wool […] we put it on Facebook and just asked a lot of people, who are following the firm because they think it's interesting in different ways, eh asked them if it was the [Greenland] they had talked about since, yeah maybe, 2007 and people got very angry because there is a lot of […] state money in the project…there was a lot of writing on Facebook and then the media and the TV […] and then it was eh hundreds of eh messages was sent back and forward and yeah, it was a lot…now there is nothing now [Greenland] get awards and […] I think it's stupid, so stupid because I think if they can get a reward for being sustainable….there is something wrong. (Kaj, May 2016)

For Kaj, sustainable products should be as natural and organic as possible. His company purchases wood chips and mud to insulate buildings. In Kaj's mind, a sustainable building has a lingering scent of wood, as opposed to the smell of plastic that is prevalent in most buildings. Freja had a different approach, when she was faced with the task of creating the world's most sustainable hotel and conference centre. She formed partnerships with famous architects and engineers and focused on design, innovative green-tech solutions, and products with sustainable labels, e.g. the Cradle to Cradle certification. Below, Freja explains the dispute from her perspective.

> So, suddenly, it was the whole project, and I was lying. I was misusing EU money eh we should pay back the money; this would never be sustainable—some said, "oh how sad, I thought it could have been a great project" […] The stupid thing about this is that when you open a debate like this on Facebook, it's impossible to argue because this is not about the insulation anymore, it's becoming something totally different. And yes, we did use glass wool because, and I'm quite sure that [Kaj] actually if he would he could, have understood why we did it because it's logical what we did. We have an old swimming pool [that has been transformed into an energy storage] because we can't use all the energy from the [solar panels], so we heat up as much water as possible and then we have it for later use, you can say, so that is actually a very sustainable solution but when you insulate something with water […] glass wool is actually the only material that you can use because if you have a leakage and you use paper wood chips or hemp, then it will rotten […] It will start to get out into the

> insulation and it will rotten before we will notice. Then we have to change everything […] that's why we use glass wool and another very important [piece of] information, which was impossible to come out with: 80 per cent of the glass wool is actually reused glass…whether you like it or not, yeah! [laughing] […] What we did here and you can say that was more like, you could call it a gimmick, but we actually changed the glass façade here; instead of just taking the glass to the waste handling here at the Island, we actually [spent] money and sent the whole glass façade to the company that makes the glass insulation…so we did what we could to close the loop, but it was impossible to talk to [Kaj] about that so… (Freja, May 2016)

This disagreement over insulation material shows two actors that have both taken the role as the 'good' consumer, but they have done so in different ways. Freja's version seems more aligned with the ecomodern narrative, in which sustainability is used as a brand and an attraction. It involves green-tech innovations such as the repurposed swimming pool or the glass façade turned into glass wool insulation. Kaj has also adopted the role of the 'good' consumer, but he represents a different view that questions the goodness of Freja's chosen commodities. The point of demonstrating the insulation dispute is not to highlight the inauthenticity of Greenland or what might have been a marketing trick by the green construction firm, but to focus on the difference that can be produced in imitation. The narrative that highlights the responsibility of individuals to consume right is enacted by both Freja and Kaj who position themselves as 'good' consumers. However, we also see that it is not a role that is taken on verbatim, but one that can be rewritten and adjusted.

As mentioned before, the difference produced in imitation can be interpreted as a form of resistance to the ideal being imitated. It is not the revolutionary kind of resistance embodied by the Islander, whose adversaries need police protection, but a more subtle kind of defiance. One might regard it as opposition that remains within the frame of the ecomodern narrative (Wright et al., 2018); not revolutionary but rather revisionary. Even in partly objecting to this ideal, Kaj still wants to be seen as a 'good' consumer. This can be compared to the context of colonialism, where both the colonized and the colonizer strive for authenticity (Huddart, 2006). However, for Kaj, being 'good' is not enough. He is competing for the purpose of showing that he is not only good but a better consumer. Imitation becomes resistance when it renders the imitator more authentic than the ideal, and in this way, it can challenge the representations of superiority and inferiority (Huddart, 2006). Of course, the example of the insulation conflict shows more of a direct confrontation than what could be seen in colonial times; most likely the British were not called out by their colonized for not being British enough. Instead,

the resistance practiced through imitation lies in a subtle process of showing oneself as too similar, which causes the colonizers to anxiously question their right to authority (Bhabha, 1994). On the Island, the overt accusation made by Kaj forced Freja to justify her authenticity as a 'good' actor. Sometimes, imitation seems so exaggerated that it becomes a form of mockery (Bhabha, 1994). The insulation conflict shows a similar kind of ridicule expressed through an inflated imitation that does consumption, and hence, progression, even better than the ideal.

In the case of the insulation conflict, the role of the 'good' consumer meant to challenge products thought to be good for the benefit of products considered better. Kaj, who associated himself with these better products, could in this way be highlighted as a more progressive consumer. More rarely, being a 'good' consumer could entail choosing not to consume. Below, Dagmar, a local artisan and a member of a citizen association, explains her view on good consumption.

> Yes, it should [cost more to be sustainable]! We can afford it, that's why I think it's so foolish. And when I spoke to one of the men from [political party], I mentioned these things about buying ecological, and he was like "oh but it's so much more expensive!" And I know that he doesn't want for nothing. I mean he is well-off, he has a good job, a nice house, and a nice car and a nice garage, but then it's like: is it more important to have a nice garage and a nice car and a nice new kitchen? Is it not more important that we have clean fields, clean water and clean air? And about the kitchen, I mean ours is still the old one, and we use paint that is environmentally certified, and that stuff and we don't pour our paint down the drain. Well, it just goes for all of them, to think a bit further than the here and now! […]. But it is so much one can do that doesn't cost, just by thinking differently. I mean you should pay a bit more for the ecological stuff and keep your old kitchen, keep your old table. Yeah, the furniture industry might not like it but…

As mentioned previously, part of the goodness expressed through consumption can be ascribed to the sacrifice made when spending private capital on matters that benefit the collective. However, another kind of sacrifice becomes evident in this quote, that of making do with less than one can afford. Dagmar puts her active choice of preserving the original kitchen in her house against the 'nice new kitchen' of someone else. At the same time as she highlights progressive actions that do not cost anything, she emphasizes that it is also important to be willing to pay more for the 'good' products. In a way, she is resisting the ecomodern narrative that highlights consumption as key to achieving a sustainable society, and in another way, she is conforming to it by presenting

herself as a ‘good’ consumer. Something to take note of is that even when Dagmar is advocating non-consumption, she continues to include objects in her argument: the original kitchen, the old kitchen table and so on. In this way, she still positions herself as associated with certain material possessions; only these are based on previous consumption.

In this chapter, I have used the concept of mimicry to understand forms of conformance and resistance to the ideal evoked in the way we talk about social entrepreneurship. Previous studies have taken a similar approach in showing how indigenous social entrepreneurship practices are influenced by the Western business model and managerial discourse (Martínez et al., 2019; Morales et al., 2021). In this study, I have instead tried to understand how mimicry of social entrepreneurship may take form beyond social entrepreneurs themselves. As we have seen, one way of relating to the ideal of social entrepreneurship is to take on the role of the ‘good’ consumer. Thus, I have demonstrated a way in which social entrepreneurship may encourage a merging of the roles citizen/consumer (Hjorth, 2013; Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006).

In sum, the ideal of the Good Entrepreneur can be simultaneously imitated and challenged amongst citizens. However, there seems to be a tendency to organize discussions around tangible matters, even if the main message goes beyond products. Going back to the insulation conflict, Freja said that after a while it seemed like the discussion was not even about the insulation, that it was as if it became something different. Perhaps, what she felt was that the conflict was rooted in different understandings of how to reach the common good, rather than the particular goodness of glass wool insulation. Seemingly, these opposing views on how to organize the common good are most easily expressed by pointing to the tangible elements of the sustainable transition. Thus, the difference created in imitation involves advocating other products while still presenting oneself as a ‘good’ consumer. This means that resistance through imitation is a defiance that remains within the ecomodern take on the common good.

As we have seen in this chapter, an ecomodern idea of the ‘social’ became settled on the Island. In the previous chapter, I showed how the ‘social’ was relationally constructed through Others. This Othering followed the ‘social’ as it also became settled in non-business contexts. We thus see that social entrepreneurship encourages certain ways of being (Skoglund & Berglund, 2018) which are accomplished by relating oneself to Others. However, the concept of mimicry allows us to also see subtle and perhaps undeliberate forms of resistance to this idealized subjectivity. It is noteworthy that research participants drew upon objects in both resisting and conforming to this ideal.

We thus see that (commercial) objects played an important role in constructing an idea of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship. Next, I discuss how this focus creates criteria for participation in the sustainable transition.

The (for some) unreachable goodness

> …many people can't afford to live in the [Sustainable Island] dream. (Kaj, August 2017)

As we have seen, 'good' products play an important role in showing oneself as willing. To gain association with the idealized Good Entrepreneur, one may present oneself as a 'good' consumer, and in this way become an actor in the sustainable transition. However, this may run the risk of excluding part of the Island community, as Olga explains.

> …most of these people, that I talk to and I help, don't have the ability...they just get by, they just get along. So, saying to them that you should change your way of living by sorting your waste or buying ecological food or...doing something for the environment, they go like, "yeah right! I can't read, I can't write, I don't have a job, I don't have a home [laughing] my friends—I have anxiety problems you know, yeah...so...yeah. (Olga, the municipality, February 2018)

If the way to display will is to consume things that are assumed to be good, willfulness translates into non-possession of such things. What these 'good' commodities have in common is that they are most often significantly more expensive than their unsustainable counterparts. This means that a membership in the progressive group of society requires enough capital to consume the right things. On the Island, people are recognized for commercial participation and produced economic value. What lies outside of this realm, not only goes unnoticed but is also deemed problematic. Sten, who works at the energy company, explains what he sees as the obstacle in the process of becoming a fully sustainable society.

> the rich guys are not the problem. They will invest in their own PV uhm photovoltaic system, solar powers, or they will invest in an EV electric vehicles something something, you know. They have the money and the means to do so, but the guy in a household in the *somewhere* on [the Island] having a household worth 35,000 euro uh perhaps, you cannot even go to the bank to lend money to do stuff like this because the value of his house is simply too small. The bank is saying, "oh, we are not quite sure you'll be able to sell your house at any

> given point, so we are not going to lend you any money”. (Sten, the energy company, June 2016)

The ‘somewhere’ on the Island refers to the remote rural regions where houses in general are not worth as much as they are along the coastline. Sten stresses how residents of these areas not only lack the capital to invest in ‘good’ commodities, but they also lack the credit value necessary to attain a bank loan for the purpose of making such an investment. People on the Island do not blame poorer individuals for not being able to participate in ‘good’ consumption. On the contrary, they show sympathy and understanding for this less-fortunate societal group, as explained by the municipality workers Eva and Mona.

> If you are challenged financially and socially, it's hard to be a part of this whole [sustainable] transition; it requires some kind of resources. (Eva, the municipality, August 2017)

> … the people living in these ghetto areas, in these, they…we shouldn't expect that they could relate to this vision in any way, I think. (Mona, the municipality, August 2017)

It is this understanding of the poor’s inability to participate in the sustainable transition that also sets a criterion for membership in the progressive group. The assumption is made evident that a sustainable transition requires citizens to spend capital in accordance with what has been established as ‘good’ consumption practices. Hence, to be able to mimic the Good Entrepreneur, and to demonstrate will, one needs to be in possession of capital. If not, one will be rendered a problematic, yet sympathized, part of society. Some, municipality workers, in particular, express concern about Sustainable Island’s potential negative impact on an already segregated society.

> My concern was that it was breaking the Island in two, like an A and a B team…when the A team was on the [Sustainable Island] and they were…buying sustainable clothes and they were buying ecological food and they were buying—sorting their waste—and they were buying LED lights and and then the other half was just getting by. It was not about buying ecological food; it was about how to use a carrot. (Olga, the municipality, February 2018)

The fact that participation in Sustainable Island is granted the few and not the many is recognized by numerous people on the Island. There is a perceived injustice in the fact that every citizen cannot take part. However, such criticism rarely addresses the underlying assumption about what is sustainability. That

is, there is no perceived possibility to nudge the criteria for membership in the progressive group; participation will still require consumption of certain sustainable goods. Even if there are voices that argue for Sustainable Island to address social issues, and in this way become more inclusive, this would yet reduce the 'B team' to beneficiaries. There appears to be no notion of the poor as active contributors.

One can presume that those with limited economic capital, who cannot participate in good consumption, overall, participate very little in any consumption. The discussion on what sustainable consumption really means, that is, different consumption or less consumption, is not much heard on the Island. While the prevalent view seems to be that increased (green) consumption equals collective welfare, an alternative view would instead see the current scale of consumption as damaging, both for the environment and for people's general well-being (Jackson, 2005). There are those who argue that in order to save our environment, we need to put the economic development to a halt (Chertkovskaya, Paulsson & Barca, 2019; Escobar, 2015). However, the potentiality of the poorer parts of society to contribute through their non-consumption is not spoken of on the Island. Instead, Island residents tend to emphasize the unsustainable aspects of the underprivileged.

Alvar, who lives in the collective, does not agree with the prevailing business-sustainability language that constitutes Sustainable Island. In the quote below, he explains that this language discourages the poorer parts of society to participate in the sustainable transition. In doing so, he also describes his view on the unsustainable habits of the economically deprived.

> You've got a language that...pushes people, like pushes the bulk or at least a sizable part of the population away...eh and that will probably be the part of the population where transition is the heaviest, you know like, who will be eating a very meat heavy diet and transporting themselves in cars a lot, probably in old cars as well eh...who will be in very big, very energy-heavy houses. (Alvar, the collective, August 2017)

It is perhaps accurate that poorer segments of society have yet to upgrade their houses and cars to more sustainable versions. But the point I want to make here is that the conversation on the Island has been steered towards the unsustainable habits of the poor, and not the unsustainable habits of the wealthy. Sustainability in general is a disputed area regarding both its meaning and how it should be put in practice. For example, Sayer (2016) argues that it is the rich who threaten the well-being of people and our planet. The habits of the poor can be rendered unsustainable, and the habits of the wealthy can be

rendered sustainable because one chooses to exclude certain topics, such as the environmental cost of air travel, or that of manufacturing solar panels, and to highlight others, such as food habits or the possession of outdated cars and houses. This is connected to the prevailing way of talking about societal progress on the Island, which interlinks economic growth and social value. The goodness of consumption is taken for granted as the appropriate means to achieve the common good. Similar conclusions have been drawn regarding the discourse of sustainable development. Banerjee (2003) posits that this discourse reflects an economic rationality in which nature becomes capitalized on, leading to an assumption that simply purchasing green products will solve our environmental problems. However, consumption as a prerequisite for the willing self makes it highly exclusionary. As Irving and Helin (2018) note, the sustainable development discourse is directed to the middle class and fails to recognize those unable to consume. The discourse consists of dualisms, such as human/nature, men/women, and self/other, which 'reinforces rather than alters forms of hierarchy and domination of gender, nature and class' (Irving & Helin, 2018, p. 265).

At the Island, we have seen that in constructing the 'social', a similar kind of duality was created between the 'good' consumer and the Islander. The Islander, here as the poor, unable (and in some cases unwilling) to consume, becomes a form of subalternity created through this instance of social entrepreneurship. The expressed sympathy for them prohibits their equal participation. However, this form of exclusion is perhaps not as unfortunate as Island residents make it seem. For without it, there would be no point of differentiation from which one could measure the progressiveness of the self. It may be the fact that this identity is not available to all that makes it desirable. Just like the identity of the Good Entrepreneur is achieved through the Islander, the idea of a 'good' consumer can only be imagined in relation to an Other.

Summary

In this chapter, I have showed how the ideal of the Good Entrepreneur has settled. Consequently, it is not only business founders and innovative project managers who stress their entrepreneurial qualities in relation to the Islander, but it is also carpenters, housewives, construction workers, retirees, community workers, etc. who seek to ensure their surroundings that they are not the Islander. One way of not being the Islander is to present oneself as a 'good' consumer. Taking on this role can be seen as a way of relating to the

established identity categories of the idealized Good Entrepreneur and the anti-ideal of the Islander. What we learn from this is that social entrepreneurship, when referring to the application of business methods to solve social problems, is likely to affect the subjectivities not only of social entrepreneurs themselves, but also of citizens.

This settled ideal also means that the ecomodern narrative constitutes an interpretative frame for understanding the ‘social’ and directs how one goes about to create a better society. Thus, the sustainable transition utilizes the environmental part of sustainability to promote economic growth, which is believed to have a self-evident correlation with social welfare. From the perspective of this narrative, the ‘social’ becomes material and visible. It is about smart buildings and technology, green energy and organic produce. As a consequence, producers and consumers become important actors in a sustainable societal development. Thus, we see that the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship is relationally constructed, not only with reference to Others but also with reference to objects. The superiority of ‘good’ objects in the sustainable transition creates criteria for membership in the willing group of society. With consumption as a prerequisite for being ‘good’, this attribute becomes unreachable for those lacking the economic means to purchase the right products.

Thus, in the case of the Island, the way in which the ‘social’ was constructed involved representational practices, more favourable to some than others. The idea of what was good for society and what it meant to be a good citizen appeared settled. So far, I have showed how this idea of the ‘social’ can be subtly resisted through mimicry, bringing a slight rereading of the ecomodern narrative. In the upcoming chapter I will outline how the ‘social’ was more overtly resisted and upheld against this opposition.

7 Resisting good will

From the beginning of this research project, what I found interesting about the Island case was the proclaimed resistance from the Islander. It appeared strange to me that someone would resist an initiative that was clearly for their own benefit. In this chapter, I will address this apparent paradox of resisting goodwill. In my interpretative process, I have tried to think of the resistance from various perspectives and at some point, I assumed that the Islander resisted some form of imposed symbolism that would not at first be evident to an outsider like myself. As it turned out, it was much simpler than that. The resistance seemed mysterious because the conversations I had with interviewees tended to revolve around the characteristics of the Islander, who was said to be naturally resisting, rather than their reasons for protesting. Although it is difficult to represent the experiences of 'the Islander' due to its nature as a constructed identity category which may stick to different groups of people at different times, this chapter can be seen as an insight into the perspectives of people who live in economically deprived areas inland and who are known to resist various initiatives. Of course, the perspective presented here should not be seen as 'the true story', but as an alternative to the apparently fixed perception that renders the Good Entrepreneur the ideal and the Islander its opposite.

The title of this chapter, 'Resisting good will', refers not only to benefaction (goodwill) but also to the type of will that I have related to the 'social' in social entrepreneurship. In the two previous chapters, we have seen how such will is understood by looking towards what is considered willful, i.e. one becomes willing by distancing oneself from the Islander. Thus, the notion of will, or the 'social', can be seen as guiding behaviours and opinions in the 'right' direction. As Ahmed (2014, p. 57) explains,

> […] will often takes the form of good will, a will that speaks the language of "ought to," or "should," or even […] the language of "must." We could think of will as a pressing device: bodies are pressed this way or that by the force of a momentum. The will in having direction becomes directive.

Although will should not be seen as coercive, deviating from its path has consequences of being considered willful, as we will see in this chapter. In the following, I will show how the 'social' was resisted in different ways. In the first part of this chapter, I show how people opposed the sustainable transition meant to benefit them, by protesting its materialization. In the second part, I depict how people opposed the idea of production and consumption as sole champions in the creation of a better society. Throughout the chapter, I discuss the role that objects play in the construction of the 'social' and particularly how they are used to uphold the 'social' against opposition. To further understand how the 'social' was upheld, I turn to the concepts of appropriate conflict and discursive closure (Deetz, 1992).

The story of the Disadvantaged Village

> You should just take the car and drive into the villages, and you would see it. They are sad; they are left to their decay […]. If you drive through, you see that they have become completely extinct. The village that I am from, [the Disadvantaged Village], there is one grocery store. Back then, there were three or four grocers, a utility store, two bakers, and there were gardeners and hairdressers and two electronics stores, and now everything is gone. One grocery store left. […] Of course, people live there, but there is no life left. […] It was such a nice village and now it's just…it's sad. (Svend Erik, February 2018)

I'm in the house of Edith and Anton, who lives on the countryside of the Island. We are sitting by their kitchen table and our interview is coming to an end. It is February and outside the window, a snowstorm that has been going on with varying intensity for the past couple of days is once again building up. This weather, which has left most roads on the Island impassable, is by far not the worst seen by Edith and Anton. They recall winters when they could not even open the front door because the snow reached all the way up to the roof. They tell me the usual story of the Islander protesting (this time it is the wind farm) and so, before I leave the interview, I ask if they can refer me to a person fitting this description.

> Edith: Have you been to [the Disadvantaged Village] yet?
> Author: No
> Edith: So, just drive to [the Disadvantaged Village] and go into the supermarket. The opposition is everywhere.
> Anton: There is a…what's his name—Ludvig!

> Edith: I don’t know if he is an opponent?
> Anton: No
> The son enters the kitchen.
> Edith: Do you know someone who is really against the wind farms?
> Son: Has she been to [the Disadvantaged Village]?
> Edith: Ha ha, he also says [the Disadvantaged Village].
> Son: If not there, I don’t know.
> Edith: We suggest you go to the supermarket in [the Disadvantaged Village].
> Anton: Yes […] the boss is called Ludvig, talk to him. He’s not an Islander. He’s a good guy but uhm…he knows people.

When I entered the local supermarket during my first visit to the village, I did notice that people appeared to be a little different there compared to grocery shoppers in the coastal villages. A man and a woman were pacing the aisles of the store restlessly while speaking a bit too loud to each other. The woman was wearing a large purple winter coat on top of sweatpants with a velvety finish while the man had on a dark, slightly more worn-out, attire. They both had the unkempt look and somewhat twitchy bodily movements that make one presume drug abuse. The Disadvantaged Village is often allowed to set the stage in stories of segregation, poverty, and the effects of urbanization on the Island.

> You can see the geographical spread of it nearly on the...like, on the coast where you find the elite and the lefties and the kind of, what should we call it, like the cultural elite, even on [this Island] eh...and then you've got like the internal, the internals of the island; that's where you find the working class and the people who can't afford—basically all more or less based on housing prices—eh funny fact is that in between [the Coastal Village], which is like the hipster central of the Island, and [the Disadvantaged Village], that's ten kilometres. [The Disadvantaged Village] is then a very agricultural town inland; ten kilometres divide them but the difference in one square metre of the house price is...about 3,500 kroner per square metre in [the Disadvantaged Village] and nearly 10,000 kroner in [the Coastal Village]...and that's over ten kilometres so that's like, that's the difference there […] but that will mean the world like moving from [the Coastal Village] where you'll see like...people with weird beards and funny hats and you know all of this, you know, home-made this and that, and then [the Disadvantaged Village] that's like...the local shop and a tractor going through town and you know...fucking pickups with Trump stickers on them. [laughing] (Alvar, the collective, August 2017)

Even if there seems to be confusion regarding who the Islander is, people are (at least sometimes) fairly sure that she or he lives in the Disadvantaged Village. Standing by the cash register in the local supermarket, I remembered

Freja telling me that if I go to one of the villages inland, they will always be able to tell that I am not from there, no matter how I try to dress. After having introduced myself to Ludvig, who had been managing the store since 1998, he hesitantly offered me a 15-minute interview. Quite possibly, it felt strange for him to have a foreigner show up in his shop requesting an interview, way off the tourist season and in the midst of a snowstorm. In the upstairs coffee room, he briefly gave his view about life in the Disadvantaged Village. Despite the promises of Edith and Anton, he did not know of anyone around who had been opposed to Sustainable Island. When asked about it, he said:

> I mean, I know that there are some people, the old, retired farmers and the like. They can simply not understand this line of thought. They are living in a different time. Otherwise, I think that people are generally committed to it. They can see the benefits it brings.

Even Ludvig, who lives in the supposed centre of Islanders, could not point out the resistors. He seemed to have a similarly abstract idea of who the Islander was, as the other people I had talked to. An additional contradiction to my expectations was that he did not spontaneously speak about disadvantage. During our short interview, he was more inclined to talk about community.

> It is a little rural community with a whole lot of activities, you can say. There is an active sports club, an active citizen association, there is a leisure centre with activities. There is something called The Living Chef where there is a lot going on. Someone called [Anette] is running a bunch of cooking classes there and…there is an old nursing home that has been transformed into a bed and breakfast, and things like that. And there is a pensioner association called Active Women. A whole lot is happening in the area, and it's actually really interesting to be a part of it. Like…I'm not only working in the supermarket, I'm on the board of the sports club, and I'm on the board of the leisure centre, where there is a whole lot of activities year-round with all sorts of things. Yoga, the chicken breeders' association. Someone is playing billiard and exercising, so it is actually a whole lot, but…it is the countryside so, of course, it is calm and quiet. (Ludvig, February 2018)

Described from the inside, life in the Disadvantaged Village is perhaps not prospering but pleasant enough. Only this kind of living is not related to economic production, which is, even according to Ludvig, admittedly limited.

> It is very cheap to live in [the Disadvantaged Village], and that is of course something that some people take advantage of, and there are of course a few

> people that stand outside the labour force and live on handouts, like unemployment benefits. So, we don't have the richest people on [the Island]. There is a really big difference between [the Disadvantaged Village] and [the Coastal Village], for example. Very wealthy people live in the [the Coastal Village]. Of course, we have a few here who have it made, but we also have some of the others. So, we can really notice when, like now, everybody just got their monthly pay checks. Now the horrible weather has an impact as well, but we can still see that our revenue increases. Further into the month, the 15th…or the 20th, people here buy less groceries. (Ludvig, February 2018)

There is no question of the socioeconomic differences between coastal villages and inland villages, or that the Disadvantaged village can be used to represent the latter. It is located only a few kilometres from the coast and yet the cost of buying a house there is only a fragment of what a house would cost on the tourist-dense coastal area. People here are said to struggle more than others. Only 25 years ago, there were 55 shops along its main street, and today these have been reduced to five. Although tourists tend to favour the coastal areas more, they also go inland to experience various sites of nature and culture. However, no memorials or cultural monuments lead the way to the Disadvantaged Village, which makes the area unique in being free of tourism year-round.

Here, I would like to remind the reader of one of the main points of the first empirical chapter: that the Islander is rendered a beneficiary in order to create a purpose for the initiative that is Sustainable Island and to help the Entrepreneur become Good. The representation of the Disadvantaged Village is important to construct this image of the Islander as in need of aid. People iterate the notion that there is no 'life' in the Disadvantaged Village. As a response, Sustainable Island aims to bring back 'life'. It was first when I heard Ludvig talk about the richness in community activities that I started to think about the meaning of the word 'life'. On the Island, it seems that the term implies the prefix 'economic', i.e. if a region has enough economic activity, it has 'life'. Seen from the inside, the lack of such 'life' does not seem as sad as portrayed by others.

A history of resisting or A history of imposed objects

In a way, the stereotype of the Islander is true. In the Disadvantaged Village, there has been a history of resistance towards various initiatives. Only here, the opposition is framed differently. This became clear to me during my second visit to the village, when I met Morris from the citizen association. Most people

on the Island can tell stories of harmless initiatives, such as the art museum, that nevertheless provoked the antagonism of the Islander. But what happened in the Disadvantaged Village is not included in the general repertoire of Islander-stories. Here, villagers proudly tell stories of how they have been able to protect themselves from a series of initiatives that always seemed to lead to their further disadvantage.

> [The Disadvantaged Village] has been severely put to the test also in the past. Through the 70s and 80s, they began to clean out the Baltic sea of remnants from the war, things like mines and old bombs and there is something called mustard gas that they used, which they wanted to deposit in [the Disadvantaged Village]. So already then, before my time, [the Disadvantaged Village] has been pushed to the limit. But nothing came of it, and nothing came of the other stuff either. So apparently, we are doing something right, and this thing about standing together is clearly the most important, and this is what we encourage all citizens to do during our meetings, and they are also well aware of it; you have to be brave to live here; that you have to be. We usually say that if wind turbines, mustard gas and nuclear waste would come, then those who live here will keep their houses for life, because you could never sell your house, no one would buy it. So, you would have to live here until you die, and we joke a bit about that, that you would have a house for life. (Morris, citizen association, February 2018)

Morris explained that the Disadvantaged Village was the proposed site for digging down chemical warfare agents from the Second World War. Next, it was suggested to host a nuclear waste site.[17] Most recently, it was advocated as the most suitable location for a wind farm, the biggest one to be placed on the island. For all of these initiatives, the community of the Disadvantaged Village gathered to protest, sign petitions, and send letters to newspapers and politicians. While residents inland and particularly those of the Disadvantaged Village are said to share a history that shows their instinctively resisting character, one can also take a different perspective and instead see a history of imposed objects that have induced resistance. If one adopts this latter view, the material and tangible content to which the opposition was directed is emphasized, rather than the widely told story of the Islander. Against the backdrop of this recent history filled with unwanted objects imposed upon the Disadvantaged Village, came the plan to establish a wind farm.

[17] The Disadvantaged Village was one of six locations proposed by the Danish Government to host the site. To my knowledge, no local actor supported this initiative. In 2018, the proposition was decided against.

Tilting at windmills

In Don Quixote by Miguel de Cervantes (1604), the protagonist (Don Quixote of La Mancha) mistakes a row of windmills for evil giants and decides to attack them; he rides to battle with his lance fully tilted against the windmills. The phrase 'tilting at windmills' has come to mean 'to use time and energy to attack an enemy or problem that is not real or important' (Tilt at windmills, 2020). Protests against the wind turbines on the Island have often been understood in a similar manner, namely as an attack on imaginary dangers.

> They had six good projects planned, everything was finished, everything! And the government was optimistic in the beginning, but then the people started fighting, and fighting, and fighting, because they don't want wind farms […] There is this idea of the shadows; well, will you even be at home right that instant when the shadow passes your house? But they have decided that the shadows are dangerous and I'm thinking *dangerous*? Look at all the things you're doing that are much more dangerous, all the stuff you put into your food, and the stuff you are drinking, and fast food, and flavour enhancers and cars and trains and airplanes, it is, it is—you never fight about that! But when it comes to the wind turbines, then it's a full battle! And they collect signatures, you know, and—*lots* of signatures—and then they send them to the government here on the Island. And as it turned out, several of the parties changed their minds about the wind turbines…because they were worried about losing voters. […] this thing about being so…so *negative* and that you don't want to carry your share of the societal burden, when it is so small! That's what I think. It is not exactly something painful; it is just shadows. (Dagmar, citizen association, February 2018)

For Dagmar, the potential harms of the wind farm are trivial in relation to its potential to contribute to a greater good for all. The wind farm project was initiated by the local energy company along with the district council, in order to make a substantial reduction in the total CO2 emission, and thus, to reach the goal of CO2 neutrality. The wind turbines were to be built on land and be financed by a private European enterprise. Before a local election in the fall of 2017, several of the political parties withdrew their support for the construction of the wind farm, allegedly out of fear of losing votes.

Out of all the opposed objects in the Disadvantaged Village: nuclear waste, mustard gas, etc., the wind farm might seem the most harmless. This may be because wind turbines have an established status as 'good', similar to the 'good' commodities discussed in the previous chapter. They contribute to a clean energy sector, which is considered a vital element in a sustainable society. A wind turbine consists of a tall tower to which a rotor is attached. The

rotor has three blades similar to a propeller, which is attached to a generator. When the wind turns the blades, energy is produced. The Island already had built a couple of wind turbines, but the new ones were supposed to be a lot bigger and more effective. Wind blows stronger higher from the ground and stronger wind produces more energy, which is why the height of the wind turbine matters. When imagining a wind farm, one would most likely see a picture of an open landscape, flat and widespread, and across it, a multitude of tall, white wind turbines scattered symmetrically. The production of energy through wind power requires a vast area of land, which is why wind farms are more often placed on rural locations rather than in cities. Before meeting someone who was actually opposed to the wind farm, I was under the impression that the content of resistance mostly revolved around polluted views, which of course, sounds kind of petty in relation to the greater goal of reducing CO2 emissions.

> It is regrettable that the compensations given to those who live close to the wind farms are not comparable to the nuisance that they experience. You have a house some place that you care about and perhaps you have a nice view, and then there comes the wind turbines that definitely don't flatter the view. And that means that the day you sell the house, you will get less for it. [...] Close to this village there is a wind farm, with the three—so far—biggest turbines on the Island and…when they were to be built, I was contacted by someone from the area because he thought the size of the turbines was frightening, and he had his house close by so…I couldn't see that it would bother us here, that they would be built, but now when we come driving down that road, we see them stretching over the round church and the city, like a landmark. Even though they are 3 kilometres further north, they extend all the way up to the sky, don't they? And it is not pretty, when you have a church like this one from 1150—to have a wind turbine circulating behind it—it is not flattering. And his house is for sale. He doesn't feel like living there anymore. (Otto, citizen association, February 2018)

However, in addition to the polluted views, opposition to the wind farm was grounded in a fear of its technology; a dreading of how its physical properties and functioning could potentially invade everyday life matters and impact on human bodies. As Dagmar already mentioned, one of these concerns relates to the shadows produced by the turning blades of the turbines, usually called shadow flickers. They occur when the sun shines through the rotating blades of a wind turbine, which causes a moving shadow. Due to the speed of rotation, these shadows are perceived as flickering light. Searching for the term 'shadow flicker' on YouTube will render numerous video clips posted by neighbours to wind farms around the world to show what this flicker looks like inside their

homes and the annoyance it causes (see e.g. betterplanWI, 2008). However, on the Island, the shadows are but one of the concerns that regard the wind turbines; another one is the noise.

Rural areas are generally free of the noise pollutions characteristic of cities, silent enough for a person to hear the sounds of nature: birds singing, the wind in the trees and the sound of the ocean. Naturally, in such a quiet environment, the sound of a wind turbine will be pronounced. The noise mostly comes from the turning of the blades. One can compare it to the sound of a landing airplane; however, instead of the familiar blare of the aircraft engine intensifying as it approximates, the sound moves in short circular intervals, repeating the same pattern indefinitely. The sound has also been described as a repeated throbbing, pounding, swishing, rushing, whistling, thumping or pulsating 'whoosh' sound (Henningsson et al., 2013, p. 31). As with the shadow flickers, one may consult YouTube to experience the ever-present noise in the daily lives of wind farm neighbours (see e.g. Kristianpont, 2012). Supposedly, the sound of a wind turbine is heard at its lowest rate when one is standing right underneath it. As distance increases, the sound may intensify up to a certain point (Henningsson et al., 2013). The sound also alternates with weather and season, as well as the atmospheric conditions that differ between day and night. Generally, the sound is perceived to aggravate at night. In addition to this audible noise, citizens living close to the areas of the planned wind farms are also worried about potential health effects on people, animals and plants, coming from long-term exposure to low-frequency sound waves.

> We did some research on the recorded cases of people who have fallen ill. Then it really started to get scary and interesting because it shows that the low-frequency noise is a burden to people. It should be said that you cannot hear the low-frequency sound through the ears, it is perceived in the organs […]. Not everyone is affected, but you can get depressions, or if you have tendencies towards schizophrenia, it can trigger all those things. You sleep extremely poorly. It is especially at night that the noise is insanely harmful. […] When you talk to people who are neighbours to wind turbines, they are ready to cry. They cannot stay in their properties; they cannot escape. They are burdened, mentally and physically, by noise and flickers. Someone told us that their child had come up to them and said "Mom, Mom! My insides are shaking!" (Sonja, citizen association, March 2018)

The fear of the disturbance and possible health effects of the wind farm is aggravated by an imagined scenario where one is forced to stay in one's house due to the property devaluation that is expected to follow the construction of the wind turbines.

> We got a real estate agent to perform a property appraisal after they had made the decision [to establish the wind farm]. Our property lost between 150 and 175,000 [Danish kroner]. It is our retirement savings that we have invested in our farmyard, so we have actually already now paid for the community's clean CO2-conscience with our property. And this is now; when they have actually built the wind farm, we will lose more. Nobody wants to invest in a property that is right beside a wind turbine. It can be hard to sell it and so on. So we have paid a very high price, and the rest of [the Island] is not paying […]. Some people will carry the big financial burden—and we are not compensated. You can apply for it […] but it's very small amounts. People get 10 to 20,000, which is nothing in comparison to what you lose. (Sonja, citizen association, March 2018)

When Morris said 'So, you would have to live here until you die, and we joke a bit about that, that you would have a house for life', he was exemplifying the same concern as Sonja. Living in the Disadvantaged Village until you die is maybe not the problem per se. The issue is rather that the option of moving is lost. In a similar way, the wind turbines could bring about the opposite situation; they could also force you to move.

> There is a safety zone around the area where they chose to place the wind farm, and within this zone you cannot live. So, there were actually some people who would have to leave their house and home because they were located within the safety zone. Then the health authorities say, 'you cannot live there' and the state or the wind turbine company will buy the house and tear it down. And some of these people have lived in their houses for 40 years. (Morris, citizen association, February 2018)

From these accounts, it becomes clear that protests towards objects such as the mustard gas and the wind farm are not only objections to their potential negative consequences for humans and wildlife, but also to their potential to limit one's ability to make choices. One may be forced to move, or one may be forced to stay as a consequence of these objects.

(Appropriately) Resisting 'good' objects

In November 2014, a local television channel showed a 40-minute news feature that treated the re-branding of the Island. The intro read: '[The Island] is now a [Sustainable Island]. But how green are we when it really comes down to it? Is it a genius move or false advertisement? What has the last six years of focusing on the green and the sustainable resulted in? And how do we move

on, if we even should continue down this road'. The documentary shows a journalist who approaches locals on the street with the question 'If I say [Sustainable Island], what do you respond?' Most people answer that they have no idea about the term, a few explain that they do not speak English (referring to the fact that the name Sustainable Island is in English rather than Danish), while others are able to relate it to 'something environmental'. The feature concludes that the Island is not really in the forefront of sustainable solutions as it was intended to be. Two years later, Emil, a municipality employee, reflects on the success of the brand.

> It's...eight years ago and...I will say that we have some difficulties to get the citizens involved in the brand. Perhaps, it's better known outside [the Island] than inside [the Island] one can say […] I think they kind of lost the locals in that process as it was more interesting to talk about [Sustainable Island] in Canada [laughing] than in the local community, and also the brand [Sustainable Island] was not in Danish, so it could be like "ah what is that bullshit; is it just a buzzword or what is the—what is the—the content of this eh [Sustainable Island] thing" yeah […] it is not that easy to [convey] this understanding in ordinary people's minds. (Niklas, June 2016)

Sometimes Sustainable Island was criticized for being just hot air with little substance. Many explain this critique by saying that it is hard for the 'ordinary' Islander to relate to the matters of the strategy. Talk about electric vehicles, or a hotel and conference centre with high-tech energy solutions and water purifications techniques, is not relatable for someone who is struggling to make ends meet at the end of the day. Because it might be unclear to many what Sustainable Island is and does; people might not know if they agree with this strategy or not, or they might simply not care about it. It was only when the strategy became tangible and consequential for inland residents that they started to protest against it. The prospective wind farm made it clear to people what they did not want; it provided something tangible to organize the resistance around.

In accounts describing their protests, inland residents often draw upon the material properties of the objects that they do not want. They explain how their vibrations, sound waves, radiation, toxicity, etc. can disturb natural environments, wildlife and people. The meaning assigned to an object is limited to its built-in affordances (Engeström & Blackler, 2005). This means that the physical properties of an object narrow the range of interpretations we can make of it. We know what a wind turbine looks like, how tall it is, how its blades circulate, and if we have been close to one, we know the sound that it makes. We also know that these qualities of the wind turbine have a direct

impact on our life should we live close to it. In the scenario that it would force us to leave our home or to prevent us from selling our house, the wind turbine would be able to limit the choices we can make. In Don Quixote, the windmills are imaginary giants that need to be conquered in an idealistic spirit of chivalry. The wind turbines arriving to the Island are equally monstrous. But unlike the innocent and passive windmills that become fantastic giants in Don Quixote, the wind turbines of the Island hold a certain agency of their own; they do things that extend beyond their basic function of producing electricity.

Non-human actors, i.e. objects and technology, have the potential to make social relationships enduring (Latour, 1991). This is seen, for example, when black communities in the US disproportionately carry the burden of hazardous waste landfills (Mohai & Bryant, 1992) or when the global waste trade enables high-income countries to export toxic waste to low-income, and perhaps formerly colonized, countries. In this way, objects ensure that historically produced social relationships, such as those between black people and white people or those between the Global South and the Global North, continue. On the Island, it is the relationship between inland regions and coastal regions that persists. Geographically, the most suitable place for the wind farm would not be the Disadvantaged Village; the location that is placed on the Island's highest altitude and thus, is naturally windy, lies next to a historical site frequented by tourists. In order to preserve this tourist attraction, the Disadvantaged Village was chosen as the next best choice. As explained by Morris, similar situations have occurred in the past.

> First the nuclear waste, then the wind turbines, and then the military wanted to have an 85-metre-high mast up here under the pretence that the Danish Intelligence Agency would listen to Putin and Russia. […] So, they had to put a mast up and because of the geography, [the Disadvantaged Village] is located on a high altitude, it would be put here. We made the argument that if they want it located as high as possible, they should put it in [the Coastal Village]. They didn't agree because it wouldn't be especially nice to have such a huge mast of 80 metres in a tourist village. So, [the Disadvantaged Village] had to take the hit again. (Morris, February 2018)

The placement of less desired objects indicates a prioritization of certain regions over others. This becomes apparent when coastal areas hold the polished symbols of the sustainable transition, such as Greenland, while the midst of the Island is left with its unsightly and potentially hazardous materialization, i.e. the wind farm. Hence, objects provide tangibility to the perceived injustice between the coast and the countryside, as Sonja and Simone explain.

> We who live in the middle of the Island—at [the Island], the case is that those who live by the coast, that's where all the attractions are. The amenity value is by the coast. The expensive houses are by the coast; the tourists, the politics are there, all the focus is there: in the cities, there are two or three, and by the coast. Everything that is located inland is not interesting; it is just old farms and agriculture. It's not something that gets promoted, featured or invested in. The economic situation is different for families here; it is workers: farmworkers, social and health workers. Those who buy the houses out here are ordinary workers, and it is also here they have chosen to place the wind turbines. (Sonja, citizen association, March 2018)

> I'm not an opponent of [Sustainable Island]. I am an opponent of the way that politicians force it upon us ordinary citizens. […] It is the feeling of them meeting behind closed doors and making decisions that affect our everyday lives, about, for example, the oil burners, burning stoves, and on to the wind turbines that I am a great opponent of. (Simone, citizen, February 2018)

The discursive representation of a group of people, such as that of the stereotyped colonized people, or that of the Islander, is likely to be difficult to resist until such representation gains material ground. I have mentioned previously that the Islander lacks a fixed referent; that the representation of the Islander is open-ended and sometimes contradictory, for its constructors to be able to lift different parts of themselves at different moments. Even if most people are aware of the circulating story of the Islander, few people would suspect that they themselves fit the bill. The Islander is always someone else. However, this situation potentially changes through affiliation with objects (Suchman, 2005). By this, I mean that the representation of the Good Entrepreneur as ideal and the representation of the Islander as an anti-ideal make themselves known through their association with objects.

The ties between objects and persons represent relations of affiliation which become meaningful for social relationships (Suchman, 2005). One relation of affiliation could be that between an inventor and their object of creation, such as that between an entrepreneur and their enterprise, or that between Freja and Greenland. Another could be the relation between a commodity and its owner, such as that between 'good' consumers and the solar panels they have installed on their roofs. By tying ourselves to 'object worlds', we can position and stabilize our identities (Knorr-Cetina, 1997). In the previous chapters, we have seen how 'good' objects take part in the construction of the 'social', and that in order to be seen as progressive, one ties oneself to these objects by way of consumption or creation. Objects, such as the wind turbines, became tokens of the 'social' to some, i.e. signs that society is moving in the right direction. But

to others, the same objects were posed as villains. In the story of the Disadvantaged Village, an important aspect of the plotline is the recurrently imposed and yet again averted objects. For inland residents, these objects bind them together into a collective who are proud of their bravery and ability to take action, as Morris demonstrates.

> The Disadvantaged Village has been put on the map because of things that have to do with nuclear waste from Copenhagen that they wanted to deposit in the Disadvantaged Village; things that have to do with huge wind turbines, like 150 metre turbines, that they wanted to put up out here actually, and through this the Disadvantaged Village has become known as the village that stands together. All of us have come together in protest, because the wind turbines will ruin the nature and the view. We have a bird sanctuary in the Disadvantaged Village, which would also have been affected by this. […] And the Disadvantaged Village opposed the most. Of course, there were also complaints from the rest of the Island, but the Disadvantaged Village was clearly where most of them came from. I mean, there were almost 400 protests made against the wind turbines, and 370 of them came from the Disadvantaged Village. (Morris, citizen association, February 2018)

The well-known narration of the dystopic Disadvantaged Village, home of conservative and antagonistic Islanders, is, in Morris' account, transformed into a place of solidarity and bravery. For Morris, it is of particular importance to note that the Disadvantaged Village resisted most of all. In a way, he is taking ownership of the role as the Islander in showing off his resisting character. Most importantly, he is drawing upon objects to construct a collective identity, one that the Disadvantaged Village is known for. The imposed objects become part of what the Disadvantaged Village is and why they resist. In this way, they resist the 'social' by resisting the objects that hold it together. However, inland residents are also organized by others on the basis of objects: they become 'the opponents of the wind farm' and can be placed in the category of the Islander.

> Those who are afraid of being neighbours to wind turbines, nervous about their health or financial situation, they are just considered troublemakers. (Sonja, citizen association, March 2018)

As mentioned in previous chapters, the construction of the Islander enables a disregard of resistance by focusing on the resisting character of the Islander instead of the content of resistance. This means that even if protests have generally been successful in halting the establishment of objects such as the wind turbines, the act of protesting reduces one to an Islander, or a

troublemaker, as Sonja says. Hence, these acts of resistance may be seen as demonstrations of freedom and agency, or they may be seen as a deadlock in which the discursive representation of the Islander as an anti-ideal is enforced. Inland residents become the Islander, and their protests are discounted to mere 'tilting at windmills'. I find Ahmed's (2012, n.p.) anecdote of going against the crowd to be helpful in understanding this scenario.

> We all know the experience of "going the wrong way" in a crowd. Everyone seems to be going the opposite way than the way you are going. No one person has to push or shove for you to feel the collective momentum of the crowd as a pushing and shoving. For you to keep going, you have to push harder than any of those who are going the right way. The body who is "going the wrong way" is the one that is experienced as "in the way" of the will that is acquired as momentum. For some bodies, mere persistence, "to continue steadfastly", requires great effort, an effort that might appear to others as stubbornness or obstinacy, as an insistence on going against the flow. You have to become insistent to go against the flow, and you are judged to be going against the flow because you are insistent. A life paradox: you have to become what you are judged as being.

Even if you manage to get through the crowd, you might not come out as you would like on the other side. The protests were successful in altering the distribution of objects, but they could not change the representation that categorized some people as Good and Others as problematic. Thus, the opposition towards 'good' objects may be seen as an appropriate conflict, in that it fits within, and potentially even enforces, the established power structure (Deetz, 1992). As we have seen, the 'social' in social entrepreneurship is constructed relationally through an Other, as well as through associations with 'good' objects. Opposing these objects thus becomes an objection to the 'social'. However, as this opposition is seen as normal and even expected, rather than adjusting the construction of the 'social', it becomes part of what holds it together. 'The Islander' was expected to resist, and in resisting, they became the Islander. Even if the resistance was successful, it reinforced the Other-representation of the Islander, and in doing so, supported the ideal identity category of the Good Entrepreneur, and thus, the prevailing understanding of the 'social'.

In this way, the objects inviting resistance can be seen as deceptive. Perhaps the energy should be directed elsewhere, e.g. towards the lack of participation in decision-making or towards the stigmatization of the rural and the poor. While the triumphs of the various object-battles can be seen as expressions of agency, which gives the protesting individuals a sense of pride and

communion, we could also consider the possibility that these objects function to redirect attention from other potential conflicts. We saw similar tendencies in the previous chapter, where I outlined how 'good' consumption can be seen as a form of mimicry of Good Entrepreneurship. Here, the resistance focused on the goodness of specific products (rather than the fact that products are posed as 'good' to begin with) and thus it remained within the prevailing notion of the 'social' as framed within the ecomodern narrative. The 'good' consumer challenged the ideal that they imitated by presenting themselves as a proponent of a different product, in order to become an even better consumer. This led to a discussion on the products in question and possibly a slight reformulation of the definition of certain 'good' products. However, it could, at its most, switch out one product for another, which means that it did little to change the 'social', i.e. the idea of what is good for society or what it means to be a good citizen. On the contrary, a meaningful conflict is one that does something to alter the current order, and one that enables an increased participation in the ongoing production of meaning (Deetz, 1992). Seen from this perspective, objects not only play a role in evoking resistance but also in potentially guiding resistance towards their direction, as opposed to other possible directions.

So far in this chapter, I have addressed the apparent paradox of resisting goodwill, by shifting the focus from the Islander as inherently resisting towards the objects imposed and opposed. As we have seen in previous chapters, the resisting part of the Islander aided an idea of the Good Entrepreneur as an achiever overcoming obstacles. In this way, the opposition I have described, which was mainly directed towards 'good' objects, can partly be interpreted as appropriate (even if rendered willful), in that it aligns with existing power relations (Deetz, 1992). In the following, I will describe another kind of resistance, namely towards the very idea of production and consumption as sole champions in the creation of a better society, and how this instead may be seen as inappropriate. Further, I will discuss how the 'social' was upheld against such inappropriate resistance through a form of discursive closure (Deetz, 1992).

Upholding the 'social'

In the following, I will depict how the 'social' was upheld against objections of the ecomodern approach to the common good. I will suggest that this type of resistance can be understood as inappropriate, seen through the way it was suppressed through a discursive closure (Deetz, 1992). The opposition that I

will describe here involves a few municipality workers and members of a permaculture collective. It challenges the very idea of societal development as inescapably connected to economic growth and instead argues for the need to address social inequality and to restructure the economic system.

Despite the apparent success of Sustainable Island, some argue that the social problems on the Island persist. According to Olga, the head of the municipality's health department, health issues such as chronic disease and obesity are still mainly found where the people are unemployed and lack higher education. Supposedly, a lot of children leave elementary school without having learnt how to read and write. Olga reasons that without being able to proceed with their education, they grow up to have children very young, and so, social inheritance ensures sustained class differences across generations. Olga is amongst the proponents of a social perspective on Sustainable Island, which advocates initiatives that directly address social inequalities, instead of taking the detour around economic growth. In the following, Olga and Mona explain their views on Sustainable Island.

> I would definitely include uhm the aspect of social responsibility, so then when the businesses are going to promote themselves through the [Sustainable Island] strategy, they have to have—as well as a green strategy or a green way, they also have to argue for their social responsibility. So, how do they [imagine] their social responsibility [to enter] the [Sustainable Island] strategy? uhm that is not something we tell them to do today; they just—they can go along with the green, the energy strategy, the green way and... totally turn their backs on the social aspects. (Olga, February 2018)

> How can we make a resilient municipality if we do not have equality in health, if we do not have equality in employment, if we still have this huge uhm difference between people's health. Many people do not have education here, many... so, we need to focus on that as well, because if we only focus on windmills, we will not be a resilient society. We need to look at the people who live here; we need to look at the way we arrange our community. (Mona, the municipality, August 2017)

In 2016, the municipality attained enough resources to take a more active role in Sustainable Island and to do so they employed a project manager. In 2017, the municipality initiated a strategy camp to which all citizens were invited. The aim of this camp was to have the strategy gain ground with the population and thus to create ownership within the community. Before the camp, which was intended to 'revitalize' the strategy, there was hope amongst some people that Sustainable Island would broaden its prevailing greentech focus. A few

municipality workers tried to draw attention to, on the one hand, the risk of exclusion, and on the other hand, the potential for the strategy to become something more than green production and consumption. In this way, they were resisting the idea of the 'social' as an ecomodern project. Next, I discuss how the construction of the 'social' was upheld against these objections and, more specifically, how objects and numbers could be discursively drawn upon to suppress conflict.

The 'social' as a discursive closure

The suggestion to directly address social problems on the Island can be seen as a disagreement with the prevailing idea of the 'social', in line with the ecomodern narrative that assumes social welfare to follow from economic growth. As I am about to show, the privilege held by objects in the sustainable transition made this a difficult argument to make. Eva, the project manager of Sustainable Island, exemplifies this difficulty below.

> [Sustainable Island] has been called a strategy for the elite, eh and I think that's putting it to the extreme! I think we need to have a strategy for what we want with our island, but I do sympathize with the idea that we should...we should embrace the whole island in this strategy […] I think it's interesting to look into how—how can we compensate, how can we invite a middle way... that goes for everyone. […] Yeah but then—yeah, as some people say: [Sustainable Island] should not solve *all* the problems and that's of course true! [laughing] We have other strategies and politics in the municipality [that are] aimed at the social areas... […] I would have chosen, of course, to have a lot to do with social—we call it social sustainability—it's not a good word, maybe it could be [called] social innovation or social something else. But for now, my—my manager is reluctant; he's afraid that the government will be watching it. (Eva, August 2017)

Eva starts by saying that the critique towards Sustainable Island has been extreme, but that she still would like to find a way to make the transition more inclusive. She then takes a turn and laughs at the idea that Sustainable Island should tackle '*all* the problems'. At the end, she admits to sympathizing with the broad take on Sustainable Island which would include initiatives to directly address social exclusion, but that such ideas have been rejected by management. Besides the apparent ambivalence in Eva's attempts to position herself in relation to Sustainable Island, what I would like to emphasize with this quote is how Eva seems to be repeating the counter arguments she herself encountered when she suggested the idea of including more of the so-called

social sustainability[18] in Sustainable Island. This counterargument renders it absurd to expect everything from one single strategy; of course, the social issues should be dealt with, but why do they have to be addressed through Sustainable Island? Mona, who, in interviews prior to this, has argued for the need for a resilient society that goes beyond the green dimension, here repeats similar arguments.

> The politicians and the mayor and the [municipality director] all said that this very broad perspective of the social […] It's not the issue, they don't really want to broaden it up in that way. They will keep it tight, so that it's green development; it's [reducing CO2 emissions]. In that way, it's not that broad. So, [if] you say it has to be green—the environmental part, the economical part, the social part which are these...three dimensions and the resilience thinking; they don't buy it! Or yeah, they buy it, but they say that's supposed to be [done] in different [departments]—[we] should actually work with stabilizing the health and [lifting] the vulnerable [socioeconomic] groups […] but it's not a part of [Sustainable Island]! [Sustainable Island] is...about making this island green and healthy for the environment and nature, water...and smart tech, you know, do things smarter in order to uhm, to make it a greener environment—so what do you do with the social part? Yeah, very important...but it's not a part of the [Sustainable Island] so uhm...and and that's a grip—that's a perspective uhm I think the mayor also has taken in order to keep the relationship with the businesses, because the businesses found it much too broad. They said, "well if you go with this broad perspective, then it's everything! what is [Sustainable Island] *not* then?" And yeah, I see that risk as well actually—definitely, if we keep it very broad, then you can put everything in it and maybe you lose uhm you lose the the the—it's difficult to commit to something with the partners. So, uhm maybe, you have to do it [this way]. (Mona, the municipality, February 2018)

Adding 'everything' to the strategy means that you lose something, perhaps its essence. Sustainable Island has been a label put to use when applying for EU and state grants, as well as when seeking to attract private investments. The assumption seems to be that in order to draw benefits from this label, it must be very clearly specified what the label entails. The idea that follows is that including initiatives that would more directly address issues such as social exclusion or health, within this label, would make it impossible for the label to

[18] This is the phrase used by research participants to indicate the promotion of equality, health and well-being among people, i.e. it is not to be confused with what I refer to as the 'social' in social entrepreneurship, which I have described as the way that the common good is understood and how this translates into an idea of being a good citizen.

remain well-defined, and thus, for it to attract money. Without a referral to tangible items and technology, such clarity seems to be out of reach.

> I also know that the mayor didn't want the social responsibility included uhm she wanted a clear strategy […]. Perhaps, she thought that it would be too muddy if you started including more social aspects instead of having this green energy business strategy. So...yeah, so, I think that's...I think that's over.[19] [laughing] (Olga, the municipality, February, 2018)

The representation of the social dimension of sustainability as muddy and vague seems to have gained ground even with those who adhere to the idea of addressing social issues in a more direct manner. The environmental dimension is perceived to be more graspable as it involves tangible commodities to be produced and consumed and physical technology, which become easily understood symbols of a sustainable future. Opposition to this focus on the material is disregarded by referring to its elusiveness. An inclusion of a social dimension is automatically translated into an inclusion of 'everything' and hence, into a threat to the success of the strategy. This can be seen as a process of both naturalization and neutralization (Deetz, 1992), i.e. one talks about Sustainable Island in a way that renders the ecomodern approach as the only way, while avoiding the topic of the political beliefs that sustain this view.

Seemingly, objects, like solar panels or wind turbines, provide a feeling of clarity and serve as proof of progression. Such objects, which have been established as good and progressive, overshadow other possible interpretations of the 'social', i.e. the understanding of what is good for society. An example of an alternative interpretation that largely remains in the dark is offered by Alvar and the other members of the permaculture collective to which he belongs.

> I mean for me, it's always—the whole green and sustainability movement has always been a leverage for socioeconomic change […] I see that the green movement, if you wanna call it that, could be a leverage for pushing our society in a more sustainable […] direction. [It's] probably a little bit of a left-wing take on sustainability [in] that we're looking at how is the human factor—like how are the humans actually engaging in this? Like the example would be like

[19] The discussion on whether to include a more social dimension in Sustainable Island was closed after a two-day public meeting held in late 2017. The meeting was meant to revitalize the strategy ten years after its initiation and to create ownership amongst local citizens by inviting them to participate. The result of the meeting was a set of clear-cut goals that had a continued focus on the environment.

> uhm a low energy high rise building, for example, [it] would be a fine interesting project but very inaccessible to a massive chunk of the population [who] wouldn't like—wouldn't be able to afford any of the services that this place would provide uhm...so tying into that as well, a little bit like the democratic sustainability, is that we have to structure society in a way that the democratic...the potential for democratic participation is a lot wider and deeper than it is today. So otherwise, we're seeing a trend where it's becoming more and more superficial, more and more shallow, and I think that's very dangerous for a society... (Alvar, the collective, February 2018)

Within the ecomodern narrative, the green dimension is leveraged to bring about economic growth. From Alvar's perspective, the environmental element of sustainability could instead be leveraged to rearrange the socioeconomic sphere. The point of view expressed by people in the collective, which emphasizes the need to restructure the economic as well as the democratic system and bring it down to a more local level, and which also involves consuming less and being as self-sufficient as possible, has not surfaced in any of the other interviews conducted in this study. I recall bringing up the topic of the collective once during an interview with a person from the business scene, whereupon the interviewee commented, 'I do not like extremists'. From this alternative reading of what is good for society, we can see that any framing of the 'social' will inevitably be political and ideological. Nonetheless, the prevailing way of understanding the 'social' as an ecomodern project presents itself as natural and unavoidable, and as a consequence, other, equally political perspectives, appear 'extreme'. This privileging of the ecomodern discourse and demoting of others is also a form of discursive closure (Deetz, 1992) that serves to uphold a certain understanding of the 'social'. Further, the numbers that display progress appear to give little incentive of changing the approach to societal development.

Numbers as proof of progress

The social problems on the Island have often been framed as a consequence of the high unemployment rate, which in turn has been posed as the problem to solve through the sustainable transition. In this way, the high unemployment rate has functioned as a justification for the initiative of Sustainable Island, as well as Greenland, its most famous example. However, around one year after my first visit to the Island, I started hearing less and less about the unemployment problem. There was generally a positive atmosphere about the development in society. Newspapers were producing headlines such as 'The Island now the highest growth rate in the country' and 'First time in ten years:

more people moving in than out'. As Per who works within the sustainable energy field explained, it seemed like all the hard work had started to pay off.

> I think the last uhm six months, if you [check] some newspaper or...news on the television, you'll see that there's a lot of positive stories about companies who are getting bigger and yeah need more people to employ and so on. So, I think it's very positive right now uhm yeah...and that's very important in comparison with the 80s where there were only, the fishing sector was hit very hard by trouble with no fish [laughing] uhm so, I think it's–I think there is a very positive atmosphere right now uhm, but I yeah, that's where I am, people I meet on the Island and [what] I see [on the] news and so on. (Per, Island Energy Service, August 2017)

After the financial crisis in 2007-2008, the unemployment rate increased on the Island, as it did in most places of the world. In January 2010, the unemployment rate was 10.3 per cent, while the same year in July it was 5.9 per cent. As a comparison, in 2018, the rate was 5.8 per cent in January and 2.8 per cent in July. The Island's unemployment rate has for long been high in comparison to the country average, but it reached the same level in 2019 (when seasonally adjusted).[20] Of course, part of this decrease must be put in relation to the global recovery from the economic downturn in 2008. In any case, it seems that the Sustainable Island strategy has achieved its goal, i.e. to lower the unemployment rate. As a consequence, the focus of discussion changed from the problem of unemployment to the lack of qualified labour. The project manager of Sustainable Island explained this when I asked about the status of the unemployment situation.

> I don't think it's a problem-problem […] I don't see we're having a–discuss it as a huge problem...but if that's because we just accept it or because people are actually quite good at saving up for the winter, I'm not really sure; but it's not a big debate topic. I think the–it's more of a problem that we are lacking labour in different sectors, and it's gonna look gloomy in the future...it's gonna be a lot of vacancies. Yeah that's a much bigger issue. (Eva, August 2017)

As it turned out, the few remaining unemployed people on the Island were often not qualified for the jobs created. When asked about this, Eva explained that it is a paradox they have on the Island. Jobs are created for people meant to move to the Island, rather than the existing residents that are unemployed.

[20] As I have chosen not to convey the name of the Island, I cannot list the sources of these numbers. The purpose of sharing them is merely to give the reader a rough idea of the labour market development.

However, numbers seemed to serve as proof of progress and put other matters in the periphery. When asked how people respond to the positive development, Freja agreed that most people are hopeful.

> I think it is pretty difficult to be negative right now...even for the ones who like to be that. [laughing] (Freja, Greenland, April 2017)

Alvar, member of the permaculture collective, sheds light on the difficulty to critique the sustainable transition in light of its success.

> I think the fact that we're in this situation, like the Island was—that's way before I moved here—but that has kind of set the standard, where there is a bit of climate of, I don't wanna say fear obviously because it's not fear, it's not like an active emotion like that. It's more...it's more like you don't wanna rock the boat too much, both for a fear of getting...like attacked by your peers in society saying "hey look, it's *finally* going well" like, "look we're *finally* creating jobs", "we're finally getting something happening here", you know. So, even development just becomes positive because it's development like so, we we dare not really have the kind of, the critical approach to it […] I think there's very little discussion around this and I think it's mostly due to the kind of...don't—don't fucking rock the boat. You might risk...you know, killing it over and then we're back into shit again. (Alvar, August 2017)

We can read Alvar's analogy of the boat as ecomodernity; one must stay within its margins in order not to jeopardize the good of the whole. As we have seen, conflicts can be both appropriate and inappropriate. Appropriate conflict fits within the established power structure, while an inappropriate or meaningful conflict could enable a broader participation in the production of meaning (Deetz, 1992). In the previous chapter, we saw an appropriate conflict take place, i.e. when the 'good' consumer challenged the goodness of certain products, they still remained within the prevailing understanding of the 'social' as framed by the ecomodern narrative. To use Alvar's wording, they did not 'rock the boat'. The objects and numbers that are privileged in the ecomodern narrative seem to shadow alternative routes to societal development, such as suggestions of reducing consumption or of an increased focus on social equality. The disregard of such discussions can be interpreted as a form of discursive closure, that is, a prevention or suppression of conflict through certain discursive practices (Deetz, 1992). This is seen through how the ecomodern narrative is privileged over others: one view of reality, which reduces the social dimension of sustainability to 'everything' and interprets this as a threat to the feasibility of the sustainable transition, has become dominant and internalized even with those who attempt conflict. This idea

presents itself as rational and objective, and in this way, it dismisses objections. Although this closure is achieved in language use, we have also seen that objects (drawn upon discursively) play an important role in rejecting opposing views. The referral to the threatened success of the whole transition redirects attention away from the suggestion that additional resources need to be allocated to social issues. It enables a sustained market-technological focus on solving both environmental and societal challenges. And so, it upholds a certain understanding of the ‘social’.

Summary

This chapter has showed how the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship is upheld against resistance. In the first part of the chapter, I showed how people opposed the sustainable transition meant to benefit them by protesting its materialization. In so doing, I showed an alternative perspective of the Islander by shifting the perspective from the Islander as inherently resisting towards the ‘good’ objects imposed and opposed. As the two identity categories of the Good Entrepreneur and the Islander are mutually constructing each other, changing the representation of one will also alter the other. Depicting the unintended consequences of the sustainable transition, seen from the perspective of those who resisted it, might give us a more nuanced idea of Good Entrepreneurship.

The ‘good’ objects of the sustainable transition provided tangibility to the perceived injustice between the coast and the countryside. Through affiliation with objects (Suchman, 2005), different roles in the Island society were enacted. While the Good Entrepreneur and the ‘good’ consumer were enabled through their ties with ‘good’ objects, the Islander materialized through the imposed objects that inland residents gathered around in their protests. Despite the success of this resistance in hindering the establishment of imposed objects, such as the wind turbines, I suggested that it did little to change any power relations. The Islander was constructed as an antagonist to the project of the sustainable transition, which enforced a sense of morality and achievement with its protagonists. In this way, the resistance of the Islander can be seen as part of what holds the ‘social’ together; instead of adjusting its meaning, it contributed to maintaining a dominant understanding of what was good for society.

In the second part of the chapter, I depicted how people opposed the idea of production and consumption as the one approach to societal development. They did so by proposing to include initiatives that would more directly address the problems of people, such as health, segregation and inequality. Rendering such ideas as muddy and incomprehensible in relation to the clarity provided by 'good' technology and commodities, objects seemingly functioned to close down such discussions. The discourse of the ecomodern narrative presented itself as rational and objective and rendered other approaches to the 'social' absurd.

We may note a difference between how these two forms of resistance were discursively closed down. Why is it that the opponents described in the first part of this chapter were rendered Islanders, while the latter opponents were not? Even though I have argued that the Islander lacks a fixed referent and can become associated with different groups of people at different times, we can still observe that it appears easier to ascribe this label to some groups than others. The Islander seems to be a category that more effortlessly sticks to residents of rural areas inland, perhaps associated with a more unfortunate socioeconomic background. While this might be seen as a classed dimension of the Islander, we may also consider its materiality. The category of the Islander is assigned to groups of people, at least partly, based on their associations with the wrong objects, such as the heat pump, or with resisted objects, such as the wind turbines.

This chapter has shown both the perspective dependent nature of the 'social' and how one understanding of it holds up against others. This means that the construction of the 'social' can be seen as a quite exclusive process, which I will elaborate on in the coming chapter.

8 On the inclusive/exclusive construction of the ‘social’

In the beginning of this thesis, I asked: how is the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship constructed? My interest has been less in *what* the ‘social’ has been constructed as and more in the process by which it comes to be what it is, and the power relations involved in its construction. Of course, the *what* and the *how* of the ‘social’ cannot be entirely separated as its construction does not have a start and an end point. We should rather see it as a form of reality in the making. Despite of this, the ‘social’ presents itself as natural and settled. By considering both human and non-human actors, I have tried to understand how the ‘social’ is held together. I have found that the ‘social’ implies an idea of what is good for society which relates to the understanding of what it means to be a good citizen. In the following, I briefly recapitulate on how an idea of the ‘social’ was constructed and upheld against resistance on the Island.

The construction of the ‘social’

In chapter 5, we saw that the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship is constructed in relation to an Other, i.e. the Islander. I wrote about how research participants constructed the idealized identity category of the Good Entrepreneur, which involved three necessary elements: innovation, achievement and morality. Innovation, if the reader recalls, was also one of the themes of individualism that I noted in my review on the highly cited articles on social entrepreneurship in chapter 2. In indicating an abstract idea of change and newness, innovation seems to have become an end in itself, bringing us further down the linear path of development. However, to accomplish this element of innovation, we need an old structure from which we can break free. On the Island, this old structure was provided by the Islander, who represented the passive and reluctant part of society. The second necessary element involved in the construction of the ‘social’ was achievement. To achieve as an entrepreneur, one needs to face

difficulties and overcome obstacles (Smith & Anderson, 2004). The Islander, in protesting and objecting to the sustainable transition, offered such an obstacle against which to measure one's achievement. Their opposition further served as a confirmation to the fact that the project was innovative enough to evoke protests. Lastly, the 'social' was upheld through the element of morality. Having a social problem to resolve is crucial here. The Islander took on the role of the beneficiary, with problems such as unemployment, low education, health issues and drug abuse. Despite the sustainable transition aiming to bring back *life* to the Island, and thus, to potentially abolish some of these problems, the Islander rejected the supposed benefit. In doing so, the Islander became willful (Ahmed, 2014), thus highlighting the will and morality of the Good Entrepreneur.

As we have seen, not only the elements of innovation, achievement and morality takes part in the construction of the 'social', but also the connections made to their opposites, i.e. conservatism, antagonism and disadvantage. This means that the 'social' is partly upheld through this mutually constituting relationship between these elements which are represented through the identity categories of the Good Entrepreneur and the Islander.

In chapter 6, I elaborated on the prevailing idea of what is good for society by comparing local assumptions to the ecomodern narrative, which outlines economic development and technological innovation as the right path to societal development (Wright et al., 2018). I showed how this prevailing idea of the 'social' was upheld in settings that went beyond entrepreneurs and businesspeople, i.e. how it took form as an idea of what it means to be a good citizen. I argued that people on the Island may relate to the idealized identity category of the Good Entrepreneur and the anti-ideal of the Islander, by presenting themselves as 'good' consumers. To do this, they took on similar Othering practices as we saw in chapter 5, i.e. they presented themselves in relation to others unwilling or unable to consume. They further associated themselves with the 'social' by drawing upon objects agreed to be 'good', such as sustainable constructions, solar panels or organic produce. Hence, one became a good citizen by way of association with 'good' commodities. This means that 'good' objects facilitated the settlement of the 'social'.

In chapter 7, I outlined how the understanding of the 'social' could be upheld against resistance. I showed how the identity category of the Islander was enacted by inland residents through their opposition towards the implementation of 'good' objects, such as wind turbines. However, as we saw in chapter 5, the resistance of the Islander was an important element in the construction of the 'social', as it served as proof of its innovation and

achievement. Thus, we can think of this depiction of the antagonist Islander as a form of discursive closure (Deetz, 1992). Resistance is ingrained in the very idea of the ‘social’, allowing it to withstand any confrontation. I further depicted how others, not labelled Islanders, more directly opposed the idea of the ‘social’ as approached through production and consumption. Here, we saw how ‘good’ objects and numbers as proof of progress acted to render other approaches intangible, unrealistic and difficult. Thus, the prominence of the material items in the assemblage of the ‘social’ made it difficult for other more impalpable approaches to gain ground. Thus, these ‘good’ objects became important actors in upholding the ‘social’ against resistance.

In sum, we see that a variety of actors were involved in constructing and upholding the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship: entrepreneurs, business founders, protestors and sceptics of new innovations, the unemployed, ‘green’ consumers, the poor and the careless consumers, as well as non-human actors such as heat pumps, wind turbines and solar panels. Seemingly, all of these actors are necessary to uphold a certain idea of the ‘social’.

However, these actors do not participate in the construction of the ‘social’ on equal terms. Some actors gain from the construction of the ‘social’ and others do not. In chapter 5, we saw that some people could become associated with the ‘social’ at the expense of others. In chapter 6, we saw that consumption was a prerequisite for being ‘good’, and that this quality became unreachable for those financially unable to purchase the right products. Further, in chapter 7, we saw that despite the existence of multiple perspectives on what is good for society, it is difficult to oppose the ‘social’ once one perspective becomes dominant. Based on this, I argue that there is an element of exclusion present within the construction of the ‘social’, which we see more clearly through a postcolonial lens.

Through the postcolonial lens

What happens when we look at the relational construction of the ‘social’ through a postcolonial lens? First of all, we are able to question the predominantly positive way in which social entrepreneurship is depicted. In contrast to the associations one might have with the word ‘colonialism’, social entrepreneurship, and particularly, the relationship between social enterprises and communities, tends to be romanticized. André and Pache (2016), for example, assume that social entrepreneurs feel responsible to take care of their community, and Grimes et al. (2013) add that social entrepreneurship is driven by compassion. Often, we assume that social entrepreneurship enables and

empowers (Mair & Martí, 2009) and that it transforms the lives of the poor and the marginalized for the better (Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2004). Social entrepreneurship is also seen as a remedy of social exclusion (Kummitha, 2016). This means that we generally understand social entrepreneurship as a site of empowerment, emancipation, care and compassion. The fact that social entrepreneurship discourse thrives on compassion and morality makes it a phenomenon difficult to critique (Berglund, 2018). However, critique is duly needed (Steyaert & Dey, 2018). The postcolonial lens gives us new perspectives on social entrepreneurship in two ways. First, the analytical tools of Othering and mimicry allow us to comprehend the power relations involved in the construction of the 'social'. Second, by way of analogy with the colonial setting, it encourages us to question how we think of societal development today.

Power relations in constructing the 'social'

Postcolonialism is about repoliticizing contexts that have been depoliticized. As the 'social' usually presents itself as neutral and good for all, there is a need to critically explore it (Barinaga, 2013; Cho, 2006; Nicholls & Cho, 2006). Exploring the 'social' from a postcolonial lens has allowed us to further understand the political character of the 'social' and the power relations involved in its construction. In this thesis, exploring how the Islander was constructed became a gateway to apprehend how power relations might take form in instances of social entrepreneurship. The finding that social entrepreneurship depends on an Other to become both 'good' and 'entrepreneurial' indicates a problematic element of exclusion inherent in the construct of the 'social'.

When it comes to the literature on social entrepreneurial identities, a few studies have suggested that social entrepreneurs construct their identities in relation to what they are not (Phillips, 2013; Yitshaki & Kropp, 2016). In the field of entrepreneurship, Scharff (2016) found that musicians construct themselves as entrepreneurial (minus the 'social' prefix) by pointing out other musicians who are lazy. Thus, one would not need to consult postcolonial literature to understand processes of Othering, even if it is a concept that reappears in several postcolonial texts (e.g. Bhabha, 1994; Fanon, 1963; Said, 1978). What the postcolonial perspective does is that it shifts the focus away from those identifying as (social) entrepreneurs and towards the ones being Othered. As a consequence, it not only becomes interesting to understand how social entrepreneurs construct their identities as both 'good' and 'entrepreneurial', but also how this potentially results in an unfavourable

representation of their Others. Thus, it is not just social entrepreneurship that is accomplished through the narration of the Other; in this process, the Other is also assigned an identity. The postcolonial lens further helps us understand the ambivalence present in rendering the Other (Bhabha, 1994), which, in the case of social entrepreneurship, highlights how the beneficiary can be made the foe and the sympathized friend at the same time. Thus, the postcolonial perspective allows us to see the problematic issue of representation present within the construction of the 'social'.

Social entrepreneurship studies treating issues of power and representation tend to focus on the relations between the North/South and matters of ethnicity. For example, in a study of social entrepreneurship in South Africa, Daya (2014) showed how accounts of 'saving' beneficiaries became objectifying. These accounts enforced differences between groups by reproducing polarities of, for example, black-white and healthy-diseased. Similarly, Flowers and Swan (2017) showed how a social enterprise unintentionally ended up reproducing stereotypes of gender and race by selling 'racial difference' (p. 216). My study shows that there are reasons to be aware of similar issues of representation also in instances of social entrepreneurship that lack dimensions of race and ethnicity, or prior colonial relations. On the Island, the construction of the 'social' did create distinctions between people, but here the dimensions enforced were coastal/rural, and wealthy/poor.

Through the notion of mimicry (Bhabha, 1994), I was able to understand how the 'social' became settled. I have argued that the idealization of the identity category of the Good Entrepreneur encouraged imitation. The associated role of the 'good' consumer became attainable by purchasing 'good' objects. Previous studies have also noted that social entrepreneurship influences how people act and how they see themselves. These studies particularly focus on how the discourse on social entrepreneurship steers the practices and identities of social entrepreneurs (Dey & Steyaert, 2016; Dey & Teasdale, 2016; Mauksch, 2018; Parkinson & Howorth, 2008). Some also problematize how the ideal of social entrepreneurship may influence ways of being amongst citizens (Berglund & Skoglund, 2016; Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006; Hjorth, 2013; Skoglund & Berglund, 2018). Thus, my finding that the ideal of Good Entrepreneurship produces 'good' consumers is not new. However, it provides a different framing of the phenomenon.

The way that entrepreneurial discourse encourages citizens to take on economic roles (Harvey, 2005) is often framed through the lens of neoliberal governmentality, which means that individuals are viewed as being governed by a macro discourse which steers their subjectivities. My study paints a

somewhat less (post)structuralist picture by instead using the concept of mimicry (Bhabha, 1994) which puts more emphasis on the agency of the imitator. Through mimicry, it is possible to (at least partly) resist the idea of what a good citizen should be. This means that our roles as economic actors and entrepreneurial selves are not set in stone, but may be transformed through our enactment of them.

Further, when discussing how social entrepreneurship encourages us to be a certain way, I have not focused on the struggles experienced by social entrepreneurs and consumers in being disciplined to ''Achieve more!' 'Perform!' 'Fight against all odds!' and 'Have fun in the meantime!'' (Berglund, 2013, p. 730). Of course, constantly having to present oneself as innovative, achieving and 'good' may involve plenty of hardship. However, the postcolonial perspective has steered me towards how this way of being is accomplished through an Other. This means that I have put less focus on those enacting social entrepreneurial subjectivities, and more emphasis on the ones who fall outside of this construction. To do so, I have emphasized how the goodness implicated in this local construction of the 'social' became impossible for some to attain. Thus, I have outlined how social entrepreneurial ways of being also may involve the construction of subaltern forms of subjectivities, i.e. not just Others but marginalized Others. In doing so, I have touched upon the classed dimension brought about by the ideal of social entrepreneurship. I see this shift in focus, away from social entrepreneurs and towards the people in their peripheries, as an important empirical contribution.

So far, we have seen that the postcolonial lens provides an understanding of how power relations are involved in the construction of the 'social'. While a variety of actors were necessary to construct this 'social', they did not have equal say in the conversation on what was good for society. We saw that willful acts (Ahmed, 2014), such as protesting innovations or refuting 'good' consumption, were necessary to uphold a certain idea of the 'social'. But, at the same time, these willful actors were unable to influence the approach to societal development. In highlighting how opposition directed to the sustainable transition was simultaneously paraded and disregarded, my study has addressed the particular problematics of resistance to social entrepreneurship. Such resistance has previously mainly been posed as an obstacle on the road to success or a natural consequence of innovation (e.g. Mair & Martí, 2009; Sharir & Learner, 2006; Swedberg, 2006), assumed to lead to an adjustment of the 'social' (Newth & Woods, 2014; Newth, 2016). Here, we find a paradox of simultaneous inclusion and exclusion, i.e. the social entrepreneur needs a beneficiary and an antagonist to become 'social' and

innovative (inclusion), but they are not participants in the construction of the 'social' (exclusion). This can be compared to the construction of professional identity, which is achieved by contrasting one's identity with Others, who thus become both excluded and included (Ashcraft et al., 2012). An example of this is the professional identity of the manager who depends on the secretary as a secondary Other. We may further relate the Othering of the Islander to the concept of peripheral inclusion (Rennstam & Sullivan, 2018), which implies inclusion in a social group without granting full membership. Dey, Schneider and Maier (2016) have also noted that the social entrepreneurial subjectivity involves a form of 'inclusive exclusiveness' (p. 1457), in that it simultaneously celebrates exceptional individuals while being posed as something that everyone can and should be. However, they do not elaborate on the parallel inclusion and exclusion of Others. On the Island, the 'social' was rather inclusive and available to the many, but to some who were needed in the role of the Other. In this way, we see that the inclusion of Others in the assemblage of the 'social' becomes excluding.

By analogy with colonialism

Since postcolonialism traditionally directed its gaze towards colonialism and its repercussions, adopting this lens in a different empirical context will inevitably create associations between this new context and the historical context of colonialism. Before I reflect upon what type of links we might make between social entrepreneurship and colonialism, and how this might help us to view the former in a new light, I would like to say something about why this comparison is unescapably problematic.[21]

Colonialism and neocolonialism have involved and continues to involve a reality of domination, violence, slavery and exploitation. By comparing this reality of colonialism to another context, particularly one that lacks its severity and violence, one runs the risk of reducing the unique past and present experiences of the concerned people to something generalizable to us all; as if it would somehow encompass the experiences of Western/white people, which it, of course, does not. Ahmed (2000, p. 81) exemplifies this in problematizing the metaphorical treatment of the term 'migration'. She writes:

> Migration becomes an impossible metaphor that no longer refers to the dislocation from place, but dislocation as such (thought already dislocates). The

[21] Note that I here reflect upon how the *analogy* drawn between social entrepreneurship and the historical context of colonialism can be problematic, and not the challenges of adopting a postcolonial *theoretical* lens, which I treat in chapter 3.

> migrant becomes a figure: this act of granting the migrant the status as a figure (of speech) erases and conceals the historical determination of experiences of migration, even though those experiences cannot be reduced to a referent.

Based on this, I would like to emphasize that from the associations created between the two contexts of social entrepreneurship and colonialism, there are gains to be made in terms of furthering our understanding of the former but not the latter. Social entrepreneurship is not the same as colonialism, but there are insights to be drawn from the comparison of the two. It further seems that when applying a postcolonial lens, however problematic, the evocation of this analogy is impossible to avoid. Therefore, I will reflect on the types of associations the postcolonial perspective brings and how these associations might be useful for us to start thinking about social entrepreneurship in new ways.

I have already written extensively about the Othering practices present in social entrepreneurship and how these remind of the way that the colonized were Othered by their colonizers, as well as how the imitation of the idealized Good Entrepreneur can be resembled to how the colonized imitated their colonizers. Here, I would like to further underline how our present idea of what is good for society can be better understood by referencing the colonial context.

Although we look back at it today in incredulity of its horror and cruelty, colonialism and its mission of civilization was, in the Western society, broadly thought of as a good thing. This fact in itself allows us to reflect upon how the good has been constructed in different times, and how it presents itself, across eras, as natural and unavoidable. Several scholars have noted that our idea of 'societal development' today relates back to colonialism (Banerjee & Prasad, 2008; de los Reyes & Mulinari, 2005; Mir, Mir & Upadhyaya, 2003). We usually talk about this idea of development as framed within the discourse of modernity, wherein a linear scale of development poses some countries behind and others in the forefront. What determines the placement on this scale is the country's or the region's degree of economic growth and technological advances[22]. This notion of 'societal development' has been depoliticized (Dey & Steyaert, 2010), just like the construction of the 'social' on the Island.

Comparing our assumptions on social entrepreneurship today to the perceived goodness of past colonial missions may enable us to question what we take for

[22] Of course, there are other approaches to societal development, emphasizing e.g. non-consumption and de-growth (e.g. Chertkovskaya, Paulsson & Barca, 2019; Escobar, 2015). But these are still seen as alternative to the dominant story.

granted about societal development. Colonialism involved an essential contradiction, i.e. the mission of civilization was to change people, to make them 'civilized'.[23] But at the same time, the colonized were assigned the fixed quality of savagery, rendering them unchangeable. Prasad and Prasad (2003) have noted a similar contradiction in managerial discourse, referring to how it simultaneously emphasizes worker empowerment and worker surveillance. The phenomenon of social entrepreneurship, which has become an important way to undertake societal development today (Dey & Steyaert, 2010; Chandra, 2018), implies further contradiction—it celebrates individualism while declaring to exist for the collective.

In this study, I have tried to portray the problem of representation inherent in social entrepreneurship. To do so, I have showed how social entrepreneurship is constructed as an ideal subjectivity. Social entrepreneurs are celebrated for their action-orientation, achievements and innovations, which inevitably poses those who are not these things, and thus, who cannot solve their own problems, as problematic. The ideal of individualism, present in the way that we talk about social entrepreneurship, implicitly becomes a vilification of beneficiaries who are in need of 'help', or in other words, people of lesser socioeconomic privilege.

The category of the Islander serves as an example of how people may relate themselves and Others to this ideal. Elevating oneself through the Othering of the Islander is reminiscent of a competitive predisposition rather than one of solidarity. Lifting our gazes, we can think of the Islander as an old structure that we want to move away from in order to *develop* and to become progressive as societies and individuals. In this way, the distance we try to achieve between us and the Islander becomes symbolic of the idea that we need constant development, which many times seems to imply economic growth. Seen in this light, the very way in which we think of societal development creates distinctions between people, ranging from the way we differentiate between developed and developing countries on a global scale, to the way we differ between the coastal and the rural regions of a small Danish Island.

My illustration of how the 'social' was constructed as aligned with the ecomodern narrative may serve as a local example of how a depoliticized idea of societal development takes form. However, when it comes to this type of social welfare creation, it is the responsibility of individuals to spot opportunities to make life better for themselves. By living by the rules of the

[23] According to Oxford Lexico, 'civilized' means 'at an advanced stage of social and cultural development' or 'polite and well-mannered' (Civilized, 2021).

market, one becomes a willing individual who plays a part in the creation of a better future. My findings highlight that this idea of the ‘social’ may lead us to discredit ‘unproductive’ parts of society. We can see similar tendencies in the global environmental debate as we did on the Island: the poor (countries) are posed as problematic for our ability to halt climate change (Banerjee, 2003).

Further, the sustainable transition meant that some groups would have to carry the burden of the environmental backyard, while the people living along the coast would reap the benefits of the front yard. This brings to mind the issue of environmental justice, which is usually thought of from the other way around. We know that poor communities are disproportionately affected by climate change (Wright et al., 2018), that they are often the ones hosting landfills and hazardous waste sites, and that they are more likely to be exposed to air and water pollution (O’Lear, 2010). But we know less of the distributive injustices potentially created in a ‘sustainable’ society, and the social repercussions of environmental implementations.

In sum, comparing social entrepreneurship to colonialism helps us to see how the prevailing idea of what is good for society may legitimize the overriding of opinions, and thus, how one can be rendered a saviour even when the saved resist the salvation. Similar to The White Man’s Burden to civilize, the burden of societal development falls on the social entrepreneur. Thus, this comparison, although it is quite strong, is a way of shedding light on how powerful an idea of the ‘social’ may be once it becomes fixed. We saw an example of this on the Island, where economic growth was the assumed prerequisite to social welfare. By resembling social entrepreneurship to colonialism, we can easier understand how established notions of goodness also can have exclusionary effects.

Summary of contributions

My study has implications for the way we think of social entrepreneurship, particularly with regards to how we can make sense of the ‘social’ in social entrepreneurship. Here I will outline how my findings contribute to our understanding of the construction of the ‘social’ as well as how they may contribute to expanding the range of applicability of postcolonial theory.

Understanding the 'social' in social entrepreneurship

Through my empirical illustration of how the 'social' is constructed I have contributed to our understanding of the 'social' as both political and ideological (Barinaga, 2012; Nicholls & Cho, 2006). While I am not the first to problematize the way that the 'social' is intertwined with an economic and managerial discourse (e.g., Dey, Schneider & Maier, 2016; Hjorth, 2013), my study furthers our understanding of *how* the 'social' is constructed, by outlining how it is assembled and upheld, as well as the power relations involved in the process. The 'social' presents itself as naturalized and fixed, as it in different ways deflects objections. I have found that the 'social' is constructed in relation to an Other, and further that the idea of the 'social' and its opposite, i.e. the willful Islander, becomes settled through associations with objects. In doing so, I have showed how objects can become powerful actors in the construction of the 'social'. These findings should not be interpreted as a universal explanation of how the 'social' is constructed, but, as an illustration of how power may play out in social entrepreneurship; something that we generally accept as good, empowering and harmless. This acknowledgement of power relations has implications for how we can understand the relationality of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship.

Inviting new perspectives on the relationality of social entrepreneurship

The concept of relationality is frequently framed as a way forward in reshaping the way that we talk about social entrepreneurship. Critical social entrepreneurship scholars highlight the way that academic writing has the power to change dominant conceptualizations of social entrepreneurship by lifting alternative stories of its sociality (Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Steyaert & Hjorth, 2006). Within this stream of literature, viewing social entrepreneurship as a relational co-construction has been posed as a step towards the deindividualization of social entrepreneurship, i.e. as a way to shift our focus from the messiah that is the social entrepreneur (Dey & Steyaert, 2010) and towards collective processes of creating social change (Hjorth, 2013). The well-cited article by Steyaert and Katz (2004, p. 192) hold that

> The focus on the everydayness of entrepreneurship and the shift from a view of an elitist group of entrepreneurs towards a more encompassing, although anonymous, participation of all kind of citizens, has an inevitable political consequence, as it ultimately concerns the democratic process through which people can become integrated in the construction of society.

Following this literature, Friedman, Sykes and Strauch (2018) suggest that we shift our focus from individual social entrepreneurs to social relations and the ongoing construction of social realities. Within their conceptualization, the relational framing is posed as an alternative to the 'competitive market framing' (p. 260), which instead views social entrepreneurship as 'a relational process that can potentially reconfigure social spaces, thereby expanding the realm of the possible' (p. 240). Thus, in these texts, the frame of relationality is used to rewrite social entrepreneurship as an inclusive, and potentially even democratic, process.

Although I acknowledge the transformative potential of this type of performative theorizing, I find it equally important that we, in parallel, conduct empirically grounded explorations of how social entrepreneurship, in its variety of expressions, plays out in society. While doing so, I have found that existing conceptualizations of the relationality of social entrepreneurship tend to neglect power relations. My finding that processes of Othering are needed to relationally construct the 'social' gives us a different idea of the 'anonymous participation of all kinds of citizens' that Steyaert and Katz (2004, p. 192) describe. More specifically, we have seen that in this inclusion of the many, a simultaneous form of exclusion takes form, which prevents certain societal groups from partaking beyond their role as Others. Thus, when considering the relationality of the 'social', it seems necessary to not just acknowledge the participation of a variety of actors, but also to recognize that they play different roles in the co-construction. My study has shown how postcolonial theory, and particularly the concepts of Othering, ambivalence, and mimicry, can help us understand social hierarchy and power relations in the collective construction of the 'social'.

Further, I have added to our understanding of how non-human actors take part in this relational process. This is in line with the suggestion made by Calás, Ergene and Smircich (2018) to re-imagine the 'social' as an assemblage of both human and non-human actors. Like these authors, I have been inspired by Latour (2005) in considering the connections and associations that hold the 'social' together. Calás, Ergene and Smircich (2018) show how a cotton seed in a clothing company organizes sustainability and enables the 'social' to become 'more-than-capitalist' (p. 287), which means moving towards 'non-capitalist'. I have added to our understanding of how objects co-construct the 'social' by demonstrating how human actors and objects interact to uphold a certain idea of the 'social' against resistance. On the Island, objects operated to make the 'social' tangible. They facilitated the settlement of the 'social', they guided resistance towards the sustainable transition in their direction, and

they also served as discursive tools to draw upon when rejecting opposition. Objects further served to connect people to more or less desirable societal roles. We can see this through the association made between the 'good' consumer and the solar panel as well as the connection drawn between the Islander and the old oil burner, or the wind farm that they resisted. Thus, I have shown that an enhanced understanding of the associations by which the 'social' is assembled is not only useful for the re-imagining of social entrepreneurship as something 'more-than-capitalist' (p. 287), but also for our understanding of how a certain idea of the 'social' endures, capitalist or not.

In sum, considering the relationality of the 'social' is not necessarily a way to rewrite social entrepreneurship into something else, nor is it essentially a way to critically deconstruct its capitalist undertones. It is merely a way of empirically exploring how the 'social' is constructed while considering the role that different actors take on, or are assigned, in the process. Given the inevitable power relations that take shape in constructing the 'social', I suggest that we draw further inspiration from postcolonialism (e.g. Bhabha, 1994) and sociomaterialism (e.g. Latour, 2005), in our future endeavours to understand the relationality of social entrepreneurship. In doing so, we may ask: How does a certain construction of the 'social' benefit some and disfavour others? This way of exploring the relationality of the 'social' may be interesting also for those concerned with participatory approaches to social entrepreneurship (e.g. Gleerup, Hulgaard & Teasdale, 2020; Ruebottom, 2018) as it highlights the potentiality of parallel processes of inclusion and exclusion. It may be of further interest to those more concerned with the democratic outcomes of social entrepreneurship (e.g. Eikenberry, 2018) in that it addresses the question of who gains from a particular construction of the 'social', while considering both the more intangible matter of discursive representation as well as how it de facto materializes for different societal groups. Thus, by exploring the relational process by which the 'social' is assembled and upheld against resistance, we might be better able to understand matters of democracy in relation to instances of social entrepreneurship.

Broadening the relevance of postcolonial theory

The postcolonial perspective has been applied to some extent in the fields of social entrepreneurship, CSR, and international development, mainly to understand how Western 'good' organizations solve the social and environmental problems for a previously colonized or currently low-income country (e.g. dos Santos & Banerjee, 2019; Pearson et al., 2019). The few studies that take a power perspective on social entrepreneurship often consider

the same dialectics between North-South or Black-White (Daya, 2014; de Lima, 2020; Martínez et al., 2019; McSweeney, 2020) and how it reinforces a skewed power balance, by for example reproducing racial difference (Flowers & Swan, 2017). Similar to these studies, the postcolonial lens has allowed me to understand how an instance of social entrepreneurship may enforce social distinctions. However, instead of exploring the dimensions of North/South or Black/White, which are traditionally focused on in postcolonial studies, my study has highlighted the distinctions made between the wealthy and the poor, as well as the coastal and the rural. Thus, the theoretical framework provided through postcolonialism, and particularly the concepts of Otherness, mimicry and ambivalence (Bhabha, 1994) may further help us explore aspects of class in relation to social entrepreneurship.

In sum, my study demonstrates the relevance of postcolonial theory also in instances of social entrepreneurship that lack the presence of a North-South relationship or the dimension of ethnicity. The skewed power relationship between those who give and those who receive is most easily perceivable when the benefactor is a powerful nation or institution, like the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, and their relationship to beneficiaries is tainted with a history of colonization. By exploring an instance of social entrepreneurship that takes place within the high-income economy of Denmark, my study demonstrates that the postcolonial lens can also shed light on the power relations present within a local setting of the 'West'. Like Śliwa (2008) and Sharpe and Mir (2009), I apply the postcolonial perspective in a new context that we normally do not associate with postcolonialism. By doing so, my study highlights the relevance of postcolonial theory and contributes to expanding its range of applicability.

Final reflections

There are of course other ways to understand what went on during the sustainable transition on the Island. In the introductory chapter of this thesis, I mentioned some of my initial understandings and how I came to adopt a postcolonial lens. Against the backdrop of the broadly assumed goodness of social entrepreneurship, the vague manner in which the 'social' is depicted, and the lack of acknowledgement of the power relations involved in its construction, the postcolonial lens has allowed us to understand some of the more problematic aspects of social entrepreneurship. It has made us to see

some things more clearly, such as power relations, while perhaps hiding other, more positive, aspects of social entrepreneurship.

The fact is that the sustainable transition taking place on the Island did bring about a certain kind of social welfare. The Island gained international recognition for its sustainable transformation, which led to an expansion of the tourism industry as well as the green industry. The Island region showed a higher growth rate, and the number of people moving to the Island started to outnumber those moving away for the first time in a long while. The problem of lacking employment opportunities was replaced with another—that of lacking qualified workforce. Additionally, the transition of course brought gains for the environment. The conversion to green energy meant a reduced CO_2 imprint and the fact that some residents became more aware of the impact of their consumption habits meant that industry actors had an incentive to make their production and products more environmentally friendly. The sustainable transition was, as we can see, an ecomodern success story. Without disclaiming the societal benefit gained from this instance of social entrepreneurship, my endeavour has been to highlight alternative interpretations of this narrative, in order to demonstrate the inherently political and perspective-dependent character of the 'social'.

In my postcolonial framing of social entrepreneurship, I have showed how the construction of the 'social' involved a dimension of exclusion. As a consequence, I have not contributed to the stream of literature that calls for a re-imagining of social entrepreneurship (e.g. Steyaert & Hjorth, 2006) by for example supporting 'a more prosaic and open-ended image of social inventiveness' (Dey & Steyaert, 2010, p. 98). Even though I have put the label 'social entrepreneurship' on an empirical setting characterized by collaborative activity amongst a multitude of actors, thus moving beyond the standard focus on the individual social entrepreneur, I have described this activity as the application of business methods on social problems. By outlining an idea of the 'social' as aligned with the ecomodern narrative, thus framed within a managerialist discourse, some might argue that I am in fact reinforcing this conception of the 'social', and that it would be more fruitful to write performatively for social change by reframing social entrepreneurship (e.g. Dey, Schneider & Maier, 2016; Hjorth, 2013).

Instead of defining social entrepreneurship as the solving of social problems through business methods, I could have chosen a different route, i.e. I could have endeavoured to expand our understanding of what social entrepreneurship means. If I had taken a view of social entrepreneurship that includes most creative effort directed towards social change, perhaps I would have seen

expressions of social entrepreneurship take form all across the Island. Even the Islanders, in their organized resistance of sustainable constructions, could have been labelled 'social entrepreneurs'. This would have generated a different narrative, one in which social entrepreneurship perhaps could have kept its status as good. It may further have softened the divided picture I have drawn up between the Good Entrepreneur and the Islander, and the accompanying relationship of privilege and subordination, which the reader might argue lacks nuance.

The reason for sticking with the 'business methods' definition, is that the business approach stood out to me as the dominant one in undertaking the sustainable transition on the Island, and it stands out to me as a common way of solving societal problems also on a broader scale today. Therefore, instead of showing what social entrepreneurship could be, I found it critical to explore how it, in its presently predominant form, plays out in and impacts on society. I see this as a different but equally important way of writing for social change. However, this means that I have explored but one possibility of the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship rather than its full spectrum. Without denying the potential of social entrepreneurship to do good, I have brought forth an alternative perspective of social entrepreneurship that acknowledges its additional element of social exclusion. By adding an alternative story to the dominant narrative, I have hoped to convey that social entrepreneurship is in fact a spectrum, and not a stable category of goodness.

In this thesis, I have outlined how the 'social' is constructed in an instance of social entrepreneurship where business methods were applied to solve societal problems. However, social entrepreneurship can imply a multitude of empirical contexts, such as 'social inventiveness' (Dey & Steyaert, 2010), grassroots organizations, social activism, NGOs, for-profit ventures and the like. Due to its variety of expressions, it is difficult to conclude something general about social entrepreneurship. Questions still remain, such as: how do power relations play out in other instances of social entrepreneurship, where business methods is not the approach to solve societal problems? If the 'social' would not be guided by the ecomodern organizing narrative, but instead of one that emphasizes social and environmental justice, or new ways of organizing society that challenges prevalent economic relations (Wright et al., 2018), would we see a different assemblage of the 'social', one that perhaps would not involve processes of Othering? Is the problem of representation inherent in social entrepreneurship or can it somehow be avoided? What would happen if we change the way we talk about social entrepreneurship—from the discourse of the saviour and the saved, towards a discourse of citizens with rights, and

organizations held accountable for the fulfilment of these rights—would we still be talking about social entrepreneurship?

In a study of the relational co-construction of the 'social' in social entrepreneurship, some will surely find it odd that I have not observed actual interactions between the participating actors. In an interview study, the interactions the researcher can observe are principally those between the interviewer and the interviewee. When I write about how the 'social' was relationally constructed, I am referring to how interviewees referred to themselves as good citizens as well as how they described what was good for society by drawing upon Others. Thus, I have explored how research participants constructed meaning in interaction with me. In order to generate a broader understanding of the relationality of the 'social', future research could apply different theoretical and methodological approaches. For example, a symbolic interactionist study (e.g. Goffman, 1967; Mead, 1934) could explore how the 'social' is relationally constructed through the meaning produced in face-to-face interactions. This would necessitate an ethnographic approach in which the researcher carefully observes interactions between the actors involved in an instance of social entrepreneurship. A symbolic interactionist study could potentially bring a more balanced perspective on the power relations present in the co-construction of the 'social'. However, it is important to note that in such an approach 'the Islander' might never appear, partly because of its nature as a mere construction which lacks a fixed referent in specific groups of people, and partly because of the lack of interaction between residents of coastal and inland areas.

Further, I have only begun to explore how the material comes to matter in the construction of the 'social'. Postcolonial theory is often criticized for its overemphasis on discursive and symbolic matters, while neglecting dimensions of materiality (de los Reyes & Mulinari, 2005; Prasad, 2003). In this thesis, I have explored how objects are drawn upon and referred to in talk, but I have not considered the bodily interaction between human and non-human objects. When it comes to the relational construction of the 'social', it would be further interesting to explore how objects become actors through their physical interactions with humans. In the case of the Island, this could mean a focus on how 'good' consumers interact with their purchased solar panels and heat pumps, or how protestors interact with the sustainable buildings they resisted, once they become constructed. Broadly, future research could further inquire into the role of materiality within instances of social entrepreneurship, including how objects constructed as good impact on our sense of identities and imaginations of the future.

References

Adanhounme, A. B. (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility in Postcolonial Africa: Another civilizing mission? *Journal of Change Management*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 91-110

Ahmed, S. (2000). Strange Encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality, London: Routledge

Ahmed, S. (2012). A Willfulness Archive, *Theory & Event*, vol. 15, no. 3

Ahmed, S. (2014). Willful Subjects, Durham: Duke University Press

Alvesson, M. (2003). Beyond Neopositivists, Romantics, and Localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research, *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 13-33

Alvesson, M. & Deetz, S. (2000). Doing Critical Management Research, London: SAGE

Alvesson, M. & Kärreman, D. (2000a). Taking the Linguistic Turn in Organizational Research: Challenges, responses, consequences, *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 136-158

Alvesson, M. & Kärreman, D. (2000b). Varieties of Discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis, *Human Relations*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 1125-1149

Alvesson, M. & Kärreman, D. (2007). Constructing Mystery: Empirical matters in theory development, *Academy of Management Review,* vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 1265-1281

Alvesson, M. & Sandberg, J. (2011). Generating Research Questions through Problematization, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 247-271

Alvesson, M. & Sköldberg, K. (2018). Reflexive Methodology: New vistas for qualitative research, 3rd edn., London: Sage

Alvord, S., Brown, L. & Letts, C. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Social Transformation: An exploratory study, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 260-282

Anderson, R. A. & Smith, R. (2007). The Moral Space in Entrepreneurship: An exploration of ethical imperatives and the moral legitimacy of being enterprising, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, vol. 19, pp. 479-497

André, K. & Pache, A. (2016). From Caring Entrepreneur to Caring Enterprise: Addressing the ethical challenges of scaling up social enterprises, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 133, no. 4, pp. 659-675

Arnould, E. J. & Thompson, C. J. (2005). Consumer Culture Theory (CCT): Twenty years of research, *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 868–882

Ashcraft, K. L., Muhr, S. L., Rennstam, J. & Sullivan, K. (2012). Professionalization as a Branding Activity: Occupational identity and the dialectic of inclusivity-exclusivity, *Gender, Work and Organization*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 467-488

Austin, J., Stevenson, H. & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 1-22

Baillie Smith, M. (2013). Public Imaginaries of Development and Complex Subjectivities: The challenge for development studies, *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 400-415

Baker, C. D. (2001). Ethnomethodological Analyses of Interviews, in J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 777-794

Baker, T. & Nelson, R. (2005). Creating Something From Nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 50, pp. 329-366

Banerjee, S. B. (2003). Who Sustains Whose Development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature, *Organization Studies*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 143-180

Banerjee, S. B. (2008). Corporate Social Responsibility: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly, *Critical Sociology*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 51-79

Banerjee, S. B. & Prasad, A. (2008). Introduction to the Special Issue on "Critical Reflections on Management and Organizations: A postcolonial perspective", *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, vol. 4, no. 2/3, pp. 90-98

Bargsted, M., Picon, M., Salazar, A. & Rojas, Y. (2013). Psychosocial Characterization of Social Entrepreneurs: A comparative study, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 331-346

Barinaga, E. (2012). Overcoming Inertia: The social question in social entrepreneurship, in D. Hjorth (ed.) *Handbook on Organisational Entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

Barinaga, E. (2013). Politicising Social Entrepreneurship – Three social entrepreneurial rationalities toward social change, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 347–372

Barinaga, E. (2014). Social Entrepreneurship: Cases and concepts, Lund: Studentlitteratur

Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966). The Social Construction of Reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge, 1st edn., Harmondsworth: Penguin

Berglund, K. (2013). Fighting Against All Odds: Entrepreneurship education as employability training, *Ephemera: Theory & politics in organization*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 717-735

Berglund, K. (2018). Social Entrepreneurship: Performative enactments of compassion, in P. Dey & C. Steyaert (eds.) *Social Entrepreneurship: An affirmative critique*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 182-190

Berglund, K. & Johansson, A. W. (2007). Constructions of Entrepreneurship: A discourse analysis of academic publications, *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 77-102

Berglund, K., Johannisson, B. & Schwartz, B. (2012). Societal Entrepreneurship: Positioning, penetrating, promoting, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

Berglund, K. & Schwartz, B. (2013). Holding on the Anomaly of Social Entrepreneurship Dilemmas in Starting up and Running a Fair-Trade Enterprise, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship,* vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 237-255

Berglund, K. & Skoglund, A. (2016). Social Entrepreneurship: To defend society from itself, in A. Fayolle & P. Riot (eds.), *Rethinking Entrepreneurship: Debating research orientations,* Oxon: Routledge, pp. 57-86

Berglund, K. & Wigren-Kristoferson, C. (2012). Soci(et)al Entrepreneurship: The shaping of a different story of entrepreneurship, *Tamara Journal for Critical Organizational Inquiry*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 9-22

betterplanWI (2008, December 21). Industrial Wind Turbine Shadow Flicker in Wisconsin 2008. [Video file] Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MbIe0iUtelQ

Beveridge, R. & Guy, S. (2005). The Rise of the Eco-preneur and the Messy World of Environmental Innovation, *Local Environment*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 665-676

Bhabha, H. (1994). The Location of Culture, New York: Routledge

Bloom, P. (2009). Overcoming Consumption Constraints Through Social Entrepreneurship, *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 128-134

Boje, D. (1995). Stories of the Storytelling Organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as “Tamara-land”, *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 997-1035

Bonfanti, A., Battisti, E. & Pasqualino, L. (2016). Social Entrepreneurship and Corporate Architecture: Evidence from Italy, *Management Decision*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 390-417

Brännvall, R. (2018). They Are So Damn Grateful: A longitudinal study of how postcolonial attitudes influence the innovation process in social ventures, Dissertation, Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan, Stockholm: KTH Royal Institute of Technology Stockholm

Bröckling, U. (2015). The Entrepreneurial Self. London: Sage

Calás, M. B., Ergene, S. & Smircich, L. (2018). Becoming Possible in the Anthropocene? Becoming-social entrepreneurship as more-than-capitalist practice, in P. Dey & C. Steyaert (eds.) *Social Entrepreneurship: An affirmative critique*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 264-293

Calás, M. B., Smircich, L. & Bourne, K. A. (2009). Extending the Boundaries: Reframing "entrepreneurship as social change" through feminist perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 552-569

Calvo, S. & Morales, A. (2016). Sink or Swim: Social enterprise as a panacea for non-profit organisations? *Journal of International Development,* vol. 28, pp. 1170-1188

Caton, K. & Santos, C. A. (2009). Images of the Other: Selling study abroad in a postcolonial world, *Journal of Travel Research*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 191-204

Chandra, Y. (2018). New Narratives of Development Work? Making sense of social entrepreneurs' development narratives across time and economies. *World Development*, vol. 107, pp. 306-326

Chell, E., Spence, L. J., Perrini, F. & Harris, J. D. (2016). Social Entrepreneurship and Business Ethics: Does social equal ethical? *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 133, no. 4, pp. 619-625

Chertkovskaya, E., Paulsson, A. & Barca, S. (2019). Towards a Political Economy of Degrowth, London: Rowan and Littlefield

Cho, A. H. (2006). Politics, Values and Social Entrepreneurship: A critical appraisal, in J. Mair, J. Robinson and K. Hockerts (eds.) *Social Entrepreneurship*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 34-56

Choi, N. & Majumdar, S. (2014). Social Entrepreneurship as an Essentially Contested Concept: Opening a new avenue for systematic future research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 363-376

Civilized (2021). Oxford Lexico. Retrieved at https://www.lexico.com/definition/civilized

Clark Muntean, S. & Özkazanç-Pan, B. (2016). Feminist Perspectives on Social Entrepreneurship: Critique and new directions, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 221-241

Clausen, H. B. & Gyimóthy, S. (2016). Seizing Community Participation in Sustainable Development: Pueblos mágicos of Mexico, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 111, pp. 318-326

Clegg, S. (1989). Frameworks of Power, London: Sage

Cooke, B. (2003). Managing Organizational Culture and Imperialism, in A. Prasad (ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan/St. Martin's Press, pp. 75-94

Cooke, B. & Kothari, U. (2001). Participation: The new tyranny? London: Zed Books

Croom, R. M. & Miller, C. D. (2018). Mompreneurship as a Path to Work-Life Harmony: Role conflict as an antecedent for entrepreneurial activity, *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship,* vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 1-22

Curtis, T. (2008). Finding that Grit Makes a Pearl: A critical re-reading of research into social enterprise, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 276-90

Czarniawska, B. (1997). Narrating the Organization, 1st edn., Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Czarniawska, B. (2004). Narratives in Social Science Research, London: Sage

Dacin, P. A, Dacin, M. T. & Matear, M. (2010). Social Entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 37-57

Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A. & Tracey, P. (2011). Social Entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions, *Organization Science*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1203-1213

Dart, R. (2004). The Legitimacy of Social Enterprise, *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 411-424

Daya, S. (2014). Saving the Other: Exploring the social in social enterprise, *Geoforum*, vol. 57, pp. 120-128

de Beauvoir, S. (1949). The Second Sex. New York: Random House, Inc

de Cervantes Saavedra, M. (n.d.). Don Quixote [e-book], Boulder: Champaign Ill, Project Gutenberg, Retrieved at https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1085686&site=eds-live&scope=site (accessed 2020-11-07)

de Lima, W. (2020). Modern Missionaries: An ethnography of social entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial legitimation in the humanitarian field, Dissertation, Stockholm University, Stockholm: Universitetsservice US-AB

de los Reyes, P. & Mulinari, D. (2005). Intersektionalitet. Malmö: Liber AB

de Maria, B. (2008). Neo-Colonialism through Measurement: A critique of the corruption perception index, *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, vol. 4, no. 2/3, pp. 184-202

Dean, T. J. & McMullen, J. S. (2007). Toward a Theory of Sustainable Entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action, *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 50-76

Deetz, S. A. (1992). Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life, Albany: State University of New York Press

Dey, P. (2006). The Rhetoric of Social Entrepreneurship: Paralogy and new language games in academic discourse, in C. Steyaert and D. Hjorth, (eds.), *Entrepreneurship as Social Change*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 121-142

Dey, P. & Lehner, O. (2016). Registering Ideology in the Creation of Social Entrepreneurs: Intermediary organizations, 'ideal subject' and the promise of enjoyment, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 142, pp. 753-767

Dey, P., Schneider, H. & Maier, F. (2016). Intermediary Organizations and the Hegemonisation of Social Entrepreneurship: Fantasmatic articulations, constitutive quiescences, and moments of indeterminacy, *Organization Studies*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 1451-1472

Dey, P. & Steyaert, C. (2010). The Politics of Narrating Social Entrepreneurship, *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 85-108

Dey, P. & Steyaert, C. (2012). Critical Reflections on Social Entrepreneurship, in C. K. Volkmann, K. O. Tokarski, and K. Ernst. (eds.), *Social entrepreneurship and Social Business*. Lehrbuch: Springer Gabler

Dey, P. & Steyaert, C. (2016). Rethinking the Space of Ethics in Social Entrepreneurship: Power, subjectivity, and practices of freedom, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 133, pp. 627-641

Dey, P. & Steyaert, C. (2018). Social Entrepreneurship: An affirmative critique. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing

Dey, P. & Teasdale, S. (2016). The Tactical Mimicry of Social Enterprise Strategies: Acting 'as if' in the everyday life of third sector organizations, *Organization*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 485-504

Dixon, S. E. A. & Clifford, A. (2007). Ecopreneurship - A new approach to managing the triple bottom line, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 326-345

Dobusch, L., Holck, L. & Muhr, S. L. (2020). The Im-/Possibility of Hybrid Inclusion: Disrupting the 'happy inclusion' story with the case of the Greenlandic Police Force, *Organization*, vol. 00, no. 0, pp. 1-23

dos Santos, L. & Banerjee, S. (2019). Social Enterprise: Is it possible to decolonise this concept? in P. Eynaud, J. L. Laville, L. L. Dos Santos, S. Banerjee, H. Hulgard & F. Avelino (eds.) *Theory of social enterprise and pluralism: Social movements, solidarity economy, and global south*, Oxfordshire: Routledge, pp. 3-17

Eikenberry, A. M. & Kluver, J. D. (2004). The Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector: Civil society at risk? *Public Administration Review*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 132-140

Eikenberry, A. M. (2009). Refusing the Market: A democratic discourse for voluntary and nonprofit organizations, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 582-596

Eikenberry, A. M. (2018). Social Entrepreneurship and Democracy, in P. Dey & C. Steyaert (eds.) *Social Entrepreneurship: An affirmative critique*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 210-229

Ekman, S. (2014). Critical and Compassionate Interviewing: Asking until it makes sense, in E. Jeanes and T. Huzzard (eds.), *Critical Management Research: Reflections from the field*, London: SAGE

Engeström, Y. & Blackler, F. (2005). On the Life of the Object, *Organization*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 307-330

England, K. V. L. (1994). Getting Personal: Reflexivity, positionality, and feminist research, *Professional Geographer*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 80-89

Escobar, A. (2015). Degrowth, Postdevelopment, and Transitions: A preliminary conversation, *Sustainability Science*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 451-462

Essers, C. & Tedmanson, D. (2014). Upsetting 'Others' in the Netherlands: Narratives of Muslim Turkish migrant businesswomen at the crossroads of ethnicity, gender and religion, *Gender, Work and Organization*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 353-367

Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., Gebhardt, C. & Cantisano Terra, B. R. (2000). The Future of the University and the University of the Future: Evolution of ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm, *Research Policy*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 313-330

Fanon, F. (1963). Black Skins, White Masks, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Flowers, R. & Swan, E. (2017). Seeing Benevolently: Representational politics and digital race formation on ethnic food tour webpages. *Geoforum*, Vol. 84, pp. 216-217

Foucault, M. (1980). Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings 1972-77, New York: Pantheon Books

Fournier, V. & Grey, C. (2000). At the Critical Moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies, *Human Relations*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 7-32

Frenkel, M. & Shenhav, Y. (2006). From Binarism Back to Hybridity: A postcolonial reading of management and organization studies, *Organization Studies*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 855-876

Friedman, V. J. & Desivilya, H. (2010). Integrating Social Entrepreneurship and Conflict Engagement for Regional Development in Divided Societies, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 495-514

Friedman, V. J., Sykes, I. & Strauch, M. (2018). Expanding the Realm of the Possible: Field theory and a relational framing of social entrepreneurship, in P. Dey & C. Steyaert (eds.) *Social Entrepreneurship: An affirmative critique*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 239-263

Gabriel, Y. (2004). Narratives, Stories, Texts, in D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Oswick & L. L. Putnam (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Discourse*, London: Sage, pp. 61-79

Gabriel, Y. (2015). Narratives and Stories in Organizational Life, in A. De Fina & A. Georgakopoulou, *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 275-292

Gabriel, Y. (2016). Narrative Ecologies and the Role of Counter-Narratives, in T. Kuhn, M. Wolff Lundholt & S. Frandsen (eds.), *Counter-Narratives and Organization*, 1st edn., London: Routledge, pp. 208-225

Gertsen, M.C. & Søderberg, A. (2010). Expatriate Stories about Cultural Encounters – A narrative approach to cultural learning processes in multinational companies, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, vol. 26, pp. 248-257

Gertsen, M.C. & Søderberg, A. (2011). Intercultural Collaboration Stories, On narrative inquiry and analysis as tools for research in international business, *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 765-786

Gill, R. (2014). “If You’re Struggling to Survive Day-to-Day”: Class optimism and contradiction in entrepreneurial discourse. *Organization*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 50-67

Gill. R, & Pratt, A. (2008). In the Social Factory?: Immaterial labour, precariousness and cultural work, *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 1-30

Girard, R. (2008). Mimesis and Theory: Essays on literature and criticism, 1953-2005. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Gleerup, J., Hulgaard, L. & Teasdale, S. (2020). Action Research and Participatory Democracy in Social Enterprise, *Social Enterprise Journal*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 46-59

Godin, B. (2012). Social Innovation: Utopias of Innovation from c. 1830 to the Present. *Project on the Intellectual History of Innovation Working Paper*, *11*, 1-52

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction Ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior. New York: Anchor Books

Gopal, A., Willis, R. & Gopal, Y. (2003). From the Colonial Enterprise to Enterprise Systems: Parallels between colonization and globalization, in A. Prasad (ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan/St. Martin’s Press, pp. 233-254

Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the Prison Notebooks, Translated and Edited by Q. Hoare and J. Nowell Smith, New York: International Publishers

Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic Action and Social Structure: The problem of embeddedness, *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 481-510

Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., Vogus, T. J. & Miller, T. L. (2013). Studying the Origins of Social Entrepreneurship: Compassion and the role of embedded agency. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 460-463

Gubrium, J. F. & Holstein J. A. (1997). The New Language of Qualitative Method, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Gupta, P., Chauhan, S., Paul, J. & Jaiswal, M. P. (2020). Social Entrepreneurship Research: A review and future research agenda, *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 113, pp. 209-229

Habermas, J. (1984). The Theory of Communicative Action, volume 1: Reason and the rationalization of society, Boston: Beacon Press

Habermas, J. (1987). The Theory of Communicative Action, volume 2: Life-world and system, Boston: Beacon Press

Harvey, D. (2005). A Brief History of Neoliberalism, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hearn, J. (1996). Deconstructing the Dominant: Making the one(s) the other(s), *Organization*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 611-626

Henningsson, M., Jönsson, S., Bengtsson Ryberg, J., Bluhm, G., Bolin, K., Bodén, B., Ek, K., Hammarlund, K., Hannukka, I., Johansson, C., Mels, S., Mels, T., Nilsson, M., Skärbäck, E., Söderholm, P., Waldo, Å., Widerström, I. & Åkerman, N. (2013). The Effects of Wind Power on Human Interests: A synthesis report, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. Report 6545, January 2013. Retrieved at https://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Henningsson-et-al-2013.pdf (accessed 2020-04-22)

Henry, E., Newth, J. & Spiller, C. (2017). Emancipatory Indigenous Social Innovation: Shifting power through culture and technology, *Journal of Management & Organization*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 786-802

Hillenkamp, I. & dos Santos, L. (2019). The Domestic Domain within a Post-Colonial, Feminist Reading of Social Enterprise: Towards a substantive, gender-based concept of solidarity enterprise, in P. Eynaud, J. L. Laville, L. L. Dos Santos, S. Banerjee, H. Hulgard & F. Avelino (eds.) *Theory of social enterprise and pluralism: Social movements, solidarity economy, and global south*, Oxfordshire: Routledge, pp. 90-115

Hjorth, D. & Bjerke, B. (2006). Public Entrepreneurship: Moving from social/consumer to public/citizen, in C. Steyaert & D. Hjorth, (eds.), *Entrepreneurship as Social Change*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 97-120

Hjorth, D. (2013). Public Entrepreneurship: Desiring social change, creating sociality, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 25, no. 1-2, pp. 34-51

Horn, D. M. (2013). Democratic Governance and Social Entrepreneurship: Civic participation and the future of democracy, New York: Routledge

Horn, D. M. (2018). Social Entrepreneurship, Democracy and Political Participation, in P. Dey & C. Steyaert (eds.) *Social Entrepreneurship: An affirmative critique*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 230-238

Hota, P. K., Subramanian, B. & Narayanamurthy, G. (2019). Mapping the Intellectual Structure of Social Entrepreneurship Research: A citation/co-citation analysis, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 166, pp. 89-114

Huddart, D. (2006). Homi K. Bhabha, New York: Routledge

Humphries, M. & Grant, S. (2005). Social Enterprise and Re-Civilization of Human Endeavors: Re-socializing the market metaphor or encroaching colonization of the lifeworld? *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 41-50

Ideal (2020). Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Retrieved at https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ideal

Innovation (2021). Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Retrieved at https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/innovation

Irving, S. & Helin, J. (2018). A World for Sale? An ecofeminist reading of sustainable development discourse, *Gender, Work and Organization*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 264-278

Islam, S. M. (2020). Unintended Consequences of Scaling Social Impact through Ecosystem Growth Strategy in Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship, *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, vol. 13, pp. 1-6

Jantelagen. (n.d.). Nationalencyklopedin. Retrieved at http://www.ne.se.ludwig.lub.lu.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/lång/jantelagen (accessed 2019-09-16)

Jackson, T. (2005). Live Better by Consuming Less? Is there a “double dividend” in sustainable consumption? *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, vol. 9, no. 1-2, pp. 19-36

Johannisson, B. & Olaison, L. (2007). The Moment of Truth – Reconstructing entrepreneurship and social capital in the eye of the storm, *Review of Social Economy*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 55-78

Johnstone, H. & Lionais, D. (2004). Depleted Communities and Community Business Entrepreneurship: Revaluing space through place, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, vol. 16, pp. 217-233

Jones, R., Latham, J. & Betta, M. (2008). Narrative Construction of the Social Entrepreneurial Identity, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 330-345

Jørgensen, K. M. (2020). Storytelling, Space and Power: An Arendtian account of subjectivity in organizations, *Organization*, vol. 00, no. 2, pp. 1-16

Khan, F. R. & Lund-Thomsen, P. (2011). CSR as Imperialism: Towards a phenomenological approach to CSR in the developing world, *Journal of Change Management*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 73-90

Khan, F. R., Westwood, R. & Boje, D. M. (2010). 'I Feel Like a Foreign Agent': NGOs and corporate social responsibility interventions into Third World child labor, *human relations*, vol. 63, no. 9, pp. 1417-1438

Kimmitt, J. & Muñoz, P. (2018). Sensemaking the 'Social' in Social Entrepreneurship, *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship,* vol. 36, no. 8, pp. 859-886

Knorr-Cetina, K. (1997). Sociality with Objects: Social relations in post social knowledge societies, *Theory, Culture and Society*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1-30

Kohn, M. & Reddy, K. (2017). Colonialism, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), Retrieved at https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/colonialism/

Kothiyal, N., Bell, E. & Clarke, C. (2018). Moving Beyond Mimicry: Developing hybrid spaces in Indian business schools, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 137-154

Kristianpont (2012, May 1). Wind Turbine Sound – High quality audio. [Video file] Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mk5zMxYVca0

Kummitha, R. K. R. (2016). Social Entrepreneurship as a Tool to Remedy Social Exclusion: A win–win scenario? *South Asia Research*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 61-79

Kvale, S. (1994). Ten Standard Objections to Qualitative Research Interviews, *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 147-173

Kwek, D. (2003). Decolonizing and Re-Presenting Culture's Consequences: A postcolonial critique of cross-cultural studies in management, in A. Prasad (ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan/St. Martin's Press, pp. 121-146

Kwong, C., Tasavori, M. & Cheung, C. (2017). Bricolage, Collaboration and Mission Drift in Social Enterprises, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 29, no. 7-8, pp. 609-638

Latour, B. (1991). Technology is Society made Durable, in J. Law (ed.), *A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on power, technology and domination*, London: Routledge, pp. 103-131

Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the Social: An introduction to Actor-Network-Theory, New York: Oxford University Press

Lee, S. Y., Shin, D., Park, S. H. & Kim, S. (2018). Unintended Negative Effects of the Legitimacy-Seeking Behavior of Social Enterprises on Employee Attitudes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 9

Levy, S. J. (1959). Symbols for Sale, *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 37, pp. 117-24

Lindgren, M. & Packendorff, J. (2006). Entrepreneurship as Boundary Work: Deviating from and belonging to community, in C. Steyaert and D. Hjorth, (eds.), *Entrepreneurship as Social Change*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 210-230

Loomba, A. (2015). Colonialism/Postcolonialism (3rd ed.) London: Routledge

Lundmark, E. & Westelius, A. (2014). Entrepreneurship as Elixir and Mutagen, *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 575-–600

Mair, J. & Martí, I. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship Research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight, *Journal of World Business*, vol. 41, pp. 36-44

Mair, J. & Martí, I. (2009). Entrepreneurship in and around Institutional Voids: A case study from Bangladesh, *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 419-–35

Martínez, S. C., Pachón, A. M., Martín, J. M. M. & Moreno, V. M. (2019). Solidarity Economy, Social Enterprise, and Innovation Discourses: Understanding hybrid forms in postcolonial Colombia, *Social Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 1-17

Mason, C. (2014). Voices in the Fog: Accounts of social entrepreneurship identity in the UK third sector, in L. Pate and C. Wankels (eds.) Emerging Research Directions in Social Entrepreneurship, New York: Springer

Mauksch, S. (2018). '(It) is exactly what it was in me': The performativity of social entrepreneurship, in P. Dey & C. Steyaert (eds.) *Social Entrepreneurship: An affirmative critique*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 137-158

Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist. Chicago: Chicago University Press

McDonald, J. (2013). Coming Out in the Field: A queer reflexive account of shifting researcher identity, *Management Learning,* vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 127-143

McKay, F. H., Lippi, K., Dunn, M., Haines, B. C. & Lindberg, R. (2018). Food-Based Social Enterprises and Asylum Seekers: The food justice truck, *Nutrients*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 1-10

McKeever, E., Jack, S. & Anderson, A. (2015). Embedded Entrepreneurship in the Creative Re-Construction of Place, *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 50-65

McSweeney, M. J. (2020). Returning the 'Social' to Social Entrepreneurship: Future possibilities of critically exploring sport for development and peace and social entrepreneurship, *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 3-21

Melissen, F., Mzembe, A. N., Idemudia, U. & Novakovic, Y. (2018). Institutional Antecedents of the Corporate Social Responsibility Narrative in the Developing World Context: Implications for sustainable development, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, vol. 27, pp. 657-676

Mills, S. (1997). Discourse, London: Routledge

Mir, R., Banerjee, B. S. & Mir, A. (2008). Hegemony and its Discontents: A critical analysis of organizational knowledge transfer, *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, vol. 4, no. 2/3, pp. 203-227

Mir, R. A., Mir, A. & Upadhyaya, P. (2003). Toward a Postcolonial Reading of Organizational Control, In A. Prasad (ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan/St. Martin's Press, pp. 47-73

Mohai, P. & Bryant, B. (1992). Environmental Injustice: Weighing race and class as factors in the distribution of environmental hazards, *University of Colorado Law Review*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 921-932

Morales, A., Calvo, S., Martínez, J. M. G. & Martín, J. M. (2021). Hybrid Forms of Business: Understanding the development of indigenous social entrepreneurship practices, *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 124, pp. 212-222

Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, Metaphors, and Puzzle Solving in Organization Theory, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 605-622

Newth, J. (2016). Social Enterprise Innovation in Context: Stakeholder influence through contestation, *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 369-399

Newth, J. & Woods, C. (2014). Resistance to Social Entrepreneurship: How context shapes innovation, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 192-213

Nicholls, A. & Cho, A. H. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: The structuration of a field, in A. Nicholls (ed.) *Social Entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 99-118

Nicholls, A. & Huybrechts, B. (2016). Sustaining Inter-organizational Relationships Across Institutional Logics and Power Asymmetries: The case of Fair Trade, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 135, pp. 699-714

Nicolopoulou, K., Lucas, I., Tatli, A, Karatas-Ozkan, M., Costanzo, L., Özbilgin, M. & Manville, G. (2015). Questioning the Legitimacy of Social Enterprises through Gramscian and Bourdieusian Perspectives: The case of British social enterprises, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 161-185

Nkomo, S. M. (2011). A Postcolonial and Anti-Colonial Reading of 'African' Leadership and Management in Organization Studies: Tensions, contradictions and possibilities, *Organization*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 365-386

Nobel Media AB (2020). The Nobel Peace Prize 2006. Retrieved at https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/2006/summary/ (accessed 2020-07-05)

O'Lear, S. (2010). Environmental Politics: Scale and power, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ojha, H., Cameron, J. & Bhattarai, B. (2005). Understanding Development through the Language of Habermas and Bourdieu: Insights from Nepal's Leasehold Forestry Programme, *International Development Planning Review*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 479-97

Othering (2020). Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Retrieved at https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/othering

Özkazanç-Pan, B. (2008). International Management Research Meets "The Rest of the World", *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 964-974

Özkazanç-Pan, B. (2012). Postcolonial Feminist Research: Challenges and complexities. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, vol. 31, no. 5/6, pp. 573-591

Özkazanç-Pan, B. (2014). Postcolonial Feminist Analysis of High-Technology Entrepreneuring, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 155-172

Özkazanç-Pan, B. (2017). On Entrepreneurship and Empowerment: Postcolonial feminist interventions, in C. Essers, P. Dey, D. Tedmanson & K. Verduyn (eds.) *Critical Perspectives on Entrepreneurship: Challenging dominant discourses*, London: Routledge, pp. 192-205

Özkazanç-Pan, B. (2019). CSR as Gendered Neocoloniality in the Global South, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 160, pp. 851-864

Parkinson, C. & Howorth, C. (2008). The Language of Social Entrepreneurs, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 285-309

Parsons, R. (2008). We Are All Stakeholders Now: The influence of western discourses of "community engagement" in an Australian Aboriginal community, *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, vol. 4, no. 2/3, pp. 99-126

Partzsch (2017). Powerful Individuals in a Globalized World, *Global Policy*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp 5-13

Partzsch, L. & Ziegler, R. (2011). Social Entrepreneurs as Change Agents: A case study on power and authority in the water sector, *International Environmental Agreements*, vol. 11, pp. 63-83

Pearson, Z., Ellingrod, S., Billo, E. & McSweeney, K. (2019). Corporate Social Responsibility and the Reproduction of (Neo)Colonialism in the Ecuadorian Amazon, *The Extractive Industries and Society*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 881-888

Peredo, A. M. & Chrisman, J. J. (2006). Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 309-328

Peredo, A.M. & McLean, M. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept, *Journal of World Business*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 56-65

Pestoff, V. & Hulgård, L. (2016). Participatory Governance in Social Enterprise, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 1742-1759

Phillips, M. (2013). On Being Green and Being Enterprising: Narrative and the ecopreneurial self, *Organization*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 794-817

Polanyi, K. (1944). The Great Transformation, Boston: Beacon Press

Potter, J. & Hepburn, A., (2012). Eight Challenges for Interview Researchers, in J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti & K. D. McKinney (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The complexity of the craft*, (2nd edn.) Thousand Oaks: Sage

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour. London: Sage

Prasad, A. (2003). The Gaze of the Other: Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis, in A. Prasad (ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis,* New York: Palgrave Macmillan/St. Martin's Press, pp. 3-43

Prasad, P. (2005). Crafting Qualitative Research: Working in the postpositivist traditions. New York: M. E. Sharpe

Prasad, A. & Prasad, P. (2003). The Empire of Organizations and the Organization of Empires: Postcolonial considerations on theorizing workplace resistance, in A. Prasad (ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan/St. Martin's Press, pp. 95-119

Ragin, C. (1992). Cases of "What is a case?", In C. C. Ragin & H. S. Becker (eds.), *What is a Case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Rennstam, J. (2012). Object-Control: A study of technologically dense knowledge work, *Organization Studies,* vol, 33, no. 8, pp. 1071-1090

Rennstam, J. & Sullivan, K. R. (2018). Peripheral Inclusion through Informal Silencing and Voice — A study of LGB officers in the Swedish police, *Gender, Work and Organization,* vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 177-194

Rennstam, J. & Wästerfors, D. (2015). Från Stoff till Studie, Lund: Studentlitteratur

Representation (2020). Oxford Lexico. Retrieved at https://www.lexico.com/definition/representation

Richter, R. (2019). Rural Social Enterprises as Embedded Intermediaries: The innovative power of connecting rural communities with supra-regional networks, *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 70, pp. 179-187

Risberg, A., Tienari, J. & Vaara, E. (2003). Making Sense of a Transnational Merger: Media texts and the (re)construction of power relations, *Culture and Organization*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 121-137

Riessman, C. K. (2008). Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences, Thousand Oaks: Sage

Rose, G. (1997). Situating Knowledges: Positionality, reflexivities and other tactics, *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 305-320

Roundy, P. (2014). The Stories of Social Entrepreneurs, *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 200-218

Ruebottom, T. (2018). Deliberative Democracy in Social Entrepreneurship: A discourse ethics approach to participative processes of social change, in P. Dey & C. Steyaert (eds.) *Social Entrepreneurship: An affirmative critique*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 191-209

Saebi, T., Foss, N. J. & Linder, S. (2018). Social Entrepreneurship Research: Past achievements and future promises, *Journal of Management*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 70-95

Said, E. W. (1978). Orientalism, New York: Pantheon Books

Sandemose, A. (1933). En Flyktning Krysser sitt Spor: Fortelling om en morders barndom. Copenhagen: Gyldendal

Sassmannshausen, S. P. & Volkmann, C. (2018). The Scientometrics of Social Entrepreneurship and Its Establishment as an Academic Field, *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 251-273

Sayer, A. (1997). Essentialism, Social Constructionism, and Beyond, *The Sociological Review*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 453-487

Sayer, A. (2016). Why We Can't Afford the Rich, Bristol: The Policy Press

Scaffidi, F. (2019). Soft Power in Recycling Spaces: Exploring spatial impacts of regeneration and youth entrepreneurship in Southern Italy, *Local Economy*, vol. 34, no. 7, pp. 632-656

Scharff, C. (2016). The Psychic Life of Neoliberalism: Mapping the contours of entrepreneurial subjectivity, *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 107-122

Schuler, S. R., Hashemi, S. M. & Badal, S. H. (1998). Men's Violence Against Women in Rural Bangladesh: Undermined or exacerbated by microcredit programmes? *Development Practice*, vol. 8, pp. 148-57

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). The Theory of Economic Development, Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press

Sharir, M. & Lerner, M. (2006). Gauging the Success of Social Ventures Initiated by Individual Social Entrepreneurs, *Journal of World Business*, vol. 41, pp. 6–20

Sharpe, D. R. & Mir, R. (2009). Control as Colonialism: Workplace democracy and the transfer of managerial practices within multinational corporations, *Journal of Workplace Rights*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 27-48

Shepherd, D. A. (2015). Party on! A call for entrepreneurship research that is more interactive, activity based, cognitively hot, compassionate, and prosocial, *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 30, pp. 489-507

Shepherd, D. A. & Patzelt, H. (2011). The New Field of Sustainable Entrepreneurship: Studying entrepreneurial action linking "What is to be sustained" with "What is to be developed." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 137-163

Short, J. C., Moss, T. D. & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in Social Entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, vol. 3, pp. 161-194

Sinha, P. N. & Bathini, D. R. (2019). Resistance Toward Dominant US Work Practices in Emerging Markets: A case study of enacting mimicry at an Indian fast-food outlet, *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 323-340

Skoglund, A. & Berglund, K. (2018). Entrepreneurship and the Entrepreneurial Self – Creating alternatives through entrepreneurship education? in K. Berglund and K. Verduyn (eds.) *Revitalizing Entrepreneurship Education: Adopting a critical approach in the classroom*, London: Routledge, pp. 158-174

Slater, D. (1998). Post-Colonial Questions for Global Times. *Review of International Political Economy*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 647-678

Śliwa, M. (2008). Understanding Social Change Through Post-Colonial Theory: Reflections on linguistic imperialism and language spread in Poland, *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, vol. 4, no. 2/3, pp. 228-241

Smith, R. & Anderson, A. R. (2004). The Devil is in the E-Tale: Forms and structures in the entrepreneurial narratives, in D. Hjorth and C. Steyaert, (eds.), *Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak? in C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture,* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, pp. 271-313

Stake, R. (2000). Case Studies, in N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Thousand Oaks: Sage

Stake, R. (2010). Qualitative Research: Studying how things work, New York: Guilford Publications

Steyaert, C. (2007). "Entrepreneuring" as a Conceptual Attractor? A review of process theories in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 453-77

Steyaert, C. & Hjorth, D. (2006). Entrepreneurship as Social Change: A third movement in entrepreneurship book. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing

Steyaert, C. & Katz, J. (2004). Reclaiming the Space of Entrepreneurship in Society: Geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, vol. 16, pp. 179-196

Steyaert, C. & Dey, P. (2018). The Books on Social Entrepreneurship We Edit, Critique and Imagine, in P. Dey & C. Steyaert (eds.) *Social Entrepreneurship: An affirmative critique*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 1-15

Social (2020). Oxford Lexico. Retrieved at https://www.lexico.com/definition/social

Suchman, L. (2005). Affiliative Objects, *Organization*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 379–399

Sullivan, P. (2008). Bureaucratic Process as Morris Dance: An ethnographic approach to the culture of bureaucracy in Australian aboriginal affairs administration, *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, vol. 4, no. 2/3, pp. 127-141

Svensson, P. (2003). Setting the Marketing Scene: Reality production in everyday marketing work, Dissertation, Lund University, Lund: Lund Business Press

Swedberg, R. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: The view of the young Schumpeter, in C. Steyaert and D. Hjorth, (eds.), *Entrepreneurship as Social Change*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 21-34

Sørensen, B. (2008). 'Behold, I am Making All Things New': The entrepreneur as saviour in the age of creativity, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, vol. 24, pp. 85-93

Teasdale, S. (2011). What's in a Name? Making sense of social enterprise discourses, *Public Policy and Administration*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 99-119

Tillmar, M. (2009). Societal Entrepreneurs in the Health Sector: Crossing the frontiers, *Social Enterprise Journal*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 282-298

Tilt at windmills (2020). Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Retrieved at https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/tilt%20at%20windmills

Vertigans, S. (2011). CSR as Corporate Social Responsibility or Colonial Structures Return? A Nigerian case study, *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 159-162

Waldron, T., Fisher, G. & Pfarrer, M. (2016). How Social Entrepreneurs Facilitate the Adoption of New Industry Practices, *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 821-845

Watson, T. (1994). Managing, Crafting and Researching: Words, skill and imagination in shaping management research, *British Journal of Management*, vol. 5, pp. 577-587

Weick, K. (1995). Sensemaking in Organizations, Thousand Oaks: Sage

Weerawardena, J. & Sullivan Mort, G. (2006). Investigating Social Entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model, *Journal of World Business*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 21-35

Welter, F., Baker, T., Audretsch, D. B. & Gartner, W. B. (2016). Everyday Entrepreneurship—A call for entrepreneurship research to embrace entrepreneurial diversity, *Entrepreneurship, Theory & Practice*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 311-321

White Man’s Burden (2019). Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Retrieved at https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/white%20man's%20burden

Williams, D. A. (2012). The Dark Side of Social Entrepreneurship, *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, vol. 16, pp. 63-75

Wilson, K. (2011). 'Race', Gender and Neoliberalism: Changing visual representations in development, *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 315-331

Wright, C., Nyberg, D., Rickards, L. & Freund, J. (2018). Organizing in the Anthropocene, *Organization*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 455-471

Yitshaki, R. & Kropp, F. (2016). Entrepreneurial Passions and Identities in Different Contexts: A comparison between high-tech and social entrepreneurs, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 28, no 3-4, pp. 206-233

York, J. G., O'Neil, I. & Sarasvathy, S. D. (2016). Exploring Environmental Entrepreneurship: Identity coupling, venture goals, and stakeholder incentives, *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 53, pp. 695-737

Young, R. J. C. (2016). Postcolonialism: An historical introduction, Anniversary edition, Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons

Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O. & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A Typology of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges, *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 24, pp. 519-532

Zietsma, C. & Tuck, R. (2012). First, Do No Harm: Evaluating resources for teaching social entrepreneurship, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 512-517

Lund Studies in Economics and Management

Editor, issues 142–	Charlotta Levay
Editor, issues 109–141	Thomas Kalling
Editors, issues 88–108	Mats Benner & Thomas Kalling
Editor, issues 1–87	Allan T. Malm

152. Anna Stevenson (2021): *Constructing the 'social' in social entrepreneurship: A postcolonial perspective*
151. Tanya Kolyaka (2021): *Financial Bootstrapping as Relational Contract: Linking resource needs, bootstrapping behaviors, and outcomes of bootstrapping exchanges*
150. Louise Klintner (2021): *Normalizing the Natural: A study of menstrual product destigmatization*
149. Zahida Sarwary (2019): *Puzzling out the choice of capital budgeting techniques among high-growth small and medium sized firms*
148: Vivek Kumar Sundriyal (2019): *Entrepreneurship as a career: An investigation into the pre-entrepreneurship antecedents and post-entrepreneurship outcomes among the Science and Technology Labor Force (STLF) in Sweden*
147. Ziad El-Awad (2019): *Beyond individuals – A Process of Routinizing Behaviors Through Entrepreneurial Learning: Insights from Technology-Based Ventures*
146. Carys Egan-Wyer (2019): *The Sellable Self: Exploring endurance running as an extraordinary consumption experience*
145. Lisa Källström (2019): *'A good place to live' – Residents' place satisfaction revisited*
144. Anamaria Cociorva (2019): *Essays on Credit Ratings*
143. Elisabeth Kjellström (2019): *Outsourcing of Organizational Routines: Knowledge, control, and learning aspects*
142. Erik Ronnle (2019): *Justifying Mega-Projects: An Analysis of the Swedish High-Speed Rail Project*
141. Gustav Hägg (2017): *Experiential entrepreneurship education: Reflective thinking as a counterbalance to action for developing entrepreneurial knowledge*
140. Mathias Skrutkowski (2017): *Disgraced. A study of narrative identity in organizations that suffer crises of confidence*
139. Ana Paula do Nascimento (2017): *Funding matters: A study of internationalization programs in science, technology and innovation*

138. Amalia Foukaki (2017): *Corporate Standardization Management: A Case Study of the Automotive Industry*

137. Nathalie Larsson (2016): *From performance management to managing performance: An embedded case study of the drivers of individual and group-based performance in a call center context*

136. Clarissa Sia-Ljungström (2016): *Connecting the Nodes – An interactive perspective on innovative microenterprises in a mature industry*

135. Sten Bertil Olsson (2016): *Marknadsreglering och dess effekter på regionala och lokala gymnasiemarknaders funktion*

134. Mattias Haraldsson (2016): *Accounting choice, compliance and auditing in municipal organisations*

133. Kaj-Dac Tam (2016): *Perceptual Alignment of Retail Brand Image in Corporate Branding: A study of employee perceived stakeholder alignment and effects on brand equity*

132. Wen Pan-Fagerlin (2016): *Participant, Catalyst or Spectator? A study of how managers apply control in innovation processes*

131. Yaqian Wang (2014): *Inside the Box – Cultures of Innovation in a Mature Industry*

130. Paul Pierce (2013): *Using Alliances to Increase ICT Capabilities*

129. Linn Andersson (2013): *Pricing capability development and its antecedents*

128. Lena Hohenschwert (2013): *Marketing B2B Sales Interactions Valuable – A Social and Symbolic Perspective*

127. Pia Nylinder (2012): *Budgetary Control in Public Health Care – A Study about Perceptions of Budgetary Control among Clinical Directors*

126. Liliya Altshuler (2012): *Competitive Capabilities of a Technology Born Global*

125. Timurs Umans (2012): *The bottom line of cultural diversity at the top – The top management team's cultural diversity and its influence on organizational outcomes*

124. Håkan Jankensgård (2011): *Essays on Corporate Risk Management*

123. Susanne Lundholm (2011): *Meta-managing – A Study on How Superiors and Subordinates Manage Their Relationship in Everyday Work*

122. Katarzyna Cieślak (2011): *The Work of the Accounting & Controlling Department and its Drivers: Understanding the concept of a business partner*

121. Ulf Elg and Karin Jonnergård (editors): *Att träda in i en profession: Om hur kvinnor och män etablerar sig inom revisionsbranschen och akademin*

120. Jonas Fjertorp (2010): *Investeringar i kommunal infrastruktur – Förutsättningar för en målfokuserad investeringsverksamhet*

119. Fredrik Ericsson (2010): *Säkringsredovisning – Implementeringen av IAS 39 i svenska icke-finansiella börsföretag och konsekvenser för säkringsverksamheten*
118. Steve Burt, Ulf Johansson & Åsa Thelander (editors, 2010): *Consuming IKEA. Different perspectives on consumer images of a global retailer*
117. Niklas Persson (2010): *Tracing the drivers of B2B brand strength and value*
116. Sandra Erntoft (2010): *The use of health economic evaluations in pharmaceutical priority setting – The case of Sweden*
115. Cecilia Cassinger (2010): *Retailing Retold – Unfolding the Process of Image Construction in Everyday Practice*
114. Jon Bertilsson (2009): *The way brands work – Consumers' understanding of the creation and usage of brands*
113. (2009): *Ett smörgåsbord med ekonomistyrning och redovisning – En vänbok till Olof Arwidi*
112. Agneta Moulettes (2009): *The discursive construction, reproduction and continuance of national cultures – A critical study of the cross-cultural management discourse*
111. Carl Cederström (2009): *The Other Side of Technology: Lacan and the Desire for the Purity of Non-Being*
110. Anna Thomasson (2009): *Navigating in the landscape of ambiguity – A stakeholder approach to the governance and management of hybrid organisations*
109. Pia Ulvenblad (2009): *Growth Intentions and Communicative Practices – Strategic Entrepreneurship in Business Development*
108. Jaqueline Bergendahl (2009): *Entreprenörskapsresan genom beslutsprocesser i team – En elektronisk dagboksstudie i realtid*
107. Louise D. Bringselius (2008): *Personnel resistance in mergers of public professional service mergers – The merging of two national audit organizations*
106. Magnus Johansson (2008): *Between logics – Highly customized deliveries and competence in industrial organizations*
105. Sofia Avdeitchikova (2008): *Close-ups from afar: the nature of the informal venture capital market in a spatial context*
104. Magnus Nilsson (2008): *A Tale of Two Clusters – Sharing Resources to Compete*
103. Annette Cerne (2008): *Working with and Working on Corporate Social Responsibility: The Flexibility of a Management Concept*
102. Sofia Ulver-Sneistrup (2008): *Status Spotting – A Consumer Cultural Exploration into Ordinary Status Consumption of "Home" and Home Aesthetics*

101. Stefan Henningsson (2008): *Managing Information Systems Integration in Corporate Mergers and Acquisitions*

100. Niklas L. Hallberg (2008): *Pricing Capability and Its Strategic Dimensions*

99. Lisen Selander (2008): *Call Me Call Me for Some Overtime – On Organizational Consequences of System Changes*

98. Viktorija Kalonaityte (2008): *Off the Edge of the Map: A Study of Organizational Diversity as Identity Work*

97. Anna Jonsson (2007): *Knowledge Sharing Across Borders – A Study in the IKEA World*

96. Sverre Spoelstra (2007): *What is organization?*

95. Veronika Tarnovskaya (2007): *The Mechanism of Market Driving with a Corporate Brand – The Case of a Global Retailer*

94. Martin Blom (2007): *Aktiemarknadsorienteringens ideologi – En studie av en organisations försök att skapa aktieägarvärde, dess styrning och kontroll samt uppgörelse med sitt förflutna*

93. Jens Rennstam (2007): *Engineering Work – On Peer Reviewing as a Method of Horizontal Control*

92. Catharina Norén (2007): *Framgång i säljande – Om värdeskapande i säljar- och köparinteraktionen på industriella marknader*

91. John Gibe (2007): *The Microstructure of Collaborative E-business Capability*

90. Gunilla Nordström (2006): *Competing on Manufacturing – How combinations of resources can be a source of competitive advantage*

89. Peter W Jönsson (2006): *Value-based management – positioning of claimed merits and analysis of application*

88. Niklas Sandell (2006): *Redovisningsmått, påkopplade system och ekonomiska konsekvenser – Redovisningsbaserade prestationsersättningar*

87. Nadja Sörgärde (2006): *Förändringsförsök och identitetsdramatisering. En studie bland nördar och slipsbärare*

86. Johan Alvehus (2006): *Paragrafer och profit. Om kunskapsarbetets oklarhet*

85. Paul Jönsson (2006): *Supplier Value in B2B E-Business – A case Study in the Corrugated Packaging Industry*

84. Maria Gårdängen (2005): *Share Liquidity and Corporate Efforts to Enhance it – A study on the Swedish Stock Exchange*

83. Johan Anselmsson & Ulf Johansson (2005): *Dagligvaruhandelns egna varumärken – konsekvenser och utvecklingstendenser*

82. Jan Alpenberg & Fredrik Karlsson (2005): *Investeringar i mindre och medelstora tillverkande företag - drivkrafter, struktur, process och beslut*

81. Robert Wenglén (2005): *Från dum till klok? – en studie av mellanchefers lärande*

80. Agneta Erfors (2004): *Det är dans i parken ikväll – Om samverkan mellan näringsliv och akademi med forskningsparken som mäklande miljö och aktör*
79. Peter Svensson (2004): *Setting the Marketing Scene. Reality Production in Everyday Marketing Work*
78. Susanne Arvidsson (2003): *Demand and Supply of Information on Intangibles: The Case of Knowledge-Intense Companies*
77. Lars Nordgren (2003): *Från patient till kund. Intåget av marknadstänkande i sjukvården och förskjutningen av patientens position*
76. Marie Löwegren (2003): *New Technology Based Firms in Science Parks. A Study of Resources and Absorbtive Capacity*
75. Jacob Östberg (2003): *What's Eating the Eater? Perspectives on the Everyday Anxiety of Food Consumption in Late Modernity*
74. Anna Stafsudd (2003): *Measuring the Unobservable: Selecting Which Managers for Higher Hierarchical Levels*
73. Henrick Gyllberg & Lars Svensson (2002): *Överensstämmelse mellan situationer och ekonomistyrsystem – en studie av medelstora företag*
72. Mohammed Nurul Alam (2002): *Financing of Small and Cottage Industries in Bangladesh by Islamic Banks. An Institutional-Network Approach*
71. Agneta Planander (2002): *Strategiska allianser och förtroendeprocesser – en studie av strategiska samarbeten mellan högteknologiska företag*
70. Anders Bengtsson (2002): *Consumers and Mixed-Brands. On the Polysemy of Brand Meaning*
69. Mikael Hellström (2002): *Resultatenheter i kommunalteknisk verksamhet struktur, process och effekt*
68. Ralph Meima (2002): *Corporate Environmental Management. Managing (in) a New Practice Area*
67. Torbjörn Tagesson (2002): *Kostnadsredovisning som underlag för benchmarking och prissättning – studier av kommunal va-verksamhet*
66. Claus Baderschneider (2002): *Collaboratively Learning Marketing: How Organizations Jointly Develop and Appropriate Marketing Knowledge*
65. Hans Landström, Jan Mattsson, Helge Helmersson (2001): *Ur en forskar-handledares örtagård. En vänbok till Bertil Gandemo*
64. Johan Anselmsson (2001): *Customer-Perceived Quality and Technology-Based Self-service*
63. Patrick Sweet (2001): *Designing Interactive Value Development. Perspectives and Strategies for High Precision Marketing*
62. Niclas Andrén (2001): *Essays on Corporate Exposure to Macroeconomic Risk*
61. Heléne Tjärnemo (2001): *Eco-Marketing & Eco-Management*

60. Ulf Elg & Ulf Johansson (2000): *Dynamiskt relationsbyggande i Europa. Om hur olika slags relationer samspelar, illustrerat av svenska dagligvaruföretag*
59. Kent Springdal (2000): *Privatisation of the IT Sector in Sweden*
58. Hans Knutsson (2000): *Process-Based Transaction Cost Analysis. A cost management exploration in SCA Packaging*
57. Ola Mattisson (2000): *Kommunala huvudmannastrategier för kostnadspress och utveckling. En studie av kommunal teknik*
56. Karin Bryntse (2000): *Kontraktsstyrning i teori och praktik*
55. Thomas Kalling (1999): *Gaining Competitive Advantage through Information Technology. A Resource-Based Approach to the Creation and Employment of Strategic IT Resources*
54. Matts Kärreman (1999): *Styrelseledamöters mandat – ansats till en teori om styrelsearbete i börsnoterade företag*
53. Katarina Svensson-Kling (1999): *Credit Intelligence in Banks. Managing Credit Relationships with Small Firms*
52. Henrik Kristensen (1999): *En studie av prisförhandlingar vid företags förvärv*
51. Anders H. Adrem (1999): *Essays on Disclosure Practices in Sweden. Causes and Effects*
50. Fredrik Ljungdahl (1999): *Utveckling av miljöredovisning i svenska börsbolag – praxis, begrepp, orsaker*
49. Kristina Henriksson (1999): *The Collective Dynamics of Organizational Learning. On Plurality and Multi-Social Structuring*
48. Stefan Sveningsson (1999): *Strategisk förändring, makt och kunskap. Om disciplinering och motstånd i tidningsföretag*
47. Sten-Åke Carleheden (1999): *Telemonopolens strategier. En studie av telekommunikationsmonopolens strategiska beteende*
46. Anette Risberg (1999): *Ambiguities Thereafter. An interpretive approach to acquisitions*
45. Hans Wessblad (1999): *Omständigheter på ett kärnkraftverk. Organisering av risk och institutionalisering av säkerhet*
44. Alexander Styhre (1998): *The Pleasure of Management Ideas. The discursive formation of Kaizen*
43. Ulla Johansson (1998): *Om ansvar. Ansvarsföreställningar och deras betydelse för den organisatoriska verkligheten*
42. Sven-Arne Nilsson (1998): *Redovisning av Goodwill. Utveckling av metoder i Storbritannien, Tyskland och USA*
41. Johan Ekström (1998): *Foreign Direct Investment by Large Swedish Firms –The Role of Economic Integration and Exchange Rates*

40. Stefan Yard (1997): *Beräkningar av kapitalkostnader – samlade effekter i bestånd särskilt vid byte av metod och avskrivningstid*

39. Fredrik Link (1997): *Diffusion Dynamics and the Pricing of Innovations*

38. Frans Melin (1997): *Varumärket som strategiskt konkurrensmedel. Om konsten att bygga upp starka varumärken*

37. Kristina Eneroth (1997): *Strategi och kompetensdynamik – en studie av Axis Communications*

36. Ulf Ramberg (1997): *Utformning och användning av kommunala verksamhetsmått*

35. Sven-Olof Collin (1997): *Ägande och effektivitet. Wallenberggruppens och Svenska Handelsbanksgruppens struktur, funktion och effektivitet*

34. Mats Urde (1997): *Märkesorientering och märkeskompetens. Utveckling av varumärken som strategiska resurser och skydd mot varumärkesdegeneration*

33. Ola Alexanderson & Per Trossmark (1997): *Konstruktion av förnyelse i organisationer*

32. Kristina Genell (1997): *Transforming management education. A Polish mixture*

31. Kjell Mårtensson (1997): *Företagets agerande i förhållande till naturbelastningen. Hur företaget möter myndigheternas miljökrav*

30. Erling Green (1997): *Kreditbedömning och intuition. Ett tolkningsförslag*

29. Leif Holmberg (1997): *Health-care Processes. A Study of Medical Problem-solving in the Swedish Health-care Organisation*

28. Samuel K. Buame (1996): *Entrepreneurship. A Contextual Perspective. Discourses and Praxis of Entrepreneurial Activities within the Institutional Context of Ghana*

27. Hervé Corvellec (1996): *Stories of Achievement. Narrative Features of Organizational Performance*

26. Kjell Tryggestad (1995): *Teknologistrategier og post Moderne Kapitalisme. Introduksjon av computerbasert produksjonsteknik*

25. Christer Jonsson (1995): *Ledning i folkrörelseorganisationer – den interaktiva ledningslogiken*

24. Lisbeth Svengren (1995): *Industriell design som strategisk resurs. En studie av designprocessens metoder och synsätt som del i företags strategiska utveckling*

23. Jon Aarum Andersen (1994): *Ledelse og effektivitet. Teori og prøving*

22. Sing Keow Hoon-Halbauer (1994): *Management of Sino-Foreign Joint Ventures*

21. Rikard Larsson, Lars Bengtsson, Kristina Eneroth & Allan T. Malm (1993): *Research in Strategic Change*

20. Kristina Artsberg, Anne Loft & Stefan Yard (1993): *Accounting Research in Lund*

19. Gert Paulsson (1993): *Accounting Systems in Transition. A case study in the Swedish health care organization*
18. Lars Bengtsson (1993): *Intern diversifiering som strategisk process*
17. Kristina Artsberg (1992): *Normbildning och redovisningsförändring. Värderingar vid val av mätprinciper inom svensk redovisning*
16. Ulf Elg & Ulf Johansson (1992): *Samspelet mellan struktur och agerande i dagligvarukedjan. En analys ur ett interorganisatoriskt nätverksperspektiv*
15. Claes Svensson (1992): *Strategi i federativa organisationer – teori och fallstudier*
14. Lars Edgren (1991): *Service management inom svensk hälso- och sjukvård – affärsutveckling och kundorganisation*
13. Agneta Karlsson (1991): *Om strategi och legitimitet. En studie av legitimitetsproblematiken i förbindelse med strategisk förändring i organisationer*
12. Anders Hytter (1991): *Den idémässiga dimensionen – decentralisering som struktur och idéförändring*
11. Anders Anell (1991): *Från central planering till lokalt ansvar. Budgeteringens roll i landstingskommunal sjukvård*
10. Rikard Larsson (1990): *Coordination of Action in Mergers and Acquisitions. Interpretive and Systems Approaches towards Synergy*
9. Sven-Olof Collin (1990): *Aktiebolagets kontroll. Ett transaktionskostnadsteoretiskt inlägg i debatten om ägande och kontroll av aktiebolag och storföretag*
8. John Ogbor (1990): *Organizational Change within a Cultural Context. The Interpretation of Cross-Culturally Transferred Organizational Practices*
7. Rikard Larsson (1989): *Organizational Integration of Mergers and Acquisitions. A Case Survey of Realization of Synergy Potentials*
6. Bertil Hultén (1989): *Från distributionskanaler till orkestrerade nätverk. En studie om fabrikanters kanalval och samarbete med återförsäljare i svensk byggmaterialindustri*
5. Olof Arwidi (1989): *Omräkning av utländska dotterföretags redovisning. Metodproblem och konsekvenser för svenska koncerner*
4. Bengt Igelström (1988): *Resursskapande processer vid företagande i kris*
3. Karin Jonnergård (1988): *Federativa processer och administrativ utveckling. En studie av federativa kooperativa organisationer*
2. Lennart Jörberg (1988): *Svenska företagare under industrialismens genombrott 1870–1885*
1. Stefan Yard (1987): *Kalkyllogik och kalkylkrav – samband mellan teori och praktik vid kravställandet på investeringar i företag*

Constructing the 'social' in social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship is often depicted as *the* solution to the various problems we have in society today. In the mainstream literature, it tends to be presented as a site of empowerment, inclusion, morality and compassion. Although the 'entrepreneurship' part of the term has received much attention, we yet know little about the 'social' in social entrepreneurship. In the study and practice of social entrepreneurship, the meaning of the 'social' is largely left vague and open-ended, seemingly implying a neutral and universal form of goodness.

Drawing upon a more critical stream of literature, which emphasizes the inherently political and ideological character of the 'social', I explore how the 'social' in social entrepreneurship is constructed and upheld. To do so, I study how an idea of the 'social' became established during the process of a sustainable transition taking place on a small Danish Island. Acknowledging the community resistance directed to this initiative, and making use of a postcolonial lens to highlight the power relations implicated in the process of making the island sustainable, I discuss who gets a say in deciding what is 'social' and for whom it turns out to be 'social'. Although a multitude of actors were necessary to form and uphold an idea of the 'social', these actors did not participate on equal terms. Some gained from the construction of the 'social' and others did not. I thus suggest that we can understand the 'social' in social entrepreneurship as shaped by parallel processes of inclusion and exclusion.

Printed by Media-Tryck, Lund 2021 NORDIC SWAN ECOLABEL 3041 0903

LUND UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT

Department of Business Administration

ISBN: 978-91-7895-845-0 (tryck)
ISBN: 978-91-7895-846-7 (pdf)