

How does the new phenomenon of political Social Entrepreneurship diverge and converge with the existing theory of Social Entrepreneurship?

Master's thesis in Social Entrepreneurship and Management - autumn semester 2015

Johannes Vasco Lockwood (51096)

Supervisor: Luise Li Langergaard

Pages: 60

Words: 20.800

Characters: 139.321

Abstract in Danish

Hovedformålet med denne opgave er at forsøge at forstå det nye fænomen "Det socialt Entreprenante Politiske Parti" via et single case-studie af Alternativet. Ydermere er hensigten at undersøge i hvilket omfang det teoretiske concept "Politisk Social Entreprenørskab" konvergerer eller divergerer med den eksisterende teori inden for Socialt Iværksætteri. Dette undersøges via en teoretisk triangulering af begrebet Socialt Iværksætteri som fører til 4 operationaliserbare dimensioner a) Socialt drive og identitet b) Værdiskabelse c) Social Innovation 4) Organisatorisk/cross-sectorial. Disse 4 dimensioner består af hver 59 indikatorer som hver efterprøves på Alternativet. 58 ud af de 59 indikatorer for Social Entreprenørskab viser at være kongruente med fænomenet "Det Socialt Entreprenante Politiske Parti" Efterfølgende problematiseres den interne validitet, hvilket skaber et mere nuanceret billed af den umiddelbare komplette kongruens i mellem de to koncepter. Ydermere diskuteres der fremtidsudsigterne for "Det socialt Entreprenante Politiske Parti" ud fra teori om politisering, governance og diskurs.

Table of Contents

Introduction	p. 4
Problem Definition	p. 6
Problem Area and Context	p. 7
Project Outline	p. 9
Literature Review	p. 10
Case Description	p. 12
Methodology	p. 13
Research Philosophy	p. 13
Deductive and inductive reasoning	p. 15
Case Study	p. 16
Semi-Structured Interviews	p. 17
Interview with Alternativet	p. 18
Transcription	p. 19
Limitations	p. 19
Theory	p. 20
Social Drive and Identity	p. 20
Value Creation	p. 22
Social Entrepreneurship from an Organizational Perspective:	
Corporate Entrepreneurship and Cross-Sectorialism	p. 24
Social Innovation	p. 26
Conclusion of theory	p. 29
Operationalization	p. 30
Social Drive and identity dimension	p. 30
Value creation dimension	p. 32
Social Innovation dimension	p. 34
Organizational/cross-sectoral dimension	p. 35
Analysis	p. 36
Alternativet's Political Party Program	p. 36
Social Drive/Identity	p. 37

	Value Creation dimension	p. 39
	Social Innovation dimension	p. 41
	Organizational/cross-sectoral dimension	p. 43
	In summary	p. 44
	Possible Divergences	p. 45
	Capitalism and the new ways of class society	p. 46
	Values, as a fixed entity or as an ongoing process	p. 47
	The identity of Alternativet	p. 48
Discussion	The future of Political Social Entrepreneurship	p. 49
Conclusion		p. 55
Bibliography		p. 56
Appendix 1		p. 60

Introduction

A social entrepreneur, who through social innovative processes created a social entrepreneurial political party. This is the short version of how the Danish party Alternativet was established. Despite the newsworthiness in the very fact that a new party was established with visions, which were rather unorthodox, there was nothing genuinely new about this. New parties rise and most make their way into obscurity after a while. The visionary unorthodoxy as well is a common feature of new parties; friends of Schiller Institute had the idea of a world wide maglev and Nihilistic Folk Party imagined a world where young people should play World of Warcraft for 8 hours a day. The fame of the latter was compendious. But, the birth of Alternativet was different. Uffe Elbæk and Alternativet did not fade away - on the contrary - they grew. They grew in members, they gathered people from all the country to participate in more than 20 political laboratories, and the media coverage continued. It was apparent that something Alternativet did, or said, was in vogue.

From being a circumspect and sagacious discipline, Social Entrepreneurship is now buzzing. Ashoka founder and chief executive Bill Drayton together with Yale economics professor and MIT Poverty Action Lab research fellow Dean Karlan were asked to put down a list of the 30 top social entrepreneurs in contemporary society. A list, which consisted of highly inspiring people in the spheres of social business, education, innovation, academia and etc. (Forbes, 2011). Noteworthy, there were no politicians present, or for that matter anyone working primarily within the traditional formal political system.

One could easily argue that the field of Social Entrepreneurship is increasingly wide spreading, economically, discursively, organizationally and academically - but a distinct and self-proclaimed social entrepreneurial party is cutting edge conceptually, discursively and theoretically.

As scholars and facilitators of Social Entrepreneurship we routinely address social enterprises like Gramin Bank or Buddha Bikes, we analyze innovative collaborations between private companies and NGO's or we discuss different kind of CSR projects among various other things. The common denominator is that our focus has been on the entities and processes

outside the formal political system. A Social Entrepreneurship theorist Filipe M. Santos (2012) explains that the negligence of the problems Social Entrepreneurship tries to solve is based on the idea that the government is not able to allocate resources or incentives towards the resolution of such problems. Furthermore, social enterprises are characterized as actors, who pursue disregarded problems occurring from the failure of the government and the market. Even Professor Gregory Dees, who is widely acknowledged for being the first to define the field of Social Entrepreneurship, (Bloomberg, 2014) explains that although government and philanthropic activities are undeniably helpful, they are often not sufficient, and in the process of identification of this gap, Social Entrepreneurship occurs (Dees, 1998). In other words, the inadequacy of the state and the market helps to give rise to the need for Social Entrepreneurship. Historically one could argue that a transition was made from a traditional system in which the state was the sole provider of reallocation and welfare services and into a connected globalized information society in which actors e.g. social entrepreneurs or social enterprises outside the state would supplement or compensate services or goods.

Sociologist Manuel Castells (2005) calls the latter for The Network Society in which the individual is disillusioned and mired with apathy relating to the traditional system. A reaction is seen from the individual through an exploration of the possibilities forwarded to attain influence in various ways. This result is made to be an extensive and prevailing focus on the effects or outcome (red. output) of the political system. The former gives place for the identity of the social entrepreneur.

The materialization of activities relating to social entrepreneurship has been seen through the lens of three decisive macro-dynamics. The first involves the reduced speed of the mechanisms related to public offering that resulted to an increase in the non-response to social needs, particularly of social services and products (Mair and Marti, 2006). Also, Bornstein (2004) mentions that disequilibrium in the income level distribution among countries in developed and developing areas is seen to trigger a growth in the need for novel paradigms as well as business strategies. Lastly, there has been an increasing need for professionalizing the activities related to the aim of reducing financial dependence among nations. This is due the growing competition seen between non-profit sector organizations in regarding the way in which grants and donations are received. This leads to an assurance of economic stability towards the development and maintenance of social mission in such sectors (Fowler, 2000)

Undoubtedly, it is of high complexity to pinpoint exactly what factors, variables or causalities caused the rise of Social Entrepreneurship as a distinct phenomena, however this thesis will not approach these themes. This thesis takes its basis on what I would suggest is a completely new phenomenon in our modernity - the rise of *A Social Entrepreneurial Political Party*; exemplified by the new Danish party Alternativet.

This thesis will shed light upon Social Entrepreneurship when it *merges* with the traditional formal political system (in terms of a formal political party) - and *not*, as scholars and researchers of Social Entrepreneurship normally perceive it, as a separate identity, with entities *outside* the formal political system reacting against or collaborating with the system itself.

I want to investigate Alternativet as the formal *politicization* of Social Entrepreneurship, which I see as a radical shift in how we are academically comprehending, theorizing and conceptualizing this domain of study. Very little has been written about this prior to this thesis, also due to the fact that Alternativet is a new party. I would argue that there is a great need to investigate this new phenomenon in order to deduct whether it has theoretical implications for Social Entrepreneurship, as we know it today.

The following research questions has led me to the problem definition, which is going to serve as a guideline throughout the project:

- How can we use the theory of Social Entrepreneurship to understand the new phenomena of a Social Entrepreneurial political party exemplified by Alternativet?

With the additional sub questions:

- How can the Social Entrepreneurial political party Alternativet be understood from the following dimensions:
 - a) Social Drive and identity
 - b) Value Creation
 - c) Social Innovation
 - d) Organizational/cross-sectorial

Problem definition

How does the new phenomenon of political Social Entrepreneurship diverge and converge with the existing theory of Social Entrepreneurship?

Problem Area and Context

It is of course not a coincidence that the Political Social Entrepreneurial Party Alternativet rises at this point in our modernity. In order to comprehend the full meaning and academic context I would argue that it is of utmost importance to introduce the contextual frame of the modernity from which this thesis takes its basis.

Many political scientists and sociologists theorize about the apparent paradox that despite the fact that democracy is increasingly spreading as a governance paradigm all around the world, people continuously become disillusioned. Numerous studies and scientific reports support this assumption - that individual to a greater extent than previously feels alienated, abused and apathetic regarding the political sphere.

There are written many reports about how political participation as a collective identity in our contemporary political modernity. Despite a wide variety of explanations among thinkers who engage academically in the so-called *Democratic Deficit*, there is substantial consensus in mainstream sociology that modern democracy is characterized by an extensive disintegration (March and Olsen, 1995, 69-70). The traditional consensual politics have been replaced by celebrities, spin-doctors, and self-interest, and people generally feel that their government is not sufficiently responsive to their preferences. Furthermore, individuals feel like representative democracy by no means represent the citizens' interests - but rather some narrow elitist organized group interests (Warren, 2002).

One of the most prominent critics of the current democratic situation, Jürgen Habermas, tells the story of how the public sphere is constantly being undermined by widespread egocentric approach to life; flourishing around leisure, consumption and lifestyle (Goode, 2005, 18). The culture is being dragged down to the lowest common denominator - where the possibilities of intellectualism, debate and inter-subjective understanding are made a question of whether it can be sold or not. A common terminology, *colonization of life world*, where money and power invades and erodes meaningful, and solidarity between human understanding of the subjective, inter-subjective and objective world (ibid, 69).

Other theoretical perspectives emphasize a development that has led to the erosion of social capital as disastrous for democracy - an example of this is Robert Putnam, who focuses on a

symptomatic downward frequency of newspaper reading and voting, which according to him are significant indicators that the community previously was surrounded by a strong social network, whereas now people are increasingly interested in just being themselves (Putnam, 1995, 674). The consequences are that the whole basis of democracy is threatened; mistrust, exploitation, isolation and disorder reinforce each other and causes people to become democratic passive (Putnam, 1993, 177).

Nowhere does it seem like traditional politics are exciting or engaging people. It is therefore no surprise that participation in elections and parties has been in free fall across most western societies (Hay, 2007). Expert systems have invaded the individual's everyday life and stripped it of its autonomy and, the individual is robbed every cognitive ability for. Thus, the individual is to devolve as a human being (Goode, 2005, 20).

A further criticism is directed towards the many traditional political parties around Europe. They are alleged to have rationalized policy to an extent where there is no potential of identification. The lack of distinct political identification has had alienating effect on the electoral. Policy and communications have simply been undergoing a radical process of rationalization, leading to political apathy among many voters (Mouffe, 2000b, 108-11).

There is furthermore a more moral philosophical criticism, pointing out that unlike previously, democracy has tragically decoupled morality - where the former and the latter were previously considered inseparable, today morally normative attitude becomes disintegrated in the political domain (Goode, 2005, 70). Another criticism puts more emphasis on the emotional aspect of the individual, as a fixed latent essential component of man and criticizing democracy to have evolved into something that ignores and rejects the major role of passions and emotions in politics. This has led to apathy and inhibited identification (Mouffe, 2000a, 1). Following this criticism Mouffe states that our democracy has simply become too vague. They argue that an essential element of democracy is resistance and disagreement, entities that should never be excluded or eliminated (Little 2008). The existence of democracy needs diversity and clear alternatives - in order for the individual to maintain the possibility of identification. Today's democracy regrettably has undergone a development in which the identification has been made more difficult, due to the severe difficulties of maintaining and stimulating empathy (March and Olsen, 1995, 60).

An institutional critique emphasizes that the institutional design in itself fails to facilitate the transformation from antagonism to agonism (Mouffe, 2000b, 116). The result of the latter is

that democracy which is theoretically understood as based on freedom and equality, actually operates in such a way that it contributes to exclusion and marginalization of 'dissidents' and their oppositional perspectives. There is an emerging an almost universal disdain towards traditional politics - to say that someone "acts politically almost means he or she lacks integrity, honesty or ability to deliver. Today we are in a situation where large multinational corporations have been given such a degree of sovereignty that they have been able to break away from the political and have gained something resembling outright political autonomy (Warren 2002).

Horror scenarios are clear if the democracy decay continues. The consequences could be that destructive and morality abandoned individuals gather in plenty and makes system rebellion, which in extreme cases leads to the cancellation and the destruction of the society we know today - that our common intersubjective universe of symbols is due, and the individual does not focus on anything other than sheer existential survival (Habermas, 1998, 122-125).

The above-mentioned decay of democracy is something that Alternativet acknowledges. Both in relation to the current economic and political structure of today from an individual policy and structural point of view, which according to Alternativet, is completely unsustainable (Alternivet, 3). Luckily, Alternativet also has a firm belief that we are on a verge of a societal breakthrough (ibid, 4). These thoughts and stands have clearly and repeatedly been communicated by Alternativet. By addressing the current issue in our modernity, Alternativet arguably created a fresh new breeze in the Danish political environment, and by doing so created a new hope among many Danes. This, without a doubt, has greatly contributed to the rise of Alternativet as a party. Even though Alternativet has been, or still is, considered by many a rather naive party with visions that are often seen as unrealistic, the people were still eager to give Alternativet a chance. An explanation of this can be that people wanted to see the change in the discourse of politics, and to renew the lingering hope that the modernity is not completely going into decay. Thus, it is of my belief, that Alternativet was seen as a contrast to the other political parties, who in the eyes of the electorate were part of contributing to the decay - and by being so, became an important new stepping stone in Danish politics.

Project Outline

My main objective is to understand the new phenomena of a Social Entrepreneurial political party Alternativet, and to investigate to what degree the concept of Political Social

Entrepreneurship converges or diverges on four operationalized dimensions of the theoretical concept of Social Entrepreneurship.

Firstly, I try to create a transparent overview of the theories I use throughout this thesis. Secondly, I make a formal case description of Alternativet. Thirdly, I present the methodology and the choices I have made concerning philosophy of science, research design and approach, and the use of data. Fourthly, I present the theories which are divided in four sections: 1) Social Identity and Drive of Social Entrepreneurship 2) Value Creation 3) Social Innovation and 4) Organizational/cross-sectorial. Subsequently, I take the four theoretical dimensions and I operationalize them into four dimensions consisting of a total of 59 indicators. I then look for the 59 indicators in the political manifesto of Alternativet and put forth the different divergences and convergences between the 59 indicators (Social entrepreneurship: 4 dimensions) and Alternativet (Political manifesto). I then include possible discrepancies between my conceptualization of the theory (internal validity) and the phenomena of Political Social Entrepreneurship by using the political advisor of Alternativet Helene Hagel as an interviewee. Subsequently I discuss the prognosis for Alternativet and what it might take for them to actually implement their ideas politically through a process of politicization. In addition to this I discuss whether there ontologically speaking are obstacles for the conceptualization of Political Social Entrepreneurship. After this, I put forth the notion of that a variety of Political Social Entrepreneurship might already be present in the public administration as New Public Governance. I then proceed to the conclusion in which I sum up my results from the theories, the operationalization, the analysis and the discussion.

Literature review

This thesis is a theoretical hybrid and cross-disciplinary in that sense that numerous theorists are used within the academic field of Social Entrepreneurship, Sociology, Business studies and Political science. The consequences of this a broad variety of theorists. In order to shed light upon my theoretical choices I have made a graphical overview of the literature being used (please see below). The first column from the right is which theorists being used in answering what questions (second column from the right) in which sections of the thesis (third column from the right).

Introduction	The broad perspective	(Santos 2012), (Dees, 1998), (Castells, 2005), (Mair and Marti, 2006), (Bornstein, 2004), (Fowler, 2000)
The problem area	The political modernity	(March and Olsen, 1995), (Warren, 2002), (Goode, 2005), (Putnam, 1995), (Putnam, 1993), (Hay, 2007), (Mouffe, 2000b), (Mouffe, 2000a), (Habermas, 1998)
	Explanations of the rise of Social Entrepreneurship?	(Santos, 2012), (Dees, 2014), (Dees, 1998), (Mair and Marti, 2006), (Bornstein, 2004), (Fowler, 2000;)
Methodology	Theory of Science, research approach, Use of Data, Case Study, Pre-understanding, case-selection, interview, documents, limitations,	(McLaughlin, 2007), (Saunders et al., 2009), (Dey, 2004), (Sandelowski, 2004), (Yin, 2009), (Bryman, 2007), (Stake, 2012), (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007), (Hellevik 2002), (Elkit and Jensen 2010: 4), (Aberbach and Rockman, 2002), (Kvale, 2008), (Lynggaard, 2010), (Patton, 1999), (Boyce and Neale, 2006)
	How can value creation be understood	(Mair and Marti, 2006), (Santos, 2012), (Austin et al., 2006a), (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010), (Peredo and McLean, 2006), (Dees, 1998),
	What is social innovation?	(Moulaert, 2005), (Franz, 2010), (Phills et al., 2008), (Mair and Marti, 2006), (Zapf, 1991), (Bestuzhev-Lada, 1991)
	What is Social Entrepreneurship on an organizational level?	(Martin and Osberg, 2007), (Austin et al., 2006a), (Austin and Reficco, 2009), (Phills et al, 2008)
Discussion	How does the future seem for Political Social	Green-Pedersen, 2011), (Dees, 2004), (Williams, 1976) (Cornwall, 2007). Cho (2006), (Moulart et. al., 2003),

	Entrepreneurship?	(North, 1990), (Mair and Marti, 2009), (Martin and Osberg, 2007), (Santos, 2012), (Chell, 2010)
--	-------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Case Description

Alternativet

On the 27th of November 2013 former Minister of Culture Uffe Elbæk and Josephine Fock held a press conference where they have announced the formation of new party called Alternativet.

Many people were surprised, also due to the fact that there was no presentation of a formal political program. Instead, Uffe Elbæk and Josephine Fock submitted Alternativet's core values, and general ideas. The clear aim was to use crowdsourcing as a modus operandi of the formal party program-to-be (alternativet.dk, accessed 2015).

This prioritization was politically controversial, and according to Uffe Elbæk it should be perceived as an attempt to take a stance against the hegemonic notion that the current state of political party discourse is characterized by top-down and management-by-fear governance (ibid).

Instead of the latter, Alternativet would enter a continuous open source process, which would be accessible for all who had the urge to do so. The only two conditions were that one would have to acknowledge the party's six core values: courage, generosity, transparency, humbleness, sense of humor and empathy; and have the desire to change the course of Denmark to be more sustainable in the broadest sense possible.

More than 700 people accepted the invitation and subsequently more than 20 policy laboratories were executed. Visions were discussed, values generated and all the concrete policy ideas, which were hatched were then presented to an audience of expert of critique to assure the quality of the former.

On 24th of May 2014 Alternativet held their first annual meeting where the first political party program was adopted and the official agreed ambition became: *"We strive for Denmark not only being the best country in the world but the best country for the world"* (Alternativet, 2015, 1)

From 2014 to 2015 Alternativet worked hard on gathering signatures in order to officially qualify as candidates for Folketinget, the Danish Parliament. On the 23rd of February 2015 Alternativet's heave was rewarded, and they were able to participate in the official Danish general election. The Danish general election was a success for Alternativet and the party gained 4,9 % of the votes, qualifying them to get into Parliament. Today Alternativet has 9 members in the Parliament and candidates in all constituencies.

Methodology

In this section I would like to present the methodological choices I have made. Firstly, I will begin by explaining the research philosophy this thesis is built upon, and my thoughts behind choosing an interpretive paradigm. Secondly, I will outline three different ways of reasoning, and present my arguments for choosing an abductive reasoning in my investigation. I will continue by describing the concept of case study. This will be followed by a description of the process of conducting semi-structured interviews, continued by a detailed account of my interview process. Finally, I will explain the limitations connected to this thesis.

Research philosophy

The choice of a research philosophy is a vital part of conducting research, since it involves what research strategy is applied and what research instruments are employed in order to investigate the problem definition. There are two main approaches used in research: *positivism* and *interpretivism* (McLaughlin, 2007). In this section I will outline both of the methodological approaches used in research, and thereafter present my own thoughts and arguments for choosing the interpretive approach for this project.

Positivism focuses on *facts* instead of impressions, and emphasizes on observations that are quantifiable and that can be understood through statistical analysis (Saunders et al., 2009). Burrell and Morgan describe this approach as one “*which seeks to explain and predict what happens in the social world by searching for regularities and causal relationships between its constituent elements*” (Burrell and Morgan in Hirschheim, 1985). As this paradigm derives from natural sciences, the main focus is on seeing the world as an entity, which is based on unchangeable, universal laws. Thus, according to the positivist paradigm, universal laws can account for every occurrence. In order to achieve knowledge and understanding of these universal laws, one must gather data by observing and recording. The data collected in this research approach is known as quantitative data. Quantitative research mainly emphasizes on

the collection of statistical data that is taken from a narrowed down sample of a given population, with the aim of drawing conclusions that can be generalized for the broad population or universe. Results and experiments should also be able to be replicated. However, there is an extensive debate about whether one can apply the positivist approach to social sciences to the same extent as to natural sciences (Hirschheim, 1985). Polkinghorne (2005) describes that human experiences is an especially difficult field to investigate, since it revolves around “*multilayered and complex*” factors such as emotions and perceptions. One could argue, that most variables of human experience and differences are not measurable in a quantifiable manner - thus, if using the positivist approach the researcher would be unable to investigate these areas.

The other approach used in research, as mentioned before, is called *interpretivism*. This paradigm of research can be seen as a contrast to the positivist paradigm. As Husserl (1965) describes: “*Interpretivists believe that reality is not objectively determined, but is socially constructed*” (in Kelliher, 2005). Interpretative philosophy of research focuses on individuals as social actors with their own worldviews and perceptions, instead of quantifiable objects (Saunders et al., 2009). As Myers explains: interpretivism is “*concerned with the uniqueness of a particular situation, contributing to the underlying pursuit of contextual depth*” (in Kelliher, 2005). Interpretivists advocate the value of qualitative data, since they are specifically devised in a way that allows the researcher to delve deeper into a person’s thoughts and worldview. Because of this, qualitative research prides itself as an appropriate method in responding to questions pertaining to “how” and “why” (Yin, 2009). One of the most utilized qualitative methods is individual interviews, a method also being used for this project. However, even though qualitative data is highly valued, the results of interpretive research can also often be questioned in relation to validity, reliability, and generalizability (Kelliher, 2005). Nonetheless, as Kelliher mentions, these concerns only reflect the complexity of the field of social studies.

For this project I am implementing the interpretive paradigm of research. Since I am investigating a field concerning social studies, it seems like the most natural choice. As previously described, I am aware of the concerns of research legitimization. I believe it is necessary to provide a brief overview of terms validity, reliability, and generalizability.

Validity is divided into two strings: *external* validity refers to the generalizability from one case to another in our case, to what extent the degree to which Alternativet can be generalized

in regards to other Political Social Entrepreneurial parties in the world. The *internal* validity refers to the extent we are measuring what we want to measure (Hellevik, 49).

Reliability is also divided into two strings: *External* reliability refers to what extent it is possible for a different researcher to reproduce my procedures. *Internal* reliability consists of to what extent there is consistency in coding/operationalization (I am only one researcher which means that a discussion concerning internal reliability is in this case irrelevant) (Ibid.).

Deductive and inductive reasoning

In the research process two reasonings are known: the *deductive* and *inductive* approach. Deductive approach involves the process of testing a theory. In here, the development of a theory, together with a corresponding hypothesis is done by a researcher, and then the hypothesis is tested by collecting quantitative data to make an inference (Saunders et al., 2009). On the other hand, inductive approach involves the creation of a theory instead of testing a theory. Inductive approach could be used in developing concepts associated with understanding processes linked to the apprehension of humans in relation to social surroundings (Saunders et al., 2009). The first step in inductive approach is observation, which is followed by the development of a theory. Usually, a combination of this process together with a qualitative method is made with the aim of answering the current research questions being posed by a researcher (Saunders et al., 2009).

Another new reasoning proposed by researchers has been called *abductive* reasoning. In here, a theory is being used and then an observation follows, which then leads to the drawing of a conclusion regarding the observation in consonance with the presented theory (Dey, 2004). Sometimes, observation is also used as a start, which serves as the stepping-stone for finding a hypothesis and a theory that could be applied. The difference between abduction and induction lies in the application of the theory and the observation, while deduction and abduction differ based on the occurrence of possible interpretations and the production of logical conclusion (Dey, 2004). In theory building, dynamics is followed by abduction by moving to and from the process of building theory and the collection of data. Hence, application of abductive approach aims to be done based on the aim of interpreting an event with the use of a certain theoretical framework as a reference. A new insight would be put forth if the created theory is deemed to be good and capable in explaining aspects or elements of the phenomenon being studied investigation (ibid).

For this particular thesis, a certain theoretical framework has been built before collecting the data. Hence, deductive approach was considered in here. However, this research does not aim to test or prove the theory of social entrepreneurship; rather it is known to have an *exploratory* nature. It is therefore safe to say that the approach used in this research is more of an inductive rather than a deductive one. If this is the case, it is better to apply the proposal of Saunders et al (2009) that abductive approach could be considered for similar instance as it is more suitable when elements of both inductive and deductive are present. With the aim of applying a continuous process of theory development, this research refers to abduction relating to a dynamics seen from conceiving something through a process. This process could lead to the creation of a different and more developed concept of social political entrepreneurship through the placing and interpretation of original ideas related to a certain phenomenon through a certain frame or new ideas.

Case Study

A case study will be utilized in doing this research, which should be considered as a natural continuation of the methodological choices outlined previously. Case study is used in developing profound understanding based on a particular case (Bryman, 2007) - for this research I have chosen the case study of the Danish Social Entrepreneurial party Alternativet.

The conduct of case study, particularly in social researches could be through the use of either an *intensive* or *extensive* focus. For this thesis, an intensive focus is applied for the reason that the aim of the study is to present and focus on Alternativet, and not to make a comparison between two scenarios. The case being studied could be a rare or an *unusual* case, which in this case is seen not as a problem but more as a particular research interest. As mentioned previously, Alternativet is a relatively new party and the first of its kind to fully embrace the Social Entrepreneurial approach. This means that even if I wanted to compare two social entrepreneurial parties in the same context this would not be feasible simply due to the non-existence of a second similar party.

Researchers commonly use case studies because issues are commonly impossible or difficult to explain through quantitative approaches (Bryman, 2007). Similarly, if the objective of the study is to explore a certain issue then intensive case study seems to be more appropriate (Saunders et al., 2009). The case study is important in developing a certain understanding of a specific case instead of proposing a generalization (Stake, 2012). Therefore, the case study could also answer “how” and “why” questions during a research (Saunders et al., 2009),

which is related to case study's exploratory nature suitable for this particular study. The scarcity of research in Social Entrepreneurial political parties also makes the application of intensive case study an appropriate method for this research as it will enable the researcher to develop a more extensive knowledge and understanding of Social Entrepreneurship in a theoretical and practical way for a long-term contribution to the society (Saunders et al., 2009).

The use of case study depends on intimacy as well as the benefits of understanding the details needed for the assessment of its complexity (Bryman and Bell, 2007). Researchers doing case studies aim to emphasize the distinctive characteristics of a particular case (Yin, 2009). Doing a case study enables the researcher to explore a phenomenon and gain in-depth understanding through a context that is new and exceptional (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007).

Semi-Structured Interviews

In order to gather my data, I have also chosen to conduct a semi-structured interview including an interview guide. The latter ensured a planned and a structured red line, but also made room to pursue interesting and unforeseen themes and questions. Thus, the questions for the interview were prepared beforehand, but merely were used as a guideline. This approach has the potential of making the interview more into a conversation. This not only tends to make the interviewee more relaxed, but can even lead to a creating of a stronger trust bond between the interviewer and the interviewee.

When conducting semi-structured interviews, some things should be considered. Kvale (2008) presented three fundamental considerations to be made by researchers when doing semi-structured interviews. The first consideration is related to the interviewer's openness to phenomena that are novel, instead of applying standardized categories or models for interpretation and analysis. Kvale refers to this character as "qualified naïveté". Next, it should be noted that the structure does not have a strict character, it does not possess standard questions, and it is non-directive. This means that the focus is on specific themes but the responses from the case will be obtained using open-ended questions that directly points to the specific research topic. Lastly, a clarification should be done regarding some uncertainties relating to the answers given by the respondent, with the aim to define the reason why communication fails between the respondent and the interviewer. This is also done to understand contradictions, particularly in the context of real world as seen by the interviewee.

In addition to this it is important to emphasize that the statements ought not to be seen as definitive truth, but more of a personal reflection upon the policies of the Alternativet.

Interview with Alternativet

In order to get an interview with a representative of Alternativet I have gone through a long process of contacting different party members and emailing various Alternativet's politicians who are currently sitting in Folketinget. However, it proved rather difficult to get an interview with the politicians of the party, due to their tight schedules. Instead I have chosen to interview Alternativet's political advisor Helene Hagel.

The questions prepared for the interview revolved around the general topics of this thesis - more specifically, they revolved around exploring the potential discrepancies between my operationalized conceptualization of Social Entrepreneurship of 59 indicators and Alternativet's policies.

The interview took place at Christiansborg, at Helene Hagel's workplace. This was done intentionally for two reasons - firstly, I knew that it would ensure a quiet and relaxed environment, where we would not be interrupted. Secondly, in the process of writing my thesis I felt like I have really delved into the party of Alternativet, so I found it of extreme interest to actually be present in the environment where their decisions and visions are created.

At the beginning of the interview, Helene was briefed about her ethical rights concerning the interview. Furthermore, she was asked if she wished to remain anonymous for the interview, to which she replied that she did not have a problem with her name being mentioned. The aim and problem definition was presented at the beginning of the interview.

Lastly, the whole interview was recorded using a recording device.

Transcription

According to Steinar Kvale there are two ways of conducting a transcription. The first one takes in unfinished sentences and onomatopoeitikon - this is the detail-oriented approach. The second one is the approach, which I have chosen to adapt, consisting of a more gross transcription in which the content will be presented as written language (Kvale, 2008). The result has the potential of losing some minor nuances, but on the other hand the readability is enhanced. The interview can be found as an audio file in the Appendix 1.

Limitations

All research methods have limitations. These limitations should be considered to evaluate the extent of certainty and uncertainty in given observations, and the data or results. Similarly, the limitations should also be understood in order to assess the findings' reliability, validity, credibility, and generalizability. In general, qualitative research multiplies the potential bias of the researchers' experience, knowledge, skills, and training. These elements could strongly affect the research design and its quality, as well as the data that is observed, gathered, analyzed and evaluated. The method that is proposed to be used in the research is also based on respondent, source selection and identification. This plays a vital part in the determination of research quality and credibility (Patton, 1999). Interviews can be disadvantageous when bias is seen from the respondents, especially when the interviewer is expecting a socially desirable answer to particular questions. In here, there is a possibility that the interviewee will provide an answer based on his/her assumption of the interviewer's expected answer. Likewise, interviews can be considered as an inappropriate technique if the interviewer does not have the capability or the experience in doing it. Boyce and Neale (Boyce and Neale, 2006) also consider that the technique is time-consuming. In order to attain the qualified naïveté approach as mentioned above, it is important to maintain the complexity between the interviewer's attitude that is free from presuppositions and his/her prior knowledge on the topic. In interaction is construed based on the knowledge created between the interaction of the respondent and the interviewer. In here, the interviewer may have different knowledge and claims about a subject when interacting with the similar respondent. For this particular research, the limitation on relatively few data is understood in two respects. First, only one respondent was involved when gathering primary data using semi-structured interviews; and second, there exists a scarcity of secondary data relating to policy and politics in this specific social entrepreneurial context (which also emphasizes the exploratory attributes of this research design). A limitation is then posed in relation to the likelihood of comprehensively understanding the given situation under study. The various limitations mentioned undeniably affect reliability of the research results, and consequently, the development of the same results when negative replication of the research is done.

Lastly, it is important to mention that documents and articles utilized in this research regarding Alternativet have been originally written in Danish. When citing I have myself translated the texts, which can be argued to have an influence on the research validity.

Theory

In this chapter I would like to present the theoretical framework which this thesis is built upon, with the aim of explaining multifacetedly the theory, which later will form the basis of the operationalization of Social Entrepreneurship in politics. I do this by explaining the subtle but broad concept of Social Entrepreneurship.

Firstly, I explain the various theorists' perception of Social Entrepreneurship in the section of Social Drive and Identity. Secondly, I go in-depth with the core part of Social Entrepreneurship, namely Value Creation. Thirdly, I will explain briefly about Social Entrepreneurship in an organizational and cross-sectoral field. Fourthly, I will explain in depth about Social Innovation. I will theoretically triangulate the four forthcoming, specified Social Entrepreneurial dimensions in order to gain the widest and consistent Operationalization subsequently.

Social Drive and Identity

Mair and Marti (2006, 37) explain that there are three core researcher groups, and these are guided by the differences in their views pertaining to Social Entrepreneurship (SE). The first group points out that social entrepreneurship refers to initiatives that are not-for-profit and is aimed at searching for alternative strategies for funding, or the creation and maintenance of social value through effective management schemes. The second one is related to socially responsible activities or practices related to commercial business engagement happening in partnerships involving public, private and civil society sectors. Lastly, social entrepreneurship is known to be a way of alleviating or resolving social problems, as well as catalyzing social transformation. While this shows different perspectives in understanding SE, the term is still broadly understood as a certain subset relating to entrepreneurship or entrepreneurial practices, which is strongly focused on the promotion of social value as compared to the traditionally known entrepreneurship emphasizing on economic value or profit (Martin and Osberg, 2007). Nevertheless, economic value and its process of creation are seen as means to an end, particularly in the conduct and maintenance of social activities (Dees, 1998). On the contrary, some authors such as Mair and Marti (2006) disagree with the aforementioned description because they contend that traditional entrepreneurship does not essentially aim to embody economic value. Instead, the main focus of entrepreneurship is self-fulfillment, and the social entrepreneur highlights social fulfillment in its activities (Mair

and Marti, 2006). 'Social', in this sense, is closely associated with social needs such as human necessities, including food and shelter, as well as the means to obtain employment of people in order to cover the cost of living needs or improving the quality of life. This may also refer to solutions pertaining to social problems, like poverty, unemployment, and gender inequality, among others (Zahra et al., 2009). A person's motivation to attain his social goals or to increase his contribution, or social value, in relation to the community and people's well being is the very core of the 'social' in SE (Peredo and McLean, 2006). Players of the traditional market somehow overlook these problems; hence, social entrepreneurs aim to fill this gap through their relevant activities. While government and philanthropic activities related to SE are undeniably helpful, it is also admitted that they are not quite sufficient (Dees, 1998). This makes social institutions often to be considered as ineffective or unresponsive. Thus, SE existed for this very purpose – in order to build novel models that could be used in addressing these issues. Social entrepreneurs conduct activities that are not similar with the present initiatives or activities of other sectors; rather they put forth the idea and practice of innovation and novelty (Austin et al., 2006). Generally, these are done from the point of view of established organizations or through a creation of new ventures (Mair and Marti, 2006). Nonetheless, Mair and Marti (2006) mention that SE has the tendency and possibility to coexist within the framework of for-profit or not-for-profit schema. However, boundaries associated with SE should be delineated to clarify the definition and analyze the difference of SE with other social activities (Martin and Osberg, 2007). In addition, SE is similar with entrepreneurship as they are both vital in society's economic aspect (Martin and Osberg, 2007). The most significant element that differentiates SE from different types of entrepreneurship lies in the core of its objective (Peredo and McLean, 2006). In particular, SE is known to be exclusively based on the idea of social value creation. The ultimate process for social entrepreneurs tends to start with the identification of a gap, followed by a response to this identified gap, obtainment of resources that would aid in the undertaking of actions, and finally combining them to materialize an effective solution (Thompson, 2002). Social entrepreneurs should also know how to acquire and integrate new resources through creative means while adjusting how existing social structures operate (Mair and Marti, 2006). Social entrepreneurs thriving in organizations are distinguished from others based on forces driving them, which they possess by following through with activities and practices and by coming to terms with the management. Social entrepreneurs are interested in long-term improvements rather than short-term solutions, as they are also looking into social returns that are long-term in relation to the investments they have made along the way (Dees, 1998). Hence, they

emphasize on social impact rather than on customer satisfaction or profit creation, in spite of the obvious importance derived from these (ibid). Accordingly, social entrepreneurship happening between an individual and group creates a novel activity that could be considered as a distinct undertaking outside of the general organizational activity (Austin et al., 2006).

Value Creation

The structure of social enterprises can also be based on two aspects related to value: The creation of value and the appropriation of value. The ways of creating, distributing, and appropriating value is generally focused on the inquiry relating to the nature of social enterprises being for-profit or nonprofit. Based on this distinction various perspectives have been described by Defourny and Nyssens (2010). Throughout this development in the recent years, social enterprises have been generally tagged as for-profit with a social value and a mission for the society. For instance, Dees (1998) mentions that money is seen to be regarded by social entrepreneurs more as means of achieving a higher purpose. Because of this, it was mentioned by Mair and Marti (2006) and Dees (1998) that there is a possibility that a social enterprise is concurrently seen as for-profit and at the same time, as not-for-profit. The basis for this would be the creation and appropriation of economic value, as well as the social need being addressed. Similarly, the extent of resources necessary to operate and the potential of raising capital are also the basis for saying that a social enterprise is for-profit or non-profit. A differentiation has been done by Peredo and McLean (2006) relating to the idea that the objective of social enterprises is to generate social outcomes, which are deemed beneficial, later known as integrated Social Entrepreneurship. Similarly, an enterprise is aimed at supporting other social activities intended to generate social outcomes that are longed for (ibid.). This is known as complementary Social Entrepreneurship. The term can be illustrated through collaboration with enterprises that are commercially operating and that are known to donate a fraction of its profits, either from the organization or from external organizations having activities aimed towards social development. Santos (2012) argues that the structure and mission of social enterprises depend on the interaction of economic value creation and social value creation, with the aim to improve the wellbeing of the society in connection with an improved resource allocation. However, he also maintains that social value is not easy to measure because of the intangible benefits seen. Because of this, understanding social value is seen to lead to a methodological dead-end. Thus, a distinct feature attributed to Social Entrepreneurship, is usually aimed towards the creation of value instead of capturing value (ibid). The value is then embedded to the enterprise's structure. Therefore, value creation

occurs when the value of the members of the society increases when the resources allocated for any economic activity has been considered (Santos, 2012, 6-12). On the other hand, appropriation of value includes the realization of the value, or part of it, created through the individual's action. Social enterprise is characterized as an actor with economic aim and who pursues disregarded problems having positive externalities occurring from the failure of the government and the market (Santos, 2012). Economic equilibrium can become suboptimal when failures are seen from the government and the market, and under-consumption or under-provision of goods. From a private supplier perspective, this problem can be addressed and made as optimal. However, it could not be optimally applicable for the whole society (Santos, 2012). In a traditional sense, the role of the government in addressing issues or needs having these externalities by providing the good or through some incentives, which is based on its effect to the public. A public good is considered as non-excludable and has a non-rival character. With this situation, social entrepreneurs try to resolve the needs or problems having positive externalities. The search for solutions towards neglected problems having positive externalities result to the idea that little opportunity is given for the appropriation of value, although there is an adequate opportunity for the creation of value (Santos, 2012). Furthermore, all organizations experience trade-offs between value capture and value creation (Santos, 2012). An essential distinction to be made between commercial and social enterprises lies in their process of creating value- wherein social enterprises are aimed towards the creation of sustainable solutions instead of making value creation as a sustainable advantage. In here, social enterprises emphasize on a distinctive logic with the aim of creating solutions to the aforementioned problems. The solutions are designed with the focus on empowering people rather than imposing controls on them. In here, control is usually associated with enterprises that are commercial in nature and those that aim to control important portion of the value chain to capture and understand value (Santos, 2012). Social enterprises need the process of creating solutions through the empowerment of the community as well as the target customers. The objective of which is geared towards ways of helping the community in order to become self-sustaining in relation to the solutions proposed in answering the problems or needs identified by the social entrepreneur. Hence, ultimately, social enterprises are successful when they have eradicated the problems they focus on - in theory; the enterprise should then cease to exist as well, since there is no need for them longer (Santos, 2012).

Social Entrepreneurship from an Organizational Perspective: Corporate Entrepreneurship and Cross-Sectorialism

Corporate Social Entrepreneurship (CSE) is seen by many as a new concept that is yet to be developed. CSE is made up of three conceptual frameworks from the fields of entrepreneurship and SE (Austin and Reficco, 2009). Austin and Reficco defined CSE as an organizational process aimed at developing a more powerful and more advanced kind of CSR. Accordingly, CSE has four main elements needed in the transformation of organizational operations. These are: a) creation of an environment that is enabling for the stakeholders, b) promotion of corporate social intrapreneurs, c) strengthening of the firm's aims and values, and d) generation of double value through formation and maintenance of strategic alliances (Austin and Reficco, 2009, p. 2). In CSE, elements such as stakeholder salience, governance, social proactiveness, and transparency have been considered as measures for a tool called Corporate Entrepreneurial Assessment Instrument (CEAI). According to Kuratko et al. (2011), this research-based tool is used in evaluating the cultural readiness of organizations when conducting their entrepreneurial activities. This new model suggests that new pathways are put forward in the implementation of strategies used in CSE. In order to sustain CSE, the key players should continue the conduct of entrepreneurial activities and management of such activities to attain and maintain its objectives (Kuratko et al., 2011). Likewise, CSE is similar with other entrepreneurial activities in a way that it aims to create disruptive change to make and undertake new opportunities, rather than just manage its present CSR programs or operations (Austin and Reficco, 2009). It is an aggregation of desire and willingness to build a joint social value and economic importance through processes that involve entrepreneurial redesign and systems development, as well as other needed actions (Austin and Reficco, 2009, p. 5). Many organizations are beginning to change their business strategies based on the greater demands and responsibilities of the present time. Similarly, they are also doing this because of their desire to solve issues surrounding our society by being relevant social agents (Tasavori and Sinkovics, 2011). In here, social issues are seen as opportunity instead of being a threat or a risk (Tasavori and Sinkovics, 2011). Specifically, the authors define CSE as a way of embodying social and economic mission by solving social issues and providing possible solutions as needed by target-disadvantaged groups. Additionally, it also employs and conducts activities related to corporate entrepreneurship with the aim of achieving its mission and in the creation of social value (Tasavori and Sinkovics, 2011, p. 407). Organizations conducting CSE are then subject to a

likely win-win situation because they already have the knowledge and resources, while also acquiring more of that when social issues are met (Tasavori and Sinkovics, 2011). SE, however, is not limited to the social service sector but could also be done by organizations as social entrepreneurs (Austin et al., 2006a). In here, organizations are seen to engage in the creation of strategic corporate citizenship through different forms of CSE. To clarify further, CSE is defined as the act or process of stretching the companies' abilities, competence, resources and opportunities by offering innovative resource leveraging either within and/or outside the firm's direct control. CSE's aim here is the concurrent building of both social and economic values (Austin et al., 2006a, 170). Nonetheless, CSE emphasizes on the benefits that the company could potentially gain by engaging in social enterprise and not solely on forcing the organizations to consider itself as a more socially responsible firm (Austin et al., 2006a). Accordingly, CSE has three fundamental elements: alignment, core competency leveraging, and partnering. Hence, this goes beyond strategies that are traditionally used in enabling the creation of economic and social values that are higher, especially for activities that are socially oriented (Austin et al., 2006a). Lastly, partnering refers to the intended collaboration to be undertaken by the organization with other firms. This process allows the establishment of additional resources as well as approaches that could innovatively solve current problems (Austin et al., 2006a). This collaboration process is important in entrepreneurship because of its role in the networking and benefits (Austin et al., 2006a). Three specific requirements are put forth in here (ibid.). The first one necessity refers to the process of decision-making considering the creation of social value and economic benefits. This also includes social aspects that are required in the collusion of business decisions (ibid.). Secondly, a combination of performance-oriented measurement with learning-oriented measurements is needed by managers in order to have accountability when targets are needed to be achieved. Similarly, learning tools are also given for the improvement of performance in relation to the attainment of the given targets. Lastly, effective communication of economic and social value to the stakeholders (internal and external) is needed (Austin et al., 2006a).

In connection, Porter and Kramer (2006) proposed a related concept called Creating Shared Value (CSV), which talks about connection of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) - the strategy of company that has an effect in an inefficient delivery of social responsibility as well as creation of social value. CSR could only be embedded in with a value based on its integration in the operation, mission and values of the organization. Porter and Kramer (2006,

p. 90) present that companies should do a shift from a position that is fragmented and defensive into a more integrated and affirmative one. In short, it should emphasize on substance rather than on image.

CSV and CSR are differentiated by Porter and Kramer (2011) in a way that CSR programs generally emphasize on reputation but with limited connection in relation to the business. This makes it difficult to rationalize and sustain CSR programs in this sense (Porter and Kramer, 2011, 69). CSR is also differentiated with CSV based on its importance to the firm's profitability as well as competitive position. In here, particular resources and personnel expertise are used towards attaining higher economic value and building stronger social value (Porter and Kramer, 2011, 81). In addition, CSR is seen to have a distinct business strategy as it applies a more responsive approach. Likewise, the objective of CSV is to use specific resources of the organization, as well as management capabilities and personnel skills to respond to social problems and concurrently generating economic value (ibid). To summarize, CSV could be used in CSE to establish a greater understanding of the processes related to CSE's creation of shared value. Likewise, the value of CSV could also be discerned during the analysis of perceived benefits coming from the performance of CSE from the perspectives of economic and social aspects.

Social Innovation

In relation to SE, the concept of Social Innovation also comes into play. To understand this concept, many categories are being related to understand its meaning. One example of which is the concept of Social Innovation proposed by Dedijer (1984, 80); Social Innovation is classified into a) Something that is newly made including but not limited to laws, organizations, professions, trainings, social networks, values, norms, roles, behavioral patterns, intelligence systems, and incentives, etc.; b) Who are able to make it, such as administrators, law makers, policy makers, planners, managers, entrepreneurs, educators, engineers, association or organizational leaders, and scientists, etc.; and c) How it is made, for example, if they are imported or created, made out of trial and error or systematic search, etc. As a support to this categorization, seven approaches relating to the identification of social innovation have been proposed by Zapf (1991, 84). These are propounded based on content instead of definitive style, stating that, social innovation refers to:

1) ... A restructuring of relationships or organizations;

- 2) ... Novel services provided to the public, as opposed to goods;
- 3) ... Technologies for solving social problems;
- 4) ... The act of making the innovation process as participatory by involving the public;
- 5) ... Bigger political innovations when compared to political reforms or decisions that are commonly initiated;
- 6) ... Changing models relating to the economic structure of services and goods; and
- 7) ... Modern lifestyles that are seen as expression of people's status and values, and aspirations, which can be observed based on the underlying changes in consumption patterns.

Moulaert (2005, 1977) further divides Social Innovation into four strands. First, he mentions that Social Innovation is primarily concerned about improvements relating to social capital. These improvements, according to him, result in a more productive organization in terms of efficient and effective activities. The next strand focuses on the multidisciplinary nature of Social Innovation, which talks about the combination of an organization's commercial aims and its social and environmental as well as sustainable development goals. The third strand emphasizes social and intellectual creativity component of innovation by focusing on interaction between and among people. Lastly, the fourth strand talks about the idea of local development related to regional and territorial studies. Further discussions on Social Innovation have been put forward by other researchers such as Pole and Ville (2009, 880), wherein they identified four sub-concepts in order to understand the difference by overlapping understanding in various disciplines. As presented by the authors, the first sub-concept of Social Innovation denotes institutional change in relation to the social structure of the society, particularly in the cultural normative and regulative contexts.

The second sub-concept refers to the idea that Social Innovation was conceptualized within the context of social purpose and an objective of improving life on a qualitative or quantitative basis. Third, it is closely associated with public good. The last sub-category expounds on the idea that neither the state nor the market could actually address the needs of the society.

When talking about Social Innovation, other researchers such as Bestuzhev-Lada (1991) and Franz (2010) are more concerned about the word *social*, as it is attached in Social Innovation concept. To clarify this, Bestuzhev-Lada (1991) makes a differentiation between the terms

sociological and *societal*. In here, social is more on the technological innovations seen in social innovation together with its economic and political implications to innovation; while sociological, on the other hand, refers to the changes occurring in social relationships. Franz (2010, 250) further clarifies this distinction by differentiating *social* and *societal* and the notion of *asocial* as an opposite of the terms. For him, the term and definition of *social* is usually used in social science research, particularly when talking about changes happening between people in terms of social structures and relations. On another note, his second term relates to the gratification of needs as seen in underprivileged people or groups in the society. This would imply, then, that the term contains a normative denotation as used by Franz (2010). Two criteria are needed to know that innovation exists: 1) novelty, and 2) improvement. In short, it should offer ways to make things more efficient, more effective, or more sustainable, especially if this new product, service or process is contrasted with other alternatives. Furthermore, the term 'social' in Social Innovation does not only refer inside the boundaries of the organization but is extended to all sectors, illustrating cross-sectoral approach in this concept (Phills et al, 2008, 39). This is further clarified by Phills (2008, 38) through the conceptualization of Social Innovation in relation to two segments: a) The meaning of innovation and b) the perception of *social*. In here, innovation is considered both as a process and a product. When it is seen as a process, it implies that creativity, environmental context, organizational structure, and factors relating to economic and social factors exist. On the other hand, when it is seen as a product, it is demonstrated through the creation and delivery of novel products and services, as well as new qualities and methods of production (Phills et al., 2008, 38). With this, the idea that social innovation goes beyond the boundary of various sectors, analysis levels, and methods for discovering processes (i.e., tactics, strategies, and theories) makes it strongly different to the ideas of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship (Phills et al. 2008, 37). This would now refer to the various needs, problems, and concerns of the actors and institutions in the society. Thus, coherence is seen in the society in a fixed degree based on the needs or problems encountered and the ways of valuing such (Phills et al., 2008, 39). This makes up the idea that both innovation and Social Innovation are considered as processes, a products and forms of technology. Nonetheless, Social Innovation still maintains its unique feature as a principle, idea, social movement/intervention, legislation, or even a combination of the aforementioned factors (Phills et al., 2008, 39). This, then, needs collaborations that are cross-sectoral, as previously explained. Social Innovation is said to have three mechanisms that are crucial in the fulfillment of its goals. These are the exchange of ideas and values; shifts in role and

relationships; and integration of private capital with public/philanthropic support (Phills et al, 2008, 40).

The first mechanism refers to the process of learning about aspects relating to business practices including management, entrepreneurship, revenue generation, and performance measurement with the aim of widening the sectors' perspectives and attaining resolutions to social and environmental issues. The second mechanism talks about collaboration between social enterprises, governments and nonprofits to address the issues. In here, a highly collaborative role is played by the government, as opposed to the traditional task of playing the role of regulating and taxing the other sectors. Lastly, the third mechanism aims to integrate various sectors in identifying different sources or models to make and maintain social innovations that are sustainable, while maintaining profitable ventures.

In summary, different definitions and categories have been mentioned by different researchers, as described above. For instance, (Ruede, Lurtz, 2012, 5) emphasized on what social innovation is as well as the criteria to be applied when these perceptions are categorized. On the other hand, Dedijer (1984) focuses on what, how and who social innovation consist of, while Moulaert (2005) relates social innovation to other disciplines in developing criteria. Moreover, Pol and Ville (2009) presented that the criteria for social innovation are not mutually exclusive and not adequately separate because of the presence of social purpose, need satisfaction and providing for public good.

Conclusion of theory

In this section I have attempted to broaden out the concept of Social Entrepreneurship. Firstly, I have done so by explaining about the nature of Social Entrepreneurship. Secondly, I put forward the main attribute of Social Entrepreneurship, namely Value Creation. Thirdly, I presented a more organizational perspective of Social Entrepreneurship combined with cross-sectionalism and finally put forward the concept very much connected to Social Entrepreneurship being Social Innovation.

As described in the project outline I developed these specific four theoretical sections for the purpose of inductively testing out the four dimensions, which are theoretically essential for the field of Social Entrepreneurship. I would now begin with analyzing how they would fit with the new phenomenon of Political Social Entrepreneurship exemplified in the case of Alternativet.

Operationalization

In the next section I will summarize and synthesize the four theoretical sections into four operational dimensions, which will later be used for the analysis of Political Social Entrepreneurship. The four mentioned dimensions have undergone a process of theoretical triangulation. I have called the four dimensions: *Social Drive and Identity*, *Value Creation*, *Organizational/cross-sectoralism* and *Social Innovation*. Every dimension consists of between 9 and 27 indicators, which have been extracted from the outlines theory through the aforementioned process of triangulation (for an easy overview of the theories please see the section “Literature review”). These are presented below.

Social Drive and identity dimension

The *Social Drive and Identity* dimension consists of 27 indicators and is the widest of the four dimensions, and refers to how the actors connected the predicate of Social Entrepreneurship see themselves, collaborators, how they perceive the system and the institutions. In addition to this it refers to the aims and the overarching vision(s) and how it relates to the latter. The *Social Drive and Identity* dimension will undergo an induction in the analysis and it will be tested out in order to see to which extend Political Social Entrepreneurship diverges or converges with traditional Social Entrepreneurship.

Social Drive and identity dimension

	Indicators	Theory
1	Social impact rather than customer satisfaction and profit	(Dees, 1998)
2	Social fulfillment it its activities	(Mair and Marti, 2006)
3	Empowering rather than imposing control	(Santos, 2012)
4	Improving quality of life	(Zahra et al., 2009)

5	Identify as different than players of traditional market	(Austin et al 2006.)
6	Identification of gap > action.	(Thompson, 2002).
7	Solution for disadvantage groups	(Tasavori and Sinkovics, 2011)
8	SE as a gap filler	(Dees, 1998)
9	Basic human necessities	(Zahra et al., 2009)
10	Improved resource allocation	(Santos, 2012)
11	Distinguished from others based on forces driving them	(Dees, 1998)
12	Focus on power, unemployment and gender inequality	(Zahra et al., 2009)
13	Social institutions being ineffective and unresponsive	(Austin et al., 2006)
14	Helping the community to become self-sustainable.	(Santos, 2012)
15	Social issues seen as opportunity instead of a threat.	(Tasavori and Sinkovics, 2011)
16	Higher purpose	(Dees, 1998)

17	Government and philanthropic activities are seen as helpful, but they are not quite sufficient	(Dees, 1998)
18	Social entrepreneurs conduct activities that are not similar with the present initiatives or activities of other sectors	(Austin et al., 2006)
19	Focuses on issues overlooked by the market	(Austin et al., 2006)
20	Government and philanthropic activities are seen as helpful, but they are not quite sufficient	(Dees, 1998)
21	Social entrepreneurs conduct activities that are not similar with the present initiatives or activities of other sectors	(Austin et al., 2006)
22	Long-term improvements	(Dees, 1998)
23	Distinct undertaking outside of the general organizational activity	(Austin et al., 2006)
24	Pursues disregarded problems having positive externalities occurring from the failure of the government and the market	(Santos, 2012)
25	The government and the market and under-consumption or under-provision of goods	(Santos, 2012)
26	Activities being a similar compared to other sectors	(Austin et al. 2006)
27	Social enterprises become successful if they become obsolete	(Santos, 2012)

Value Creation dimension

The *Value Creation Dimension* consists of 12 indicators and refers to how Social Entrepreneurship perceives value, and the creation and allocation of the latter regarding an individual and structural context.

	Indicators	Theory
28	Alternative strategies for funding	(Mair and Marti, 2006)
29	Creating value instead of capturing value	(Santos, 2012)
30	Performance-oriented measurements with learning-oriented measurements	(Austin et al., 2006a)
31	The creation of value and the appropriation of value	(Defourny and Nyssens, 2010)
32	Concurrent building of both social and economic values	(Austin et al. 2006a)
33	Value creation so the value of all the members of the society increases	(Santos, 2012)
34	Social Value at its objective	(Peredo and McLean, 2006)
35	Economic value means to an end	(Dees, 1998)
36	Creation and maintenance of social value	(Mair and Marti, 2006)
37	Improved resource allocation	(Santos, 2012)
38	Sustainable solutions	(Santos, 2012)
39	Long-term improvements minus short-term solutions	(Dees, 1998)

Social innovation dimension

The *Social Innovation* dimension consists of 12 indicators and refers to how Social Entrepreneurship defines Social Innovation.

	Indicators	Theory
40	Change of social structure	(Moulaert, 2005: 1977)
41	Change of cultural and regulative context	(Moulaert, 2005: 1977)
42	Defined by novelty and improvement.	(Franz, 2010)
43	Multiform: Can be process and product	(Phills et al., 2008)
44	Consists of innovation and pragmatism	(Mair and Marti, 2006)
45	The act of social innovation is making the process participatory by involving the public	(Zapf, 1991)
46	Catalyzing social transformation	(Mair and Marti, 2006)
47	Can be “Sociological” or “Societal”	(Bestuzhev-Lada, 1991)
48	Is changing models for economic structures	(Zapf, 1991)
49	Is something which is new	(Zapf, 1991)

50	New resources through creative means while adjusting how existing social structures operate	(Mair and Marti, 2006)

Organizational/cross-sectoral dimension

The *Organizational/Cross-Sectoral* dimension consists of 12 indicators and refers to the modus operandi of Social Entrepreneurship concerning organizational behavior within and outside its specific context.

	Indicators	Theory
51	Partnerships involving public, private and civil society sectors	(Martin and Osberg, 2007)
52	Build joint social value through the design	(Austin et al., 2006a)
53	Maintenance of strategic alliances	(Austin and Reficco, 2009)
54	Effective communication to stakeholders internally and externally	(Austin et al., 2006a)
55	Cross-sectoral collaboration	(Phills et al , 2008)
56	Interacting between and among people	(Pole and Ville, 2009)
57	Restructuring of relationships of organizations	(Austin et al., 2006a)
58	Promotion of intrapreneuers	(Austin and Reficco, 2009)
59	Strategic corporate citizenship through different forms of CSE	(Austin et al., 2006a)

Analysis

Alternativet's Political Party Program

There are certain ways by which a political party's position regarding policy issues can be measured. One way would be to analyze their voting preferences in Folketinget, though of natural chronological causes this of course cannot be done in the case of Alternativet due to this thesis being written prior to the yearly opening of Folketinget. Another way of conducting an analysis regarding an Alternativet's political stand would be one of using thoroughly discourse analysis on verbal statements of Alternativet's politicians. This seemed like a poor choice due to that most of the actual verbalizations of Alternativet's policies were made during the Danish Folketinget election, and in many ways one could argue that the things that were discussed in the different parties election campaign were to some degree adjusted to the broader general main themes of the election discourse. As explained previously in the Methodology section, I have chosen to use Alternativet's political party manifesto as my primary source of analysis, which is a method preferred by many theorists (Budge 2001). The analytical advantages of the latter are numerous. Firstly, the political party manifesto has been formally adopted on a party congress by a majority of members that hold the politicians responsible. Secondly, the party has the possibility to explain more in depth about policy issues that have little interest to the media, or do not fit the discourse of the other parties. Thirdly, using the political party manifesto makes it easier to make a comparative analysis (ibid.), all though this is not at all the intention of this thesis, though as interesting as it might seem it must be the privilege of future research.

However, as Budge (2001) explains, there are also disadvantages regarding this approach to analysis - the most significant one being the potential of a simplification of the policies.

Whereas I would argue that this is not the case in this analysis (due to the fact that the actual and concrete policies of Alternativet are mostly still in the process of being made concrete), the political manifesto might at a later point be viewed as a simplification. However, at this point in history it is the opposite and the most comprehensible and exemplifying outlook upon the actual policies of Alternativet. Taking the political party manifesto as an ongoing analytical premise I will proceed by a document analysis driven by data (Keman 2007). I have divided my analysis into two distinct parts. The first one consist of the operationalized

four dimensions 1) Social Drive and Identity 2) Value creation 3) Social innovation 4) Organizational/Cross-Sectorial. In this first part I will go through, as mentioned above, a document-driven analysis and through the 59 indicators operationalized from the theory section I will put these 59 indicators upon Alternativet's political manifesto. Additionally, I will analyze which of the indicators are to be found and which are not. The indicators of the former will be described in the first part in four sub section and be called convergent indicators one part for each dimension - the indicators of the latter will be placed in the section divergent indicators and will be placed in one section due to the (surprisingly) lack of divergent indicators. In addition to this, the section of the latter will also supplement its analysis with the data from the interview of the political advisor of Alternativet Helene Hagel who was interviewed with the focus of going in-depth with Divergences.

A general note of observation is that Alternativet's political party programme consists of 62 pages, and according to readability measure LIX, the text scores 43,6 - making it a medium difficulty to read. There are nine focal points with more or less concrete solution propositions. The term *Sustainability* occurs 141 times within every aspect of the nine focal points.

Social Drive/Identity

The Social Drive and Identity dimension refers to the indicators from 1 to 27 as previously explained in the section of Operationalization.

In the political manifesto of Alternativet it is mentioned multiple times the importance of weighting social impact higher than profit (indicator 1): "...*Diversity and purpose driven way of organizing...*" (Alternivet, 2015, 3) and in order to so we need to "*Reorganize our society in order to turn the trend of increasing inequality*" (ibid, 22).

Not only do they explain how farmers, fishermen, scientists, businessmen should care more about social impact, but they go as far as claiming that the neoliberal economy has created norms and perceptions in society which hinders the well-being of citizens. They furthermore explain that every single societal fraction and sphere of society should have its validity based on social value creation and enhance the social fulfillments in its activities (indicator 2): "*The current situation simply takes a completely different way of organizing and a rethinking of fundamental elements in our society; about the way we live, the way we produce, consume and transport ourselves*" (ibid, 1-2). Alternativet is in many ways driven by the wish for

change and with the focus of a higher purpose (indicator 16): *“The economy should solely be means to an end, which is to achieve a sustainable economy”* (ibid, 28)

In addition to this, Alternativet explain their stance towards control versus independency, arguing that there ought to be a *“Balance between trust and control”* (indicator 3) (ibid, 1) and especially concerning welfare services there should be: *“Less control in regards to social benefits* (ibid, 26) They have a strong focus on improving quality of life (indicator 4) and they state that: *“Denmark has to be number one in this development”* (ibid, 3).

Alternativet proposes a strong criticism towards the role of the state and its ability to provide the society and citizenry of goods and services, but not only do they shout the alarm towards the state and its lack of fulfillment (indicator 17): *“We as a society stand in front of a massive need for rethinking. Though it is completely unrealistic to believe that it is possible from the political side to come up with solutions for these complex challenges”* (ibid, 24), they also point out the failure of private industries and of the voluntary sector (indicator 19, 21, 25): *“Today it is obvious that that the traditional enterprises are not able to solve the challenges the world is facing, but also the public institutions and the volunteering sector are able to solve these challenges”* (ibid).

Alternativet identifies Social Enterprises as an essential part of the above mentioned structural problems (indicator 6, 8, 23): *“This is the reason why we need to work cross-sectorally between the three classical societal sectors and at the same time support the development of a new fourth sector”* (ibid). As Alternativet describes: *“The fourth sector is defined by enterprises, institutions and organizations which combine the very best from the private, the public and the volunteer sector”* (ibid).

Alternativet wants to bring forth: *“New ways of cooperation”* (ibid, 1) in order to create a *“Sustainable transition”* (ibid, 1) and a *“New approach to the allocation of resources”* (ibid), *“A more fair allocation of values”* (ibid, 31) (indicator, 4, 9,10), and it is of great importance that those reforms are based on the notion of long-term improvements (indicator 22): *“We want long term value creation”* (ibid, 3).

Not only does Alternativet see the state as inefficient concerning provision of services and welfare good, they also see the state as something which is increasingly being disconnected from the citizenry (indicator 11, 13, 18): *“The distance between the people and the general*

assembly has never been bigger” (ibid, 4) and a symptom of this is: “The people’s trust to the politicians is historically low” (ibid).

Alternativet is indeed a fan of responsibility for the community, but at they give tribute to self-reliability (indicator 14), they give their utmost compliments to the identity of entrepreneurship per se: *“We add value to the concept of entrepreneurship in it self” (ibid, 37) and even: “The state and the municipality should be an entrepreneurial actor in the society” (ibid, 30).* Also regarding helping communities to become self-reliable (indicator 14) and just as the individual, they are very explicit with various concrete examples: *“We want to increase the opportunities for local communities to invest in the establishment and operation of common sustainable energy production and energy infrastructure” (ibid, 14).*

Value Creation dimension

The Value Creation dimension refers to the indicators from 28 to 39, as previously explained in section of the Operationalization.

One of the first sentences in the political party program’s economical section states that the party *“Wants an ecological economy”*(Indicator 38) (ibid, 1). One of the premises in the theoretical frame of ecological economic is that the economy should be considered as a subsystem of the eco-system (Indicator 34). This is also being emphasized in the program: *“[...] the economical policy should not being promoted as we know it today. Instead it should help a green transition of our society” (ibid, 33).* In addition to this it is being explained (Indicator 29, 33, 37):

Alternativet’s policy seeks to promote human well-being, life quality and equality without threatening the eco-systems. In short we want to fight for a stable economy, which is arranged to suit the need of people and take into consideration the nature’s limitations (ibid, 33)

Noteworthy, Alternativet entirely rejects in their point of view one-sided traditional concept of growth. Alternativet does not have the opinion that it is sustainable to measure economic progression in terms of increased production as we have it today (Indicator 35): *“Economic growth and materialism are not longer valid measurements for everything” (ibid, 1).* In opposition to the latter they suggest a concept of growth which should be based on human well-being, life joy, environmental sustainability, equality and leisure time: *“We want an ecological economy in which the concept of growth is redefined” (ibid, 2).*

Alternativet is straight out negative towards the current economic paradigm in the society, which is neoliberal economy (Indicator 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37):

Alternativet states that the neoliberal economy, which has been dominating the world the last three decades, has reached its limits concerning what it can contribute in forms of growth and economic progression. Today the system of neoliberal economy leads to bigger inequality - a situation where the poor become poorer and the rich become even richer (ibid, 27)

Especially the banks and speculative businesses get attacked: *“Finance and bank industry inhibits the development of sustainability”* (ibid, 32) and the reason according to Alternativet is: *“They promote inequality, dept, instability and enhance economic crisis”* (ibid, 32). Due to the latter the banking sector should be split up and it should not be possible to lend out money without having the economic assets to support it. The latter would lead to an entirely different form of funding for entrepreneurs (indicator 28).

Alternativet sees a way out of the above-mentioned crisis. They want to implement a new growth concept and turn Denmark into a pioneering country for sustainable economic politics (ibid, 29). Not only do they applause an entirely new way of thinking and measuring economic growth, but they also suggest a new of company structure:

In addition to this civil servants in the public sector should be able to establish a new type of enterprise where they gain co-ownership within a new non-profit framework. This could for instance be done concerning school, nursing homes or kindergartens (ibid, 49)

Though it is important to mention that the traditional economy and value creation are not at all entities which are rejected completely (indicator 30, 32): *“In this economy the businesses will not just be measured using one bottom line, but three: The economical, the social and the environmental”* (ibid, 12) with the emphasis on (indicator 39): *“A long term value creation”*. (Ibid, 3) and private business sector has a lot to offer: *“Economical understanding and customer understanding from the private sector”* (ibid) Though the latter cannot stand alone and in every policy making it has to incorporate the: *“Focus on the common good from the public sector”* (ibid) and the *“Diversity and purpose driven way of organizing from the voluntary sector”* (ibid).

Social Innovation dimension

The social innovation dimension refers to the indicators from 40 to 50 as previously explained in section of the operationalization.

Alternativet is in many ways advocating for social innovation on a policy-level, an organizational level and on a structural level (indicator, 47, 49 and 50) For instance, Alternativet wants to launch an entrepreneurial benefit, which should consist of 80% of unemployment benefit (red. Dagpenge) in order to make it as widely available to start their own company, and in addition to this, include a mentor process, which is customized the entrepreneur individually: *“This social benefit should be granted to all people who have the will and the skills to a life as an entrepreneur”*(ibid, 49).

In addition to this, they want to implement entrepreneurship as a subject in primary school and incubator groups should be initiated at an early stage in school, thereby ensuring students the possibility to develop their own ideas of sustainable entrepreneurship while being educated (indicator 44). Through these incubator groups the student would gain knowledge of business network, understanding of economy, sales and communication, by which they from a very early age already will have the capacity of to transform their potential and ideas into concrete sustainable solutions (indicator 43): *“In Alternativet we have the ambition that all Danish students during their education should experience stimulating and creative teaching about how to start-up a company, project and other initiatives”* (ibid, 42, 49 and 50).

As well, on a structural level Alternativet is advocating for social innovation (indicator 40, 46 and 48):

The current situation simply takes a completely different way of organizing and a rethinking of fundamental elements in our society; about the way we live, the way we produce, consume and transport ourselves (ibid, 1-2)

Social innovation is in that sense a multilayered entity in the policy of Alternativet, which should spread across all sectors of society. Also the cultural context should undergo a process of Social Innovation (indicator 41 and 45):

Alternativet has the opinion that we should increase the support for the creation of plenty more creative free zones with room for art and culture production. We want to

support the free zone paradigm - thereby creating better possibilities for artists to take in use empty buildings (ibid, 45)

Experimentation and novelty (indicator 42) are indeed vital for Alternativet: *“We should challenge the social political agenda through courageous experiments”* (ibid, 22) and if we as society should accomplish the transition to a far more sustainable society we certainly cannot just do what we are used to doing and politics should be seeing as a: *“Place for a great deal of experimentation in helping the transition into sustainable”* (ibid, 30) Luckily all these changes in policies and structures are not just idealistic and dreamy - they are characterized also by pragmatism, as Alternativet states, things can be done because: *“A societal breakthrough is coming”* (ibid, 4). It just takes the effort from all societal actors. Social innovation will happen when: *“Of course the state plays a vital role concerning infrastructure, but we especially believe that it is the interaction between citizens, enterprises and state which makes groundbreaking solution com forth”* (ibid, 25).

Not only does Alternativet want to implement social innovation cross-sectorally in their policies and on a structural level but it is essential for them to be social innovative within their own party organization and the way they create and communicate their policies: *“We want a new political culture, which is far more transparent, honest and listening than the current one”* (ibid, 5). How this is done is by:

Alternativet wants to participate in political negotiations with the clear aim of including the citizenry in the whole process and openly tell how every single result of policy negotiations has been reached. It is the clear vision of Alternativet to present all the intermediate calculations (ibid, 9).

Also in regards to the political debate and discourse Alternativet wants to socially innovate:

The politicians in Alternativet wish to debate by taken into consideration Alternativet's debate dogmas. We don't believe that politicians are omniscient oracles, who are not able to admit when they don't know something or that the politicians are not able to acknowledge a valid argument, even if the argument comes from a political opponent (ibid)

Also the way of engaging should undergo a social innovative process, Alternativet states:

We want it to be attractive and possible to involve oneself in politics regardless if you are a craftsman or an academic, and make it irrelevant whether you can spare 8 hours a day or only 8 minutes. We have the opinion that it should be absolutely clear that it is worthwhile to be an active citizen and that we all, through our engagement, can contribute to the creation of better solutions for society (ibid, 8)

Organizational/Cross-Sectoral dimension

The Organizational/Cross-Sectoral dimension refers to the indicators 51 to 59, as previously explained in section of the Operationalization.

It is clear that one of the main objectives of Alternativet is to change in which way institutions are organized (indicator 57), and the very organizational aspect of the political and economic structure (indicator 52):

Alternivetet wants to work for local, national and international laws that support social innovation and empowers the partnerships, which are created in the tension field between the public sector, the private sector and NGO's (ibid, 51)

By doing this, they explain that the consequence of this will be that a new fourth sector will arise (indicator 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59). This new fourth sector is characterized by combining the best from all the three traditional spheres - the private, the public and the voluntary (ibid, 52). Alternativet even wants to support:

The establishment of an environmental laboratory, an institution that should facilitate, evaluates and helps the transition to a more sustainable society. It is emphasized that this should be done in equal cooperation between citizens, enterprises and public authorities (ibid, 21)

There are a lot of suggestions about concrete policies, which have as a strong underlying premise of cross-sectorialism, and among other things the policy process (Indicator 51, 56). In addition to citizen participation Alternativet wants to establish a closer cooperation between the private, the public and the civil sector in order to enhance the interaction between the former. *"We want a dynamic and participatory political culture in Denmark. A political culture which is able to build a democratic bridge between the citizens and the politicians."* (Ibid, 12) and the reason behind is: *"We hail proactive citizenship, entrepreneurship and diversity"* (ibid, 2)

Also organizational bottom-up perspectives are taking in explicitly. Here is a classical example of a political bottom-up process: “*It should be possible for citizens to suggest new policies directly to Folketinget*” (ibid, 6). Also regarding solutions for the climate crisis Alternativet proposes bottom-up solutions: “*Alternativet wants to support a sustainable energy cooperative movement, which to a great extent is based upon decentralizing producers of sustainable energy*” (ibid, 10), and concerning the sustainable economic transition they mention the concept explicitly:

There are plenty of examples of the informal economy (the civil society), who are essential actors, and who should be supported and extended with more local initiatives, which can create change bottom-up (ibid, 22)

Furthermore, regarding culture politics, Alternativet suggest that this should be thought in all policies (ibid, 43):

The cultural perspective shouldn't just inspire, but also challenge the other policy areas and the ways we think within the domains of urban development, business, social policy, environmental policy and foreign policy. In other words the cultural perspective should permeate the entire way we understand our society (ibid, 46).

Alternativet also wish to create and empower actors of social and organizational change within their political organization (indicator 58). Not only do they as an essential part of their policy building process continuously invite people to their policy laboratories in which all policies are created (ibid, 1). They also want to establish intrapreneurial watchdogs:

Alternativet wants to establish a council of ombudsmen, who should work as the political house sitters of Alternativet. This council will consist of 3 to 4 public debaters with a professional background within either media, politics or rhetoric. These should be the external reviewers of Alternativet (ibid, 47)

In summary:

I have now made a document analysis driven by data (Keman 2007) in which a theoretical triangulation led to an operationalization of 4 dimensions with 59 indicators.

- In the first dimension *Social Drive and Identity* 26 out of 27 indicators of Social Entrepreneurship converged with Political Social Entrepreneurship.

- In the second dimension *Value Creation* 11 out of 11 indicators of Social Entrepreneurship converged with Political Social Entrepreneurship.
- In the third dimension *Social Innovation* 11 out of 11 indicators of Social Entrepreneurship converged with Political Social Entrepreneurship.
- In the fourth dimension *Organizational/cross-sectoralism* 9 out of 9 indicators of Social Entrepreneurship converged with Political Social Entrepreneurship.

The only indicator which diverged in the first dimension was “*Social Enterprises become successful if they become obsolete*” (Santos, 2012) (indicator 27) this indicator will not be discussed further due to subjective realization that this indicator was never a valid indicator whether something has the social drive or identity as the theory of Social Entrepreneurship states. This is regarded as a mere normative statement/indicator and thereby it has lost its relevance for further investigation.

In summary 58 out of 59 indicators showed a resemblance between the traditional theory of Social Entrepreneurship and the new phenomena Political Social Entrepreneurship.

Possible Divergences

As I have shown previously, there was almost a perfect match between the theory of Social Entrepreneurship and the new phenomenon Political Social Entrepreneurship - 58 out of 59 indicators converged. In this section I would like to focus on something, which I call *possible divergences*. The latter should be understood by possible discrepancies between the 59 indicators of theory of Social Entrepreneurship and the policies of Alternativet - in other words a re-consideration of to what extent my internal validity should be considered strongly enough (Brymann, 2007)

The almost complete congruence between the two concepts made me very astounded, and I had a feeling that I was overlooking something. The idea arose that I might have only been looking at half of the picture by spending all my academic effort in trying to figure out the similarities between the concept of Social Entrepreneurship and Political Social Entrepreneurship - but just because all apples are fruit, does not mean that all fruit are apples. It is of extreme interest to investigate what would happen if we were to conceptually and theoretically turn everything upside down and started looking at whether possible divergences would appear between the two concepts *starting* from the point of view of Political Social Entrepreneurship and going to Social Entrepreneurship.

In the following, I want to focus Alternativet's stand towards:

- Capitalism and new ways of class society
- Values, as a fixed entity or as an ongoing process
- The identity of Alternativet.

I have interviewed the political advisors for Alternativet Helene Hagel in order to shed light upon the *possible divergences*. As mentioned in the methodology, the interview can be found in Appendix 1.

Capitalism and new ways of class society

Alternativet states that: "*Finance and bank industry inhibits the development of sustainability*" (Alternativet, 32). Banks promote inequality, debt, instability and enhance economic crisis (ibid). In addition to this: "*Alternativet wants to make speculation illegal*" (Ibid) and have "*A stronger capital control*" (Alternativet, 32) which should be done by having "*Far more governmental control of the banks*" (Alternativet, 33). Not only the banks bear the brunt, also the Worlds Trade Organization and their regulations should be reformed by Alternativet's notion of economics: "*Will make it so that a country without restriction can put a tariff on products if they are not sustainable*" (Alternativet, 34).

The above statements, which are taken from Alternativet's political party manifesto, are very critical towards capitalism and usually this would be considered to be strong and fundamental opposition towards a liberal society, and something that would only be stated by a radical left-wing party. For most parts, traditionally, in Social Entrepreneurship we take the hegemonic notion of societal economic discourse as granted. We criticize the effects of capitalism, but as social entrepreneurs we see it as a virtue to be capable of working within the system pragmatically - for instance exemplified in Castells Network Identity of the Social Entrepreneur (Castells, 2005).

I asked Helene Hagel about Alternativet's relation to capitalism and explained something, which I saw as paradox - that on one hand Alternativet praises the entrepreneurial spirit of the individual and claims that modernity is on its way into the epoch of entrepreneurship, and on the other hand criticizes the liberal way of doing things so profoundly. She replied that:

We are not talking about a revolution of the economic and financial system, but what we are talking about is the society, which solely focuses on one single bottom-line and does not take all the externalities into consideration (Hagel, Interview)

I then asked her directly whether she could explain more about their notion of Entrepreneurship, since for a lot of people this term brings forth connotations of some kind of liberalism, to which she replied:

Alternativet's economic narrative is still under development, but it is important to emphasize that the concept of entrepreneurship in their discourse always should be understood in the context of three-bottom lines and that the entrepreneur was more a way of dealing with things and it self had nothing to with economy (Hagel, Interview)

As mentioned previously Alternativet states that the inequality of society primarily is caused by the way we organize our economic system. (Alternativet, 1) The solution to the latter is according to Alternativet is a society which is structured based on values: "*Personal growth, intellectual growth and emotional growth*" (Alternativet, 41) and in addition to this: "*Art and culture should be placed in the center of policy development*" (Alternativet, 42)

I asked Helene Hagel whether the noble thought of a classless based society doesn't become completely hollow if economical class division is replaced by emotional, entrepreneurial or cultural capital. To which she replied:

The entrepreneurial, the emotional or the cultural aspects of this will not have the effect of dividing people. Because as I mentioned previously the three fundamental values of Alternativet - the triple bottom line will always come first. It will never be so that for instance it is just entrepreneurs that have something to say, that would resemble the old system (Hagel, Interview)

Values, as a fixed entity or as an ongoing process

Alternativet is very explicit about wanting to build a democratic bridge between the politicians and the people (Alternativet, 4) In addition to this they advocate for a new political culture, which is far more transparent, honest and listening than the current one (Alternativet,

5) They urge everyone to participate. Furthermore they proudly explain their open policy building process in which everything is bottom-up driven which exemplified by their many political laboratories (Alternativet, 1)

I asked Helene Hagel whether there is a contradiction between focusing so intensely on bottom-up processes, but at the same time having a few but very strict pre-defined values as fundamental in all their premises. In other words how can something be presented as something which is widely open and bottom-up be rigid concerning a few but distinct values and isn't that an imminent paradox.

Helene Hagel replied:

Yes, you can so. For instance in everything that comes from the outside or from bottom-up the values have to be on order and they are solid due to the fact that the triple-bottom line: The environmental, the economic and the social is the very foundation of our party and our movement. You might say that there is some kind of ontology and that courage and a sense of humor is the core. So, yes, every time we openly invite everyone in it is based in our three fundamental values. (Hagel, Interview)

The identity of Alternativet.

Alternativet is now a member of parliament. On one hand they criticize the political culture for not being able to come up with sustainable solutions (Alternativet, 3) and they emphasize that the distance between people and the general assembly has never been bigger (Alternativet, 4). Furthermore they talk highly about all the possibilities in the fourth sector (Alternativet 4).

I asked Helene Hagel why Alternativet had chosen to enter politics formally. After all, they state clearly that many of the solutions are to be found outside the General Assembly.

Helene Hagel replied:

I think the reason for this is the realization that it is inside here that things also happen. We really want to influence the legislation. If you want to change something it is really nice to have a voice inside of here (Hagel, Interview)

I then asked her whether Alternativet sees itself as a political party or whether their genuine identity really is to be found in another sector somewhere else.

Helene Hagel replied:

There are many people who like to see us - not as a political party but as a movement. A movement, which is represented in the General Assembly (Hagel, Interview)

Discussion – Political Social Entrepreneurship

A lot of people and opinion leaders initially did not take Alternativet and Political Social Entrepreneurship too seriously: The Danish tabloid BT asked rhetorically: “*Who asked for an Alternativet?*” (BT, 2013), and even Politiken - a Danish newspaper considered by many to be a firm believer in Political Social Entrepreneurship raised their doubts. “*One should probably be Uffe to say that there is a need for Alternativet*” (Politiken, 2013a) - was a headline in the editorial, which even concludingly summed up: “*Alternativet should seek its support from the little segment of anarchistic radicals, who for some reason are not willing to give their vote to Enhedslisten*” (ibid). Also Jyllands-Posten’s editorial from the 16th of May 2014 gave the deathblow to Alternativet with the quote “*Try Elbæk-free days*” - with the reference to Alternativet’s vision of car-free Sundays. In addition to this, the editorial promised its readers that Alternativet would not succeed and point out that: “*The huge amount of hot air which floats to the public from the party should only be considered as a threat towards the ozon-layser*” (Jyllands-Posten, 2014).

Obviously Alternativet proved the media wrong and the electoral was indeed ready to take in Political Social Entrepreneurship. Alternativet was elected to Folketinget and was pronounced as one of the big surprises of the 2015 election (Altinget, 2015). Alternativet had wind in its sails, but one thing is to build a party, be able to master an election campaign and subsequently be elected, and another thing is to know how to transform visions into real policy issues. As for this, none of us know how the former will turn out (this thesis was written prior to the opening of Folketinget), though it is of greatest importance to emphasize that the way from a vision of Political Social Entrepreneurship to an implementation of Political Social Entrepreneurship policy is not necessarily straightforward. First of all, in order for Alternativet to make Political Social Entrepreneurship into policy, Alternativet

needs to claim the discourse and put it on the agenda - in other words start a process of politicization of Political Social Entrepreneurship. Green Pedersen builds a theory in which he explains how issues are being politicized. He explains that politics should be considered as an ongoing struggle between the attention of the elite and policy issues. The political elite sets an agenda where the electorates are presented for different kind of political solution models.

When Political Social Entrepreneurship is politicized in this theory frame it is defined by the act of articulation by the Folketinget (or is being excluded from the agenda). This also means, that the politicization of Political Social Entrepreneurship is a product of the agenda of the elite, thereby the agenda initiated from the formal parties is credited as the primary explanatory variable compared to the agenda of the electoral. The reason for this among other things is the political parties' ability of working strategically concerning articulation of issues and due to the fact that they on a regular basis interact with other stakeholders within a clear defined institutional frame. The former meaning that for Alternativet to be able to claim the agenda and politicize Political Social Entrepreneurship it would take a lot of strategy and political ingenuity. Something that Alternativet does not seem to have is excess in its political experience. Hardly anyone from Alternativet's nine politicians in Folketinget has any formal political experience, notwithstanding Uffe Elbæk of course.

Green Pedersen argues that the process of politicization is a one way causality - thereby emphasizing the process of politicization goes from the agenda of the elite to the electoral but only to a small degree the other way around. The initiation and articulation of an issue might not lie in the hand of the people, which is not equal to the fact that the electoral has no influence at all. According to Green Pedersen the electoral should rather be seen as a potential multiplier - meaning the elite articulates a given issue, and thereby politicizes it, which further results in the electoral focusing additional attention to the issue, where it ends up being slinged back to the politicians. This process can happen multiple times and should be considered as a reinforcing process of politicization (Green-Pedersen, 2011, 62).

In addition to this, Green Pedersen focuses on the conditions in which a given issue can enter the process of politicization. These occasions can be relatively unpredictable. However, an example when these occasions prove to be rather predictable is when an issue becomes institutionalized - for instance the yearly budget negotiations (Green-Pedersen, 2011; 45). In addition to this what matters in the process of politicization is whom the actors are trying to

push the issue forward to. Green Pedersen argues that mainstream parties, especially if they are in the government, have far better possibilities than small or/and radical left or right wing parties. Consequently the category of the latter does depend to some extent whether the bigger mainstream parties take up a given issue or not. Although size is not everything and the smaller parties are still capable of politicization, a given issue is that timing has to be right. There are two main categories in which give smaller parties a certain window of opportunity: 1) sensational issues that are largely media-driven 2) Prominent issues, which has a personal intrinsic value for the electoral. If the issue is not sensational, not prominent, and is not backed up by the mainstream parties it is extremely difficult to politicize a given issue (ibid, 32-36).

Though it is worth mentioning that the political opposition has a certain structural advantage in the politicization process. If the opposition chooses to pursue an opportunity and the government avoids the articulation it has the potential to enhance the chances of a politicization (ibid, 39-42). On the other hand the government also controls part of the debate due to the fact the ministers often are an obvious choice when selecting a person to interview and thereby have the possibility to disseminate a certain issue.

In relation to which issues the parties choose to draw attention to there are two criteria, which are essential. Firstly, to which extent the issue at stake fits into the already existing conflict structures. This criterion brings in the classical right-left dimension - the more disagreement there is between the government and the opposition the better are the chances for an issue to be politicized. Secondly, there is the electoral criterion - the core of this that the opposition only tries to bring up issues where the electoral is on their side. Lastly, it is worth mentioning that the process of politicization has an integrated inertia, in other words, when an issue has entered the arena of articulation it can be difficult for the issue to leave the arena again.

Concludingly, the politicized issues have a tendency to become an institutionalized part of the political agenda- thereby demanding continuous attention from the parties and politicians (ibid, 39).

By nature, Social Entrepreneurship denotes cross-sectoral existence, maintaining obfuscated boundaries existing between the spheres of public and private sectors, as well as its relation to the civil society. Similar notion is also seen in the concept of Social Innovation. One thing is to present a visionary political manifesto and subsequently to make volunteers, members and the electoral believe that what you are proposing is actually feasible and can be politically

implemented - frankly speaking, some might say that history tells us that not all politicians stick to their promises.

The concept of Social Entrepreneurship is intertwined with the environment related to the market together with social welfare, as far as both idea and practice are concerned.

Traditionally, values and methodologies associated with the world of business are combined with the values of voluntary sector. Adding a third term *Political* to Social Entrepreneurship does not necessarily make the concept more clear-cut - by doing this, we have three different predicates which, from a traditional point of view, belong to three completely different (theoretical) societal spheres - the market (Entrepreneurship), the state (Political) and civil society (Social).

For this reason, strictly ontologically speaking, that *Political Social Entrepreneurship* might appear as a paradoxical and counterintuitive practice, *or* on the other hand, that it might be a rhetorical integrative discourse novelty. Nonetheless, it is nowadays evident that the social aspect of business is increasingly becoming more familiar and common among enterprises and among non-governmental organizations in Denmark, as well as in the international arena. This combination is reflected in hybrid terms combining the words social and business –(e.g., ‘social investment’, ‘social capital’, ‘social enterprise’, ‘social business’, ‘venture philanthropy’, ‘fair-trade’, etc.). In particular, it has been widely used in the fields of international development, ethical investment, and corporate social responsibility, among others. The term Social Entrepreneurship has become so prevalent and significant for businesses based on concerns, needs, and values of the society and combining these with methods and practices carried out by businesses and its actors. While it can be applied in many different circumstances, Social Entrepreneurship sometimes becomes integrated as an inspirational statement or a slogan, rather than a concrete conceptual understanding.

The vagueness and contestations lie in the language used related to its definitions, as well as the various claims connected to its nature. This, however, hopefully enables people and not just scholars and researchers of the field to carefully understand the difference between the ‘real’ and the ‘spin’ relating to Social Entrepreneurship as a concept and as a practice. Dees (2004) proposes for a division of the ideas relating to rhetoric and those that illustrate reality. He explicitly acknowledges the rhetorical and normative nature of academic and political literature. He continues to explain that it is essential to consider both language and rhetoric when engaging in Social Entrepreneurship in order to emphasize the specific contemporary

salience attached to it. Williams (1976) mentioned that the ways of using words are more important than their meanings and significance when looking at formal definitions. In particular, words involving values and ideas, as well as words demarcating the ways in which issues are being approached and discussed, and those that reflect understanding of our experiences are emphasized in his book entitled 'Keywords'. Taking this to consideration, the term Social Entrepreneurship could not be considered as a 'keyword' in its entirety; however, it could still be classified as a 'buzzword' that could attract the attention towards policy-making and implementation, press coverage, economic gains, and could also become an inspiration to people and different organizations engaged in such related activities. This is based on the notion that 'buzzwords' enable people and organizations to structure issues and come up with feasible solutions and to influence the process of thinking among policy-makers and practitioners. Moreover, these terms could also help in conceptualizing possible future scenarios and actions and the limitation for the actions related to policy and practice. When two unrelated words are combined, certain meanings develop even if these were not known before its existence (Cornwall, 2007).

Taking a different perspective, one could argue that Political Social Entrepreneurship highlights the very reality and that our societies follow a dynamic path towards a (re) definition of relationships seen between and among populations including the civil society's critical structures, and the terminology combining the state, market and civil society is mere a reflections of today's democracy. Political Social Entrepreneurship then becomes a contemporary mirroring of modernity - a campaign formed and employed by people possessing creative edge and who are dissatisfied with the currently operating institutions (Dees, 1998).

When considering the political aspect of the concept, Cho (2006) argues that Social Entrepreneurship and its present definitions are seen to be more of monological and tautological. As a result, the debate should be discontinued in order to have a limited set of alternatives and disregard the intrinsically contestable nature associated with the term 'social'. This is with the aim to divert injustices and inequalities that are seen to be structural and systemic in nature and eventually to take the chance in undermining democracy. With this, Political Social Entrepreneurship is able to accomplish its potential and promise as an influencer towards positive social change especially through creative and innovative ways (Cho, 2006). Therefore, studying and understanding Social Entrepreneurship then should

involve the introduction of a more refined and critical approach, and advanced with an interdisciplinary perspective.

If you do combine politicalology, sociology with the broad paradigm of Social Entrepreneurship and add the lens of institutionalism and governance and simultaneously put the the results from our analysis together: Open-source, bottom-up, network, cooperation between different organizational spheres of society, one could easily come to think of the governance paradigm called New Public Governance. The classical model of bureaucracy theorized by Max Weber, called Public Administration, is build upon the notion of hierarchy, management by rule and control and many of these thoughts do still reflect how the public administration is organized today. In the 1980'ies there came a reaction and the New Public Management arose. This governance paradigm included values of streamlining, competition, performance measurement and outsourcing. This paradigm emphasizes on the conformance of strategies, ways of thinking, and experiences that mostly come from private sector and applied to the public sector (Moulart et. al., 2003: 25). Because of this merging of public and private sectors, the boundaries are further blurred. While this move or concept presents benefit because the two sectors may learn from each other, some disadvantages may arise. This is for the reason that the two spheres' intrinsic logics are still considered distinct from one another. One example of which is the inherent logic of public is about the people's will, the private sector might be thinking about the economic profits. This makes them contradictory based on practice and theory.

Nevertheless, Social Innovation proves that this contradiction may still be reconciled. For the for most part, it is acknowledged that institutions (institutionalism) create and establish norms and the space in which action and formation of different kind occur. Institutions create possibilities and boundaries for the individual to act and react both verbally and nonverbally (North, 1990). In this manner, the institutional setting influences the execution of economies, especially through its impact on business people's conduct. In particular, the above-mentioned methodology proposes that the choice to establish an act of Social Entrepreneurship is dictated by the organizations and the context in which it happens. In a similar manner, theory suggests that Social Entrepreneurship is to a great degree delicate to alterations in politics particularly in regards to the sorts of administrations qualified for starting up a social enterprise. Looking through the lenses of institutionalism the primary capacity of institutions is to lessen vulnerability from the perspective of the actors by building up constant configurations for communication and action. Due to the latter social

entrepreneurs are best when they make social entrepreneurial associations, which connect with their surroundings. Mair and Marti propose that institutional variables are critical to the development and usage of Social Entrepreneurship (Mair and Marti, 2009) Along these lines, scholars of institutionalism note that social entrepreneurs are responsible for executing both the tenets and regulations identified with social entrepreneurial action and the causal standards coming about because of their knowledge and socialization procedures, having the included effect of other administrative, monetary, social and instructive standards (ibid).

As to the external environment there is by all accounts agreement on a few parts of how it forms social enterprises. As Mair and Marti state social enterprises should be perceived as a procedure resulting from the nonstop collaboration or interaction of entrepreneurs with an ongoing process with their surroundings. They distinguish and are pulled in by imperfect equilibrium in society (Martin and Osberg, 2007), or disregarded issues (Santos, 2012), in which they perceive as a window of opportunity. The way that these issues are disregarded stems from the way that legislature does not have the assets or an impetus to deal with this or that organizations don't see the prospective for value appropriation (Santos, 2012). In this sense Chell (2010) contends that social business visionaries confront the balance of their outside surroundings, and social enterprise is hence a procedure inserted in a financial setting. Mair and Marti (2006) accentuate that it is difficult to disconnect social business people from their surroundings, and they include that particularly the localism is by all accounts an essential for the achievement of social business people and social ventures, on the grounds that information is vital.

Conclusion

My main objective was to understand the new phenomena of a Social Entrepreneurial Political Party Alternativet, and to investigate to what degree the theoretical concept of Political Social Entrepreneurship converges or diverges with the existing theory of Social Entrepreneurship on four operationalized dimensions:

- 1) Social Drive and identity
- 2) Value Creation
- 3) Social Innovation
- 4) Organizational/cross-sectorial

I conducted a theoretical triangulation and found 59 indicators among the four dimensions. Out of the 59 indicators 58 showed convergence. Thereby concluding that my conceptualization of Social Entrepreneurship was congruent with the new phenomena of Political Social Entrepreneurship. I then challenged my operationalization from an internal validity point of view and realized that even though the traditional theoretical concept of Social Entrepreneurship mirrors Political Social Entrepreneurship well the transferability is not as clear-cut as the analysis initially showed and that the following values of Alternativet:

- a) Perception of capitalism
- b) Bottom-up processes and
- c) The identity

Can be questioned to be fully congruent in comparison with traditional theory of Social Entrepreneurship.

In addition to this I discussed the potential for Political Entrepreneurship and shed light upon the following issues:

- a) The importance of a politicization process in which Alternativet has to rely on other actors than them selves as well.
- b) A discursive complexity concerning the concept of Political Social Entrepreneurship it self
- c) The resemblance to New Public Governance

Bibliography

Aberbach, J., & Rockman, B. (2002). Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews. *Political Science & Politics APSC*, 35(4), 673-676.

Alternativet. (2014, May 16). *Jyllands-Posten*. Retrieved 2015, from <https://jyllands-posten.dk/debat/leder/ECE6730657/Alternativet/>

Alternativet - Partiprogram. (2015, April). Retrieved October 29, 2015, from https://alternativet.dk/website/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Partiprogram_1.3_04.15.pdf

Alternativets Historie. (n.d.). Retrieved September 1, 2015, from <https://alternativet.dk/alternativets-historie/>

Andersen, I. (2014, October 6). *Tilliden til politikerne er helt i bund*.

- Austin, J., & Reficco, E. (2009). Corporate Social Entrepreneurship. Retrieved 2015, from [http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication Files/09-101.pdf](http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/09-101.pdf)
- AvisenDK. Retrieved October 19, 2015, from http://www.ugebreveta4.dk/tilliden-til-politikerne-er-helt-i-bund_19860.aspx
- Bornstein, D. (2004). *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas* (1st ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boyce, C., & Neale, P. (2006). *Conducting In-depth Interviews: A Guide for Designing and Conducting In-depth Interviews for Evaluation Input*. Watertown, MA: Pathfinder International.
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2007). *Business Research Methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Budge, I. (2001). *Mapping Policy Preferences Estimates for Parties, Electors, and Governments 1945-1998*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Castells, M., & Cardoso, G. (Eds.). (2005). *The Network Society: From Knowledge to Policy*. Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University.
- Chell, E., Nicolopoulou, K., & Karatas-Ozkan, M. (2010). Social Entrepreneurship And Enterprise: International And Innovation Perspectives. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 22(6), 485-493.
- Cho, A. (2006). Politics, Values and Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Appraisal. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, & K. Hockerts, *Social Entrepreneurship* (pp. 34-56). Hampshire.
- Cornwall, A. (2007). *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords*. Rugby, Warwickshire, UK: Practical Action Pub.
- Coster, H. (2011, November 30). Forbes' List of the Top 30 Social Entrepreneurs. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/helencoster/2011/11/30/forbes-list-of-the-top-30-social-entrepreneurs/>
- De 'radikalt Radikale' er en luftig ide. (2013, November 19). *Politikken*. Retrieved August 16, 2015, from <https://politiken.dk/debat/ledere/ECE2146301/de-radikalt-radikale-er-en-luftig-ide/>
- Dedijer, S. (1984). Science- and Technology-related Social Innovations in UNCSTD National Papers. *Social Innovations for Development*, 57-92.
- Dees, G. (1998). *The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship*. Kansas City, MO and Palo Alto, CA: Kauffman Foundation and Stanford University.
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2008). Social Enterprise In Europe: Recent Trends And Developments. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 4(3), 202-228.
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 32-53.
- Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y., & Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 433-466). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Dey, I. (2004). Grounded Theory (C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium, & D. Silverman, Eds.). *Qualitative Research Practice*, 81-94.
- Eisenhardt, K., & Graebner, M. (2007). Theory Building from Cases: Opportunities and Challenges (pp. 25-32). Newtown Square: Project Management Institute.
- Elklit, J., & Jensen, H. (2010). Kvalitative Datakilder. In *Metoder i Statskundskab* (pp. 117-143). Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel.

- Farquhar, J. (2012, January 13). What is Case Study Research? Retrieved October 27, 2015, from http://www.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/46240_Farquhar.pdf
- Fowler, A. (2000). NGOs As A Moment In History: Beyond Aid To Social Entrepreneurship Or Civic Innovation? *Third World Quarterly*, 21(4), 637-654. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3993370?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents
- Goode, L. (2005). Jürgen Habermas (pp. 3-88, 120-133). London: Pluto Press.
- Green-Pedersen, C. (2011). *Partier i nye tider: Den politiske dagsorden i Danmark*. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Grünfeld, N. (2014, December 12). Alternativet vil lytte til borgerne. *Jyllands-Posten*. Retrieved September 16, 2015, from <https://jyllands-posten.dk/aarhus/meninger/breve/ECE7282344/Alternativetvil-lytte-til-borgerne/>
- Hagel, H. (2015, September 7). Alternativet [Personal interview].
- Hay, C. (2007). *Why We Hate Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Polity Press.
- Hellevik, O. (2002). *Forskningsmetode i sosiologi og statsvitenskap*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hemingway, C. (2005). Personal Values As A Catalyst For Corporate Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 60(3), 233-249.
- Hirschheim, R. (1985). *Information Systems Epistemology: An Historical Perspective*. London: London School of Economics.
- Holm, J., Stubager, R., Smidstrup, M., & Kramb, K. (n.d.). *Danske vælgere 1971-2011. En Oversigt over Udviklingen I Vælgernes Holdninger Mv.*
- Hvass, J. (2014, April 14). De færreste kender Alternativet. *Politikken*. Retrieved 2015, from <https://politiken.dk/indland/politik/ECE2263837/de-faerreste-kender-alternativet/>
- Hvem har bedt om et alternativ? (2013, November 28). *BT*. Retrieved September 16, 2015, from <http://blogs.bt.dk/leder/2013/11/28/hvem-har-bedt-om-et-alternativ/>
- Kelliher, F. (2005). Interpretivism and the Pursuit of Research Legitimation: An Integrated Approach to Single Case Design. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methodology*, 3(2), 123-132.
- Keman, H. (2007). Experts and Manifestos: Different sources – Same results for comparative research? *Electoral Studies*, 26(1), 76–89-76–89.
- Kerlin, J. (2006). Social Enterprise in the United States and Europe: Understanding and Learning from the Differences. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 247-263.
- Kvale, S. (1997). *InterView: En introduktion til det kvalitative forskningsinterview*. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel Forlag.
- Kvale, S. (2008). *Doing Interviews*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interview*. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Larsen, B. (n.d.). Alternativets gummiord. Retrieved September 1, 2015, from <http://www.kommunikationsforum.dk/artikler/Analyse-af-Alternativets-partiprogram>
- Little, A. (2008). *Democratic Piety* (pp. 77-108). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lynggaard, K. (2010). Dokumentanalyse. In S. Brinkmann & L. Tanggaard (Eds.), *Kvalitative Metoder : En Grundbog* (pp. 153-167). Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel.
- Maach, M. (2013, November 27). Ekspert: Der er ikke nok stemmer til Elbæks nye parti. *Politikken*. Retrieved August 13, 2015, from <https://politiken.dk/indland/politik/ECE2143884/ekspert-der-er-ikke-nok-stemmer-til-elbaeks-nye-parti/>

- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2004). *Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight*. Barcelona: IESE Business School.
- Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source Of Explanation, Prediction, And Delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- March, J., & Olsen, J. (1995). *Democratic Governance* (pp. 49-89). New York: The Free Press.
- Martin, R., & Osberg, S. (2007). *Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition*. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.
- Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- McLaughlin, H. (2007). *Understanding Social Work Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Mouffe, C. (2000a). Politics and Passion: The Stakes of Democracy. *Ethical Perspectives- Katholieke Universiteit Leuven*, 7(2), 146-150.
- Mouffe, C. (2000b). *The Democratic Paradox* (pp. 108-128). London: Verso.
- Moulaert, F., MacCallum, D., Mehmood, A., & Hamdouch, A. (Eds.). (2013). *The International Handbook on Social Innovation: Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research*. Cheltenham: Edward Edgar Publishing Limited.
- North, D. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Patton, M. (1999). Enhancing the Quality and Credibility of Qualitative Analysis. *HSR: Health Services Research* 34:5 Part II, 1189-1208. Retrieved from <https://www.uic.edu/sph/prepare/courses/chsc433/patton.pdf>
- Peredo, A., & McLean, M. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Review Of The Concept. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 56-65.
- Phills Jr., J., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. (2008). *Rediscovering Social Innovation*. Retrieved from http://ssir.org/articles/entry/rediscovering_social_innovation
- Pol, E., & Ville, S. (2009). Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term? *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38, 878-885.
- Polkinghorne, D. (2005). Language and Meaning: Data Collection in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 137-145.
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work* (pp. 163-185). Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. (1995). Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 664-683.
- Raben, M. (2013, November 30). *Alternativet. Naivitet som mærkesag. Politikken*. Retrieved 2015, from <https://politiken.dk/debat/profiler/raben/ECE2147419/alternativet-naivitet-som-maerkesag/>
- Rehling, D. (2013, November 29). *Forbandede Uffe Elbæk: Han har ret. Information*. Retrieved 2015, from <http://www.information.dk/480324>
- Sandelowski, M. (2004). Using Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 1366-1386.
- Santos, F. (2012). A Positive Theory of Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 335-351.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research Methods for Business Students* (5th ed.). Harlow, England: Prentice Hall.

- Tasavori, M., & Sinkovics, R. (2011). Socially entrepreneurial behaviour of multinational companies: Are MNCs 'social entrepreneurs'? (E. Hutson, R. Sinkovics, & J. Berrill, Eds.). *Firm-level Internationalisation, Regionalism and Globalization*, 397-411.
- Thompson, J. (2002). The World of the Social Entrepreneur. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 15(5), 412-431.
- Warren, M. (2002). What Can Democratic Participation Mean Today? *Political Theory*, 5(30), 677-701.
- Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Yin, R. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zahra, S., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D., & Shulman, J. (2009). A Typology Of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, Search Processes And Ethical Challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24, 519-532.
- Zapf, W. (1991). The Role Of Innovations In Modernization Theory. *International Review of Sociology*, 2(3), 83-94.
- Øyen, M. (2015, June 19). Her er valgets 12 store overraskelser. *Altinget*. Retrieved 2015, from <https://www.altinget.dk/artikel/her-er-valgets-12-store-overraskelser>

Appendix 1

To access the audio file of the interview, please follow the link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6YQ31ktQuYVR1lZZms2djl2MHc/view?usp=sharing>