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**Summary**  
As an effect of the neoliberalist development, the public sector has outsourced the provision of some public services to the private and the third sector. This has led to the expansion of the latter, and a more central position of the actors related to it; among them the social entrepreneur. A social entrepreneur has the objective of creating social impact, while adopting a more business-like approach. This is often a way of achieving financial sustainability or competitive advantage.

The aim of this thesis is twofold; first of all, to explore the concept of social entrepreneurship, what it entails and how it is applied. Secondly, it is viewed from the more concrete perspective of the role of a social entrepreneur. In order to operationalise the research, the role of a social entrepreneur is contemplated on in relation to one specific actor, namely Stadsbruk. They are an incubator for commercial urban farmers, with ambition of creating social impact on several levels. The discussion treats how they, as a social entrepreneurial actor, stand in relation to the public sector, the power structure it creates and their position in the urban context, primarily concerning aspects of space and power.

The findings of this study indicate that there needs to be a balance between entrepreneurial ambitions and objectives of creating a social impact for an actor to qualify as a social entrepreneur. As the field of research on social entrepreneurship is in a pre-paradigmatic state, it is reasonable to expect that the concept will be more clearly defined if or when the paradigm is set. Moreover, theories on narratives shaping the paradigm of social entrepreneurship suggest that there are different trajectories. However, one might also consider re-evaluating the concept of a traditional entrepreneur; the social entrepreneur could simply be a more holistic approach to entrepreneurship in general. Finally, the activities of a social entrepreneur are often related to that of the public sector. The results of the research imply a power structure, in which the social entrepreneur (in the case of this study Stadsbruk) are subordinate the public sector, due to structures of dependency, etc. This also relates to Massey’s theory on power relations in connection to space; power-geometry. An actor like Stadsbruk are positioned in the urban context, in which to struggles and relations of power and aspects of space are inevitable.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Contextualising the scope

Neoliberalism has been a strong influence in the shaping of society for the last many decades. The effects of this are frequently, widely and thoroughly discussed. Not only in academia but also by the public. They are noticeable in all spheres of the public realm; an example being the outsourcing of public services and activities. Much has been taken over by the private sector, but it has also spurred the expansion and importance of the third sector (also known as the voluntary sector) and its associated actors; among them the social entrepreneur. Activities associated with countering social exclusion or promoting work integration are common traits for these actors.

As the third sector has expanded, the value of social impact seems to have increased correspondingly. In the scope of this thesis social impact is interpreted as “a significant, positive change that addresses a pressing social challenge” (University of Michigan 2018). One could argue that it is a reaction to a more individualistic and profit-driven mentality. It could also be an untapped source of income. Or both. Regardless, this tendency is creating opportunities for social entrepreneurs. The scope of this thesis is to explore the concept of social entrepreneurship, as well as apply that knowledge to study a possible social entrepreneur - Stadsbruk. They are considered a ‘possible’ entrepreneur both because they describe themselves as such, and seem to fit most of the indicators. However, as will be illustrated in chapter 2, the makings of a social entrepreneur are quite complex. It is essential to understand social entrepreneurship as more than merely a conceptual perspective; it is also a type of actor. This branch within the third sector is becoming more meaningful and frequent, but the actors are also taking on a new kind of role. It is in some sense a hybrid between the third and the private sector. The dissonance of objectives for a social entrepreneur is very intriguing; wanting to do good, while simultaneously following the structures of neoliberalism, by adopting a business perspective.

The reason why Stadsbruk in particular is an interesting case in the scope of this study is that they are taking on the role of a social entrepreneur, while concurrently creating a platform for other social entrepreneurs; one of their main activities is an incubator for commercial urban farmers. This provides a meta-perspective of sorts. Stadsbruk aspire to influence city administrations to make urban farming a part of urban planning, and not the least commercial urban farming. The setup of the incubator differs a bit between the different cities. But what all local branches have in common is that Stadsbruk aim to create job opportunities, and promote a greener lifestyle by striving for food to be produced locally. Since the tool for entrepreneurship is urban farming, access to land is inherently relevant, which relates to important aspects of power; what land and what for? For how long? For who and instead of another?
The ambition of this thesis is thus to provide further research on a concept and a type of actor that seems fairly unexplored, particularly from a spatial perspective. This to contribute to the field of research on third sector actors; in particular, social entrepreneurs, as they are moving to taking on a more central and pronounced role in society.

1.2 Aim

The aim of this thesis is to investigate the development and meaning of the concept of social entrepreneurship, as well as attempting to understand the role of a social entrepreneur in the urban context. It is thus essential for the reader to note that the approach in this thesis is twofold; on the one hand we can apply the concept of social entrepreneurship as a tool to analyse a certain segment of activities within the third sector, while on the other hand being a social entrepreneur is a role that is taken by certain actors - balancing social impact with a business approach. First, the concept of social entrepreneurship is explored, and is thereafter applied to the case of Stadsbruk; analysing their ambition, their relationship with the public sector and their position in the urban context. This includes the spatial perspective of access to land: if urban farming becomes a more prioritised investment on the political agenda, this will affect structures of power.

1.3 Research questions

To operationalise and limit my study I have focused on the following three research questions:

1. What makes a social entrepreneur and can Stadsbruk be considered an example of a social entrepreneur? If so, then how?
2. What is the relationship between Stadsbruk, as a social entrepreneur, and the public sector?
3. What is the role of a social entrepreneur, and how is this role positioned in the urban context of space and power?

1.4 Previous research

Since social entrepreneurship is still a relatively recent and unexplored phenomenon, this thesis does not contain a separate section presenting previous research. Such a presentation could be misleading to the reader, as it could indicate an accumulated foundation of research, while the lack thereof is in fact one of the primary points of discussion. Rather the previous research is presented concurrently with the theoretical framework (see chapter 2).
1.5 Disposition of the thesis

The next chapter is the theoretical framework of the thesis, and contains three main strands of theory; 1. Background, development and framework of the concept of social entrepreneurship, 2. Nicholls (2010) theories on social entrepreneurship in a pre-paradigmatic state, and how reflexive isomorphism use narratives to influence the development of the paradigm, and 3. Massey’s reasoning on the concept of space, and how it relates to power (power-geometry). This chapter is proportionally larger than the other sections of the thesis. This is deemed necessary as the concept is, to some, unfamiliar and vague. A thorough understanding of the concept of social entrepreneurship will contribute to a more profound and multifaceted analysis and discussion.

The theoretical chapter is followed by the methodology; explaining the research approach and methods applied in the collection and interpretation of data. More than simply listing methods used, it is intended to also clarify to the reader how the material has been treated in an epistemological perspective, i.e. inspired by relative social constructivism. This is fundamental, especially for how the second section of the theory is applied to the case. The chapter also contains a section on the limitations of the scope; the primary purpose of this section is to explain to the reader what has intentionally not been taken into consideration and why.

The fourth chapter provides the reader with knowledge on urban farming, and how it is treated in a commercial approach. It also presents information on Stadsbruk as an actor, their intention and ambition, the current state of the Stadsbruk project, other relevant stakeholders, and the setup of funding.

This is then followed by the analysis. Since the data cannot be presented in a fully objective manner (as it contains underlying elements of interpretation) and to avoid repetition, the empirical material is presented from an analytical perspective, i.e. the analysis of the thesis. The chapter is structured according to six themes; three relating to Stadsbruk and three to the public sector (the city administrations).

The sixth chapter considers and discusses the research questions in the order they were posed in the introductory chapter, with reference to the findings of the analysis.

The seventh chapter summarises and concretises the results of the discussion, with the attempt of linking it to the overall aim of the study.

The final chapter of the thesis present other interesting, related topics of research, which could potentially contribute to the field of research regarding social entrepreneurship in general, and in the form of commercial urban farming in particular.
2. Theory

The theoretical chapter starts with a brief description of the influence of neoliberalism on public policy-making, and related operational strategies. This is followed by a general description of the third sector, within which the role and concept of social entrepreneurship is considered to have developed. Thereafter we move on to study social entrepreneurship, which includes attempts of a definition, the development, the concept, funding and how the social entrepreneur stands in relation to the public sector.

This is then followed by an overview of Nicholls’ (2010) accounts on the pre-paradigmatic state of social entrepreneurship as a field of research. This goes well in line with the scope of this study, since Nicholls presents discourse as one of the main tools for shaping the development of the paradigm of social entrepreneurship, and one of the main tools for the analysis is namely; discourse analysis. It seems sensible to, when highlighting discourse as an influential factor for the establishing of the concept of social entrepreneurship, also apply it as a tool for analysis.

The chapter concludes with an account of Massey’s (2005 and 2009) reasoning on the concept of space, as well as her reflections on power-geometry. The spatial dimension is highly relevant in the scope of this research, as the case study is an example of an actor that is dependent on access to land, i.e. space and thus also power.

2.1 The context of social entrepreneurship

This first section is intended as a conceptual framework when treating research question 1: What makes a social entrepreneur and can Stadsbruk be considered an example of a social entrepreneur? If so, then how?

2.1.1 Neoliberalism as backdrop

First and foremost, it is important to note that the terms neoliberalism and neoliberal differ significantly depending on perspective, subject etc., making it problematic to use without specifying the intention. In the scope of this thesis it is focused on the economic development and as a set of public policies, which has been current for the last many decades. Principally it favours free-market capitalism, privatisation, and the reduction of the centrality of the state (Harlow et.al. 2012: 536). Harvey (2005: 2) captures it quite well though by explaining neoliberalism as:

“The first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices […] Neoliberalism has, in short, become hegemonic as a mode of discourse. It has pervasive effects on ways of thought to the point
where it has become incorporated into the common-sense way many of us interpret, live in, and understand the world.”

2.1.2 Managerialism and NPM

Neoliberalism can be thought of as a set of ideologies, and managerialism and New Public Management (NPM) are strategies to operationalise these ideologies in public management. They are relevant to the context of the establishing and growth of the third sector, as they have been instrumental forces in shaping and creating room and a need for these initiatives associated with it. It is worth noting that this conceptualisation has through the years been highly criticised for providing a too simplified view on reality; neoliberalism is in reality a number of waves and tendencies co-occurring, together building and shaping society (Harlow et.al. 2012).

For (new) managerialism, neoliberalism can be thought of as the organisational glue, according to Harlow et.al. (2012: 538). The term is often interchangeably used with NPM, since NPM originally referred to either managerialism or new institutional economics (which is the introduction of incentive structures for public management). It is more of a structuralist strategy, inspired by the private sector’s organisation management; an umbrella term for the many sets of public reforms that were established with the influx of neoliberalism in the 1980’s (Alonso et.al. 2015: 645). It is a way to manage our complex society by promoting market mechanisms, putting greater attention to the outcomes rather than the inputs, and treating the receiver of services as a customer (Rhodes 1996: 655). Advocates for NPM reforms introduced decentralized service delivery models, to allow local authorities more independence in their provision of public services. This kind of approach would also entail public management outsourcing services, in order to make the delivery of them more efficient and effective. Cornelius and Wallace (2013: 233) write “... NPM also involves the sub-contracting out of services, in particular to the private sector but increasingly to the third sector also”. In addition, this goes well in line with the neoliberalist spirit of limiting the power of the state; allowing the supply and demand of the market to influence the public sector. It has also been claimed to be an apolitical, technical manner of management, as the ‘politics’ is taken out of policy-making (Harlow et.al. 2012: 538). Rhodes (1996) refer to Osborne and Gaebler (1992), who claim that policy decisions can be thought of as steering, and service delivery is like rowing. They argue that adopting policy strategies inspired by NPM will mean more ‘more governance’ (i.e. steering) and less government (rowing) (Rhodes 1996: 655).

2.1.3 Third sector

Now, the above described ideological structure and policies are intended to function as a foundation for the following section, which is an explanation of what the third sector is and how it came to be. This is vital, since the role and the concept of social entrepreneurship is considered to belong within, and have an interdependent relationship with the third sector.

The third sector started emerging in the 1970’s as the interest for non-profit, philanthropic and operating foundations began to spire. It stands in-between the market and the state, and is thus separated from the public and private sectors. Not only do the traits and areas of focus differ
between countries, but it is also defined by the country’s prevailing tradition, culture and political ideology (Evers and Laville 2004: 11). Funding from the public sector has frequently been a great influence in shaping the development of the third sector. In Europe it was not influential in volume or share, but rather in the form of funding. In Sweden and other socio-democratic countries, third sector organisations providing welfare services were supported and encouraged. This is possibly an indicator of a neoliberalist agenda (Defourny and Nyssens 2010: 235). Due to this historic link between the public and third sector, signified by an interdependent relationship of provision of public services, it has had a close but complex relationship with the market. Moreover, this has also forced or inspired the third sector to take on an open, multifaceted and flexible approach ventures, and made it a well-nested part of civil society (Evers and Laville 2004: 13f).

The European tradition is quite different from the US one, where the former consider the third sector to include not only non-profit organisations, but also covers not-for-profit organisations, i.e. those who might make a profit but it is not the main motif. This has later been altered to also include cooperatives and organisations, and independent actors with social aims - such as social entrepreneurs. It represents an attempt to create a different economy, where the foundation is based on a solidaric approach.\(^1\)

Along with the third sector growing in importance to the public sector, the role of the social entrepreneur is also developing and is becoming more central in terms of provider of several front-line services. This does not only have great effects on the recipients, but also on a macro-financial level (Cornelius and Wallace 2013: 232). This will be further explored in the next section.

2.1.4 Development of Social Entrepreneurship

Along with the political climate globally taking on a neoliberal direction, wealth per capita has also risen and general welfare has improved significantly in many parts of the world. In the wake of these developments, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and different forms of social entrepreneurs have been given, or maybe taken, on a more central and influential role. This new role of social entrepreneurs has been impelled by visionaries, with innovatory ideas, who have adopted organisational structures previously associated with the private sector, while maintaining features of charity and idealistic values. These organisational structures include, to the third sector, new styles of management; adopting more business-like practices is claimed to make them more reactive and optimise the use of resources (Nicholls 2010: 623). Social impact has not been of the same magnitude, nor affected as many people before (Cornelius and Wallace 2013: 232f). Nicholls (2006: 2) lists the driving forces of the growing scale and reach of social entrepreneurship in categories of supply and demand. The former includes: a general increase in the global wealth (per capita), longer general life expectancy, more democratically elected and run governments, improved education etc. The latter category lists: economic inequality,

---

1 For a closer read on the development and structure of the third sector, please see Evers et. al.’s book ‘The Third Sector in Europe (2004). It is an excellent source of information on the topic.
greater competition for resources, governments standing back to market driven models, and thus a diminished supply of public services.

In Europe the concept of social entrepreneurship was first introduced in the early 1990’s. According to Defourny and Nyssens (2010: 232) it was a reaction to the public sector’s inability to offer public services. Unlike in the US, the base of social entrepreneurship was formed in the context of the third sector, which include actors like foundations, not-for-profit organisations, charities, networks etc. As social entrepreneurs were a new kind of actor, originally there was no real legal structure or framework for how they were to be treated. In order to receive a response from the political level, in the form of legal reforms and fill the gap, third sector actors organised themselves in federate entities and initiated a lobbying scheme. However, even in countries where these reforms have gained legal force, many social entrepreneurs instead chose an association-setup etc., because it offers a greater extent of freedom or more business-like structures (ibid.: 235).

In Scandinavia great faith has always been put to the public sector offering a generous social security; the state has long had the monopoly on matters relating to welfare and the associated service. This has naturally had a great influence on the societal agenda, along with a large contribution from community associations of all kinds of varieties. An early example of entrepreneurial third sector ventures in Sweden, which would eventually evolve to more typical social entrepreneurs, was the emergence of child-care cooperatives. It was also seen in the form of a much smaller ‘at home’-day-care hosted by a local, usually a woman (ibid.).

So, social entrepreneurs are seemingly more present within certain fields and branches than others; around the time of the arrival of social entrepreneurship, Europe was coping with consequences of the financial recession. Hence, unemployment levels were high and social entrepreneurs were a useful tool in solving that crisis. Social entrepreneurs are still today closely associated with work integration policies; aiding disadvantaged groups which are distanced from the labour market etc. This is also due to pressure applied by the public sector, which has developed schemes to promote these kinds of efforts. Adjusting to accommodate public policies have rendered, especially small and medium enterprises (SMEs), an important source of income as it has made them eligible for public subsidies. In other words, these SMEs were not just filling a gap in the market, they were also supported by the public sector (Cornelius and Wallace 2013: 235).

The European Union however, have invested less, and the majority of those investments come from the European Social Fund. Even though the funding has been limited, the support of smaller contributions has provided social entrepreneurial actor a certain stamp of legitimacy, which has in turn created more beneficial conditions, i.e. opened some other doors of development and funding (Defourny and Nyssens 2010: 237).

2.1.5 Concept of Social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship as a concept is complex and very fluent. But there is one main common object for any social entrepreneur; which is creating some sort of social impact. Cornelius and Wallace (2013: 4) describe it as: “a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses
are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and owners”. A trait that separate social entrepreneurs from most other organisations in the third sector, is that they are orientated towards a market. This means that they are also exposed to certain financial risks associated with that; like maintaining certain levels of productivity, competition etc. (Defourny and Nyssens 2010: 238). In concrete terms, a social entrepreneur can be summarised to use trade to improve, develop or implement ventures that aim to create some sort of return to society in the form of social impact. The concept of social entrepreneurship can be applied to organisations of varying size, type and objective, and can take on many forms; be it a company, co-operative, charity organisation etc. (ibid.).

What can be considered social entrepreneur can also vary between and within countries. However, the form of the organisations is often highly influenced by the national context and the prevailing legislation. What distinguishes a social entrepreneurial actor from the private sector is their intention to create social impact. However, in many cases some sort of profit is highly necessary to make the organisation economically sustainable. It can be conceptualised as not-for-profit (as opposed to non-profit) (Defourny and Nyssens: 235).

The EMES (EMergence des Enterprises Sociales en Europe), a research network of universities and individual researchers focused on social entrepreneurship, undertook the task of identifying a number of indicators of social entrepreneurial initiatives, including both economic and entrepreneurial features (ibid.: 239f):

1. The organisation has a continuous production of goods or provision of services, and is thereby directly involved in their social contribution (i.e. not redistributing funds like many foundations, etc.).
2. It is key that the organisation is independent in its management, meaning it is started and run by a group of ordinary people engaged in the cause. Also, it has a democratic approach in the sense that one’s power is not in parity with their capital ownership, decision-making is dispersed evenly among shareholders.
3. The organisations are of characterized by high levels of participation, both by members, customers or users, by those affected and by stakeholders.
4. Often there is a combination of paid work and voluntary participation. By extension this also means, minimising the profit distribution. This allows the organisation to counter profit-maximising management.
5. A common struggle for both entrepreneurs and the third sector is the lack of funds. A social entrepreneur might be particularly vulnerable as the founders of an enterprise assume an inherent economic risk, and it is therefore on their shoulders to secure sufficient resources.
6. And probably most significant: having an aim of benefiting the community - at large, or a specific disadvantaged group.

According to the Defourny and Nyssens (2010: 232) though, the concept of social entrepreneurship can also be used as a “conceptual and analytical framework which sheds light on new evolutions within the third sector: either the setting up of brand new organizations or the reshaping of existing organizations through entrepreneurial dynamics”’. Thus, it is a tool to
understand and analyse a certain segment of activities within the third sector, and less viewing it as independent actors with socio-entrepreneurial aims or objectives.

2.1.6 Funding

It is a quite recognized tendency that a type of business like social entrepreneurs are heavily affected by economic pressures and struggle to find viable, sustainable financing. They are to a higher degree than other businesses supported by external funding, and therefore run a greater risk of not making ends meet. But managing under such pressures they will over time, generally, achieve economic stability (ibid.).

What differentiates a social entrepreneur from other organizations associated with the third sector, non-profits etc., is that they are expected to earn a profit on their own business activities, i.e. not rely solely on grants, public subsidies and other kinds of external funding. This is especially the case in the European context; the mission is more than merely a charitable one, and income is also brought about via some form of trade. The balance between profit and social output naturally differs between actors, but different schools of thought have different standards of what they deem to be classified of having a social mission. Most companies today for example, have a code of conduct or a scheme for Corporate Social Responsibility. What can be considered a social entrepreneur is thus also a matter of perspective (ibid.: 238).

Even though social entrepreneurs often finance their activities through some kind of trading, and thereby assume the risks of the market, many adopt a form of hybrid-financing setup (Nicholls 2010: 613). This means their business is also sustained by other kinds of resources, like public subsidies, grants and voluntary resources. This is a type of ‘substantive approach, which combines an earned income, public redistribution (like subsidies) and reciprocity, for instance via volunteering (Defourny and Nyssens 2010: 241).

2.1.7 Relationship with the public sector

As previously mentioned, in the provision of social services, the third sector is associated with work integration efforts, while the private sector has tended more towards for example health care services. The contracts with (local) public authorities have been an important source of income for many social entrepreneurs (Cornelius and Wallace 2013: 233). This is strictly regulated under EU-law though. Public contracts need to be awarded to the actor offering the service to the lowest price (naturally maintaining some standards of quality), except if another actor can offer other social element making them ‘the most economically advantageous” option. In this way, the market forces are creating ‘fair’ conditions, but social effects are still a mechanism of influence. Hence, it provides a competitive advantage to, usually smaller, entrepreneurs with social objectives in relation to the traditional private sector. This is necessary since competing with ‘traditional’ companies on purely financial terms often put social entrepreneurs at a disadvantage. This is because they usually do not have the same opportunity to externalise costs, as they are smaller and more limited resource-wise. Do note that in Sweden the structure is slightly different; “the Swedish interpretation of EU public procurement
legislation does not allow for preferred treatment for social enterprises” (Defourny and Nyssens 2010: 237).

Cornelius and Wallace (2013: 240) write that many social entrepreneurs who receive some form of public subsidy do so from local or central government. The authors therefore advocate for community-based mediating social enterprises (CMSE), since they are locally well-rooted and have a good understanding of their community and its needs. By focusing on the issues specific for their community, resources can be used more efficiently and enable the building of social cohesion. However, the authors also stress the importance of clear and just agreements for these contracts, i.e. what is expected to be achieved and how is this measured, what public policy is their work aimed to realise, at what stage in the development does the social enterprise enter, what authority is it granted etc. Through this, the CMSE can actually work as a valuable link between the public sector and the local community (ibid.: 241).

2.2 Social entrepreneurship in a pre-paradigmatic state

This second section takes its standpoint in Nicholl’s (2010) article on reflexive isomorphism; social entrepreneurship as a pre-paradigmatic field; i.e. how actors use narratives to create legitimacy and thus shape the paradigm to better suit their objective. This second section of the chapter is meant to provide perspectives on how the concept of social entrepreneurship is developing as an effect its’ actors’ behaviour. It is thus intended to be applied when considering research question 1 What makes a social entrepreneur and can Stadsbruk be considered an example of a social entrepreneur? If so, then how? and 3: What is the role of a social entrepreneur, and how is this role positioned in the urban context of space and power?

2.2.1 Social entrepreneurship is pre-paradigmatic

A lot has happened in the development of the paradigm of social entrepreneurship. However, from my reading and understanding of the field it seems to still be open to interpretation. As mentioned above, the definition of the concept is still quite fluent; ‘lacks an established epistemology’ and a ‘paradigmatic consensus’ (Nicholls 2010: 611). In this context paradigm is meant to be understood as “agreed epistemological systems that sets the boundaries for research objects of distinct validity” (ibid.: 613). Do note, that this refers to a form of institalization of the framework of social entrepreneurship, not a greater shift in how society treats welfare issues.

The consequence of a lacking epistemology is that there are discrepancies in how the concept is understood and applied. As scholars are still debating the boundaries and limitations of the concept, it brings with it the consequence of lacking legitimacy, as it erodes its normative authority (ibid.). Furthermore, Nicholls (2010) claims that this is a consequence of insufficient empirical evidence. Simultaneously, the lack of a set framework will limit the research agenda, as there is not enough precedence to refer to. This makes it problematic to make comparative studies.
Nicholls (2010) refers to Kuhn (1962) and his theories on history of science. In essence, Kuhn (1962) challenges the then prevailing ideas on science developing by accumulation of research. He instead argued that for science to develop, we need to step away from what he referred to as the practice of ‘normal science’; by allowing traditional ideas to be challenged and being open to scientific revolutions. Development of scientific theory, and thus establishing of paradigms should rather paradigm-driven. The benefit of paradigmatic development is, according to Kuhn (1962), that it will be subjected to questioning and resistance, which means that a paradigm that manages to establish successfully will have better liquidity. In turn, this can provide status, organizational legitimacy and so also access to resources - which is a common challenge for many third sector actors (Nicholls 2010: 614).

As the paradigm of social entrepreneurship has not yet reached a level of being challenged or revolutionised, there is no set paradigm for how it needs to be understood; leaving it in a pre-paradigmatic-state. There are three effects that should be noted in relation to this paradigmatic development; 1. The pre-paradigmatic status of a field allows resource-rich actors to leverage power over the legitimating processes that characterize progress toward institutionalization. 2. Such actors enact these processes by aligning the key discourses and norms of the field with their own internal logics of action as part of a process of reflexive self-legitimation. 3. There are significant implications of this process for other field actors who lack power or dominance (ibid.).

In the case of social entrepreneurship there can, however, be discerned some patterns of institutionalization. The patterns are expressed in the discourse, the narrative logic and the ideal type of institutionalization. The direction of institutionalization that becomes generally accepted, will be the foundation of the future social entrepreneurial paradigm. These patterns of institutionalizations, or ‘logics’, are exploited by dominant actors to shape the development of the field in a manner which will suit their own character:

“social entrepreneurship is an institutional space in terms of legitimating strategies of key actors who are driving the processes of paradigm building [...] this activity reflects a competition for institutional control and paradigmatic dominance” (ibid.: 612)

Nicholls (2010) discerns two main competing narratives (logics) within social entrepreneurship, attempting to establish the paradigmatic state of social entrepreneurship: the ‘hero’ logic and the ‘social change’ logic. The following sections will describe these two logics in more depth, as well provide a framework for how discourse is used as a strategy to legitimise one and not the other: reflexive isomorphism.

2.2.2 Reflexive isomorphism

In Nicholls’ (2010) article, organizational legitimacy is treated as the result of the interaction between “macro-level institutional structures and micro-level institutional actors” (ibid.: 614). Focusing on the latter, the main line of argument is that these actors are applying a strategy of ‘reflexive isomorphism’ to engage in processes of legitimacy, i.e. legitimating their kind of
social entrepreneurship, by manipulating the general discourse (Phillips, Lawrence and Hardy 2004). The term ‘isomorphism’ is used in sociology to refer to different actors performing similar actions, by using similar models or develop similar structures, either as a result of resembling circumstances or one imitating the other. ‘Reflexive’ refers to the reflexive interplay between previously mentioned macro-structures and micro-actors. It seems especially applicable to social entrepreneurship, as the dynamics take place in a closed system, with little interaction (Nicholls 2010: 616). Hence, actors in the field of social entrepreneurship consciously “engage in processes that align field-level and internal logics to shape emergent institutional fields as closed systems of self-legitimation” (ibid.: 617). It is groups of actors that can be considered dominant, i.e. possess sufficient resources and hence power, that support the social entrepreneurs in their respective narratives. There are four key-groups of actors that are considered to active in the building of a socio-entrepreneurial paradigm:

1. The government, who has the aim of delivering public services, and by involving social entrepreneurs can maximize efficiency, responsiveness and sustainability.

2. Foundations, which financially support SEs, who strive to mobilize resources to create a change. The purpose of influencing the discourse in this case is to maximise their return on investment.

3. Fellowship organizations, which hope to build social capital, and therefore their logic of reflexive isomorphism, i.e. influencing the discourse to maximise their leverage effects.

4. Finally, the pure network organisations are dedicated to building the community voice, and hence strive to maximise engagement and empowerment.

Collectively, these paradigm-building actors have been highly influential in establishing the discourses, narratives, and ideal types that characterize the early-stage development of social entrepreneurship (ibid.: 618). Each of these sets of actors promote different discourse to achieve their respective aims, or logics, which will be describe in the following section.

2.2.3 The two main narratives in social entrepreneurship

Discourse analysis is a relevant tool to investigate the processes of reflexive isomorphism since textual material tends to be central to the establishing and developing legitimacy. This is because the common way to develop new fields of research is to refer to other more widely accepted texts. As previously mentioned, there are two main discourses, or rather clusters of discourses that can be discerned. They are most clearly explained by compiling the results of a discourse analysis; i.e. categories of keywords that are either characteristic of the qualities, features of actions, or normative judgments on nature (ibid.: 621).

The hero-narrative presents social entrepreneurs as central, ambitious and innovative actors, who acts with focus on generating measurable results, using a business-like approach and is prone to be exposed to certain levels of risk. The hero entrepreneurs are often the favoured investment for foundations and fellowship organizations, since they have expectations on a return on their investments. Hence the link to commercial entrepreneurship is much closer, which makes it more suitable for traditional commercialization - as there is something concrete
to promote. Moreover, it corresponds with the reflexive isomorphism perspective; as the entrepreneurs use their hero narrative and their progress to achieve legitimacy. The endorsement from various investors makes the ‘hero entrepreneurs’ relatively influential within their field and the “reflexive isomorphism here aims to shape social entrepreneurship as a tightly interconnected elite that shares models and learning within controlled boundaries” (ibid.: 622). All these factors combined adds up to a much greater focus on achieving results, and from the investors point of view - maximising the return. The cynic would argue that these entrepreneurs adopt the epithet ‘social’ merely as a badge of honour, to be eligible for or attract different kinds of investments. Assuming that to be true, it would suggest that their main focus is not creating social impact, but rather being an entrepreneur with certain social objectives (ibid.: 623).

The social change-narrative is roughly the opposite; it is an actor with a focus creating social value or impact, and chose to do so by adopting an entrepreneurial model, i.e. be exposed to some sort of financial risk, being affected by market dynamics or have hybrid-financing scheme (as presented in previous sections). Keywords to describe a social entrepreneur from a social change narrative is localism and bottom-up initiatives, and the legitimacy is established by the community participating, and initiatives are thus more anchored in the community. These types of social entrepreneurs are more similar to the typical characteristics of a third sector-actor; unlike the hero-narrative which promotes single individuals and models, there is instead greater focus on giving back and creating social justice in the community. The reflexive isomorphism-aspect in this case is supposedly the cognitive legitimacy, similar to that of the third sector, but social entrepreneurs are more targeted on offering products or services. They are relatively weaker than the typical hero entrepreneur as they are not as attractive of a subject for investment, since the expected return in not as large. Having less resources to propagate their cause, their influence in shaping the paradigm is also weaker. According to Nicholls (2010: 624), the social change-actors have two choices; either adapt to their stronger ‘opponents’ or they can construct methods to counter the unwanted developments. It is a sort of a struggle of traditional not-for-profit logics against a new wave of business-driven and business-supported discourses characterized as ‘philanthrocapitalism’.

To conclude there seems to be two main tendencies in the paradigmatic development of social entrepreneurship; 1. A few actors are involved in shaping the paradigm, so it suits their narrative, and hence interests, and 2. Who has most resources is also the most influential in shaping the paradigm. From what is indicated in Nicholls’ (2010) article it seems as the hero-narrative is more successful in attracting resources.

To clarify, the theoretical perspectives presented in this subchapter will not be applied in the analysis in an attempt to categorize Stadsbruk as promoting either the hero or the social change narrative. It is rather to add theoretical perspectives to Stadsbruk’s expressed ambitions and objectives.
2.3 Spatial approach

The understanding of space is important, as it affects how we understand and relate to the people around us, our society, even the world. Space will come to influence processes of development, and the concept of place (this will be further explained below), which is especially relevant in the case of Stadsbruk as in their quest for land they claim to make a contribution by changing space to place (placemaking). Furthermore, the concepts presented in this third and final section of the chapter are also tools intended to be applied when considering the third research question: What is the role of a social entrepreneur, and how is this role positioned in the urban context of space and power?

2.4.1 The concept of ‘space’

The concept of space has previously been either thought of in a too narrow of a sense, or by many not reflected on very thoroughly at all. For instance, there seems to be a global expectation for all countries, areas, regions etc. to pass through certain levels of development. Massey (2005: 9) argues that this linear narrative is far too simplified, it is like suggesting that “geography is merely history, and space is merely a matter of time”. Furthermore, this approach is evidence of one geographical imagination dominating - namely the western one. This is because the expected development is based on the already ‘developed’ part of the world. It rejects the possibility that different places in the world will develop their unique trajectories of development, affected by local preconditions, circumstances and other forces or processes of influence (ibid.: 5). In addition, it would be reasonable to assume that ‘less developed’ places would be influenced by others’ prior development. For example; most introduced to telephony today will most likely not opt for a home phone, as the technology for mobile is available, and the infrastructure is more accessible.

One of the pervading points of discussion in Massey’s ‘For space’ (2005) is the binary conceptualisation of space and place (as mentioned above); previously there has been a limited definition of place as being the ‘here and now’, the concrete, the local, charged with meaning and potential. Space on the other hand is treated as the antonym; it is somewhere else, anonymous, abstract and then suggestively meaningless? It is highly problematic to apply ‘concrete’ as a term describing the local, the place, while space is supposed to be abstract. The global space is just as concrete as the local place and, according to Massey (2005: 185), should be considered from a relational perspective, as it is the total of one’s relations and linkages that makes the place. Also, if space is treated as abstract and distant, it reflects a sense of self-importance and lack of appreciation of that which is not obviously relatable; we prioritise place

---

2 Geographical imagination: is a way of thinking about the world and considering the relative importance of places and the relationships between “our” places and “other” places. The term encompasses a variety of meanings, including individual mental images and socially produced discourses about cultures, spaces, and differences. How people see the world is influenced by many factors, including social class, education, and personal and political philosophies. The particular moments in history in which people live also play a major role in how they view the world around them (Gilley 2010).
over space, and the closer we are in proximity, the greater is the responsibility. This goes hand in hand with those who claim that society (especially the western one) is at a high point of individualist liberalism (ibid.: 6).

Massey (2005: 12) argues that the understanding of space as a concept needs rather to be ‘uprooted’ from being embedded in a state of equilibrium, and should be given a more relational, versatile and open meaning, as it does contain loose ends and missing links. She lists three propositions of how ‘space’ should be re-conceptualised: 1. A space is the result of interrelations, created by synergies, from global to detail scale, 2. Space can contain a plurality of identities, where diverse processes and trajectories of development coexist, and 3. Space cannot be thought of as a static notion or finished, as it is never still. So, every spec of time will affect the development of space, as it is not enclosed from any other space or place, and there is not finite border separating it (ibid.: 10f). As space is constantly affected and shaped by the influence of time, it is simultaneously inherently also linked to the conceptualisation of time, or as Massey (2005: 47) phrases it; “imagining one in a particular way should, at least ‘logically’, imply a particular way of thinking about the others”. With this she suggests that space and time are intrinsic on a conceptual level, though not ‘the same’.

Like the antonymic conceptualisation of space/place, space was also put in opposition to time; a consequence of a strong structuralist presence in social theoretic and philosophical debates throughout the twentieth century. According to Massey (2005), this stance is problematic, as the structuralist approach contested the dominance of the narrative, and neglected incorporating geography as a part of history. Geography was instead to be considered as independent structures, consistent with each society. She summarises it as: “instead of narrative, structure; instead of diachrony, synchrony; instead of time, space” (ibid.: 37). This re-conceptualisation which was attempted, in pursuing to evade the dominance of the narrative (associated with primitive, uncivilised approaches), caused it to become synonymous with the temporal (Massey 2005 & 2009 deems it a misreading). By disregarding temporality, a-temporal structures were likened with space; “the reason that these analytical structures are dubbed as spatial is precisely that they are established as a-temporal, as the opposite of temporality and therefore without time, and therefore space” (Massey 2005: 38). Ergo, the structuralists left a legacy of an abstract understanding of the concept of space. With this followed space being regarded as the antithesis of time. This also emphasises the point made in the initial section; that our understanding of space will affect how it is treated.

2.4.2 Space in relation to power
Massey (2005 & 2009) also reflects on the power perspectives of spatiality, as they are closely connected. As mentioned above, the concept of space is inherently relational; locality and place will inevitably form and affect the identity, its politics and struggles of power. One can quite easily map clusters and scarcities of power. It includes violence, dominance, creativity, rights, or lack thereof, etc. It is found in spheres of politics, economy and culture. It can be found from a global to a local level. The neoliberal globalisation which has been ongoing for decades, has been a prominent force in connecting places, manifesting the mentioned relationality, and so “subordinating some to the powers of others” (Massey 2009: 16). It can be viewed from both
sides; there are matters of power in geography, since space is imbued with power. There is also geography in power, as there is undoubtedly a spatial dimension of power. Massey (2009: 19) even states that it is “not a geography of power, but more so a geography of power-relations”. The author proposes a concept of ‘power-geometry’, in order to compile this two-sided definition. It is a concept used to analyse the democratic order and perhaps inequalities in society. In each of the spheres mentioned above (political, economic and cultural), a different power-geometry can be discerned. However, each of them is, of course, related and probably reinforce the others. By adopting this relational perspective, it will become clear that the relational aspects do not exist in or between set units, but are rather entities composed by these relations. Furthermore, the relation between these entities also need to be considered from a wider perspective, taking into account the relations of power within which they are set (ibid.: 21).

Focusing on the power-geometry in the political sphere it can, in more concrete terms, be interpreted as socio-political processes. This is because power-geometry is a product of relations and relations are social processes (ibid.: 22). It can refer to specific figures holding power, how it is distributed, how it is exercised, onto whom, socio-political context and pressures or tensions caused by it. Again, the concept of power-geometry was initially applied as a tool of criticism, in an attempt to highlight and thereby counter democratic inequalities. It can also be used as lens through which one can observe struggles or tension of a place, the right to or lack of land, and who determines what it should be or become (Massey 2009).

In conclusion, all places must be understood as relational to the general space, the influences, the processes, the meaning, the representation etc. Space need to be treated in a way that encompasses; what we have been (society), what we are, and what we will be (Massey 2005: 180). In doing so perspectives of power-geometry also need to be taken into consideration, since power is an integral factor in the equation of understanding space. Any actor, private, public or third sector, are situated and influenced by structures of power. This is of course then influenced by and influences the city, the region, and even on a global scale. This framework presented in this chapter will be further applied to the case in chapter 5.
3. Methodology

The theoretical framework presented above is intended to be applied to the case of Stadsbruk; acting as a social entrepreneur, trying to promote themselves as a business, as well as urban farming as tool to create social impact. The following chapter is an attempt to position myself as a researcher in relation to, as well as explaining my scientific approach to the subject matter. First and foremost, I would like to clarify that, as for most researchers in the field of social science, every case and scope of research is inherently context-dependent. This means that it is highly problematic to completely integrate one’s research to perfectly fit one tradition, approach or methodology. Rather, as a researcher I consider myself as inspired by different ideas or principles, in order to provide my research a more reflective character, while simultaneously emphasising the importance of empirical data (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2017: 24).

3.1 Research approach

3.1.1 Theory of science

The epistemological approach that best complement my understanding of the theory knowledge is social constructivism. Social constructivism has its roots in the phenomenological fields, but is also related to postmodernism, because it has been argued to have been an important motor for the postmodern movement (ibid.: 30). Scholars key to the development of social constructivism refer to ideas of, among others, Marx and Nietzsche; who question whether pure, rational objective knowledge actually exists. Instead these scholars argue that knowledge is created through human processes, and carries connotations of ideology, interest or power (ibid.: 41). So, advocates of this field argue that we in fact create a social order or models, using our perception and experience to understand and explain knowledge. These constructions are then embodied, conveyed and developed through the use of language. It is important to note that this process of construction is infinite and constantly ongoing (ibid.: 44).

Much of the criticism to social constructivism stem from the misconception that all social constructionists deny the existence of an objective reality. As in so many other instances in academia, politics etc., the extremes are often criticised for not having a nuanced view. The relative social constructionists, on the other hand, consider our knowledge and understanding of the world as a combination between the objective reality and the social constructions we have created as tools to understand it. This is the position I consider to be most like my own.

The reasons why I see this approach suitable for my research are: the emphasis on the meaning and effects of language, since discourse analysis is a key analytical tool in this thesis. Also, the chosen approach acknowledges the difficulty in striving for objective answers, which makes sense as the research questions of this study are phrased in a manner that requires nuance, interpretation and subjective input (ibid.).
3.1.2 Prior familiarity
During the fall semester of 2017 I had the opportunity to do a research internship as an elective course. The research project was a collaboration between Malmö university, the Environmental department, the Streets and Parks department, the Property department and city district North (all in Malmö), where the overarching aim was to create a better organisational structure of urban farming in Malmö. It was called ‘Malmö växer’. My contribution to the project was a report, exploring the applicability of SROI (a model measuring social values) and what kind of knowledge such an analysis could generate. During my internship I came across the concept of social entrepreneurship, or more specifically Stadsbruk as commercial actor within the urban farming community.

3.1.3 White architects and Stadsbruk collaboration
White architects are one of the stakeholders in the Stadsbruk project (actually the only other private stakeholder, except Stadsbruk). Until recently they have merely held a passive role, partaking in workshops, meetings and some events, but it has now been agreed that White architects’ active contribution to the project will be a form of handbook to city administrations in why and how methods of Stadsbruk should be applied. It is important to note that both parties have an incentive in participating in this collaboration; Stadsbruk receive well-produced material that will hopefully come to influence the public sector to being responsive to their methods and services, and White architects will develop their competence on issues revolving urban farming.

My contribution to this collaboration has been to conduct and transcribe the interviews with the city administrations’ representatives of the project, on White architects’ behalf. This has also been a benefit in this study, as it has given me access to the representatives in the city administration. I have thus been able acquire empirical material, via the interviews with them, about the relationship between Stadsbruk and the public sector.

3.2 Methods of data collection

3.2.1 Qualitative approach
In line with my research approach, the empirical material included in this study is qualitative data in the form of semi-structured interviews and an overview of relevant literature of social entrepreneurship, supported by relevant context. A key difference between the quantitative and the qualitative methods is that the latter takes its starts with the subjects’ perspective, while the former to a greater degree focus on the researcher’s ideas about what dimensions and categories should be considered central. This also means that a qualitative approach requires the researcher to acknowledge his or her position in relation to the research subject, and understand how it can affect the research (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2017: 17). In addition, this study is entirely based on one case study of a social entrepreneur. So instead of gathering larger samples of the data, the use of qualitative data is better suited since it allows me to investigate the unique relationships, actions and meanings of this particular case. In addition, the ambition is to not
only gather evidence of concrete events and behaviour, but also understand more abstract positions, process and meaning, which is problematic to find using quantitative data (Maxwell 2005: 22).

3.2.2 Case study

So, it was the case of Stadsbruk that introduced me to social entrepreneurship, and not the other way around. The choice of conducting a case study then seemed quite given. Case study as a method can be defined as “an intensive analysis of an individual unit (a person or community) stressing developmental factors in relation to environment” (Merriam-Webster 2009), which fits quite well in with how I have chosen to approach case of Stadsbruk; both as an actor, their vision and how they relate to other actors. Inevitably, since the researcher is bound to focus on one specific case when conducting a case study, he or she will have to adapt the choices of data collection and analysis to suit the case chosen - naturally in combination with the research design.

Moreover, there are quite a few misconceptions about what a case study is, what it is used for, and what conclusions can be drawn from a case study. Flyvbjerg (2011: 302) outline these as;

“1. General, theoretical knowledge is more valuable than concrete case knowledge, 2. One cannot generalize on the basis of an individual case; therefore, the case study cannot contribute to scientific development, 3. The case study is most powerful for generating hypothesis […], 4. The case study contains a bias toward verification […], 5. It is often difficult to summarize and develop general proposition and theories on the basis of specific case studies”.

The point mentioned that is most relevant to note in relation to this study is the first, and by extension the fifth; since knowledge generated by a specific case can be as valuable as more general, theoretical knowledge, I have no ambition in trying to create or gather general knowledge. The intention of this thesis is rather to contribute by suggesting how a socio-entrepreneurial actor like Stadsbruk can act, not will act. I believe this to be an important contribution as the field of social entrepreneurship is still quite unexplored, and more empirical data is useful to improve the knowledge on the concept and the ‘reality’ of social entrepreneurs.

3.2.3 Semi-structured interviews

Seven interviews were conducted in total; six with civil servants acting as the project leader for Stadsbruk within the city administration of their respective city. The cities are Gothenburg (Martin Berg), Malmö (Stefan Mattsson), Växjö (Sofia Asplund), Lund (Janine Österman), Landskrona (Almir Hodzic) and Lerum (Andreas Benkel). They are the respondents connected to the previously mentioned collaboration with White architects and Stadsbruk. White architects designed an interview guide, to which I added a few questions relevant to my research. The results of the interviews relevant to White architects are meant to be included in the handbook they are producing together with Stadsbruk. The material is intended to demonstrate different cities’ experiences of applying the Stadsbruk model.
The respondents were approached via email, where they were requested to partake in a phone interview, which lasted between 20 to 60 minutes. Moreover, they were sent the questions beforehand to allow them a chance to prepare, and hopefully make them more at ease. The exceptions were Janine Österman in Lund, Almir Hodzic in Landskrona and Andreas Benkel in Lerum, who did not receive the questions beforehand, as Lund is only a member of the network, and Landskrona and Lerum are considering or are just about to start cooperating with Stadsbruk. Therefore, too many of the questions in the interview guide provided by White architects were not applicable. This was made clear to all three respondents. Even though the interview guide was greatly the same for the interviews, the respondents were allowed to speak more freely during the interview, in order to let them describe their experiences in their own words. This was also done in order to minimise the bias of the researcher, avoiding to ask leading questions etc. The consequence of this method is that even though roughly the same questions were answered, they were treated slightly differently. However, it is still the most sensible choice of method, since the circumstances for and setup of Stadsbruk differ between the cities, and thus the questions vary in applicability.

One interview was also conducted with Stadsbruk’s project manager, Cyrille Gaubert. This interview was only done for the purpose of this thesis. The set-up of that interview was somewhat different than the process described above; an interview guide was prepared specifically for the interview. The interview was done face-to-face in his office, where I have met with him before.

All interviews were recorded, and then transcribed by me. The respondents have all agreed to being recorded and have been informed of what the material is intended for. Before forwarding it however, the respondents interviewed as part of the collaboration with White architects and Stadsbruk, were sent their respective interviews in writing for approval, in order to avoid misrepresentations of the respondents. Cyrille Gaubert was also sent the interview in writing, but the material was then not shared with White architects.

3.2.4 Literature study
In order to treat the first research question, which deals with the conceptual understanding of social entrepreneurship, an outline of the established theoretical structure provided by scholars and researchers was required. Therefore, a study of the existing body of research and literature on social entrepreneurship was conducted. The most part of this study is presented in the theoretical chapter (chapter 2), however the theoretical and conceptual material will also be applied as tools to analyse the empirical material in chapter 5. The references and literary sources included in the study are carefully selected to provide a nuanced but still wide overview of the topic. A great attempt has been made to include much of the original sources, and less on the interpretation of the original sources, as it allows me as a researcher to make my own interpretation and certify the accuracy (Denscombe 2011).
3.3. Treatment of data: Discourse analysis

The approach to interpreting the material, both the literature and the interviews, is inspired by discourse analysis. Discourse analysis can be applied in different ways, and the one chosen refers more to the general interpretation of the material, and less the specific method. It is a suitable approach, considering my epistemological position highlighting the importance of language; how it is both constructed and constructive. It also ties well to Nicholls’s (2010) theories on reflexive isomorphism and narratives, as the discourse is a central element of such an analysis.

3.4 Limitations

As for all researchers, the largest limitation for my study is time. There is possibly no end to the topics, approaches and nooks that could be investigated, previous research that could be read and empirical material that could be collected. Even though there is always room for improvement, I feel I have covered the areas I find to be most relevant to my scope. Another limitation that I am most likely also not alone in encountering is the volume of produced text - the academic form puts a limit to the number of words allowed. One could claim that if you need to include everything, do you really know what is relevant? Or, if you need too many words to express it, do you know what you want to say? Maybe both of these claims are true. But, in this study a great deal of theory has seemed necessary, as social entrepreneurship is a concept that is fairly unfamiliar to most (at least an in-depth understanding of it) and it is still quite unsettled in its research paradigm.

The following limitations are more like clarifications of what I have decided to not engage in, as I have deemed it less relevant to the topic chosen. First of all, even though the interviews with the civil servants of the respective city administrations have been done in cooperation with Stadsbruk, I have also inquired about how they understand of Stadsbruk as an actor, and how Stadsbruk has influenced them in their work. This is relevant to both research question 2 and 3. I have thus chosen to not contact representatives of the municipal council (the political level) as they, to my knowledge, have had no or little interaction with Stadsbruk. If there has been contact, I feel certain it is sparser than with the civil servants who have actually worked with Stadsbruk. Second of all, the question of the farmers has come up several times. They are also potential social entrepreneurs, but not the case chosen, and on a much smaller level than Stadsbruk. Moreover, as previously mentioned; each individual farmer seems to have little direct contact with the public sector - probably as this would not be manageable. This makes this segment of social entrepreneurs less relevant to consider in relation to the public sector, a relationship which I find interesting and significant. Third of all, as described in section 3.2.2, this study is of one specific case, and the aim is not to make any kind of comparison, or collect any form of quantitative data by including other social entrepreneurs. That could very well be interesting and a useful contribution to the field of research, but is not within the scope of this study. The final limitation I would like for the reader to be informed of is that of social impact;
i.e. what kind of specific social impact Stadsbruk creates, who it affects and to what extent, has not been the focus of this study. The scope has rather been to study the ambitions, if and how Stadsbruk can be considered a social entrepreneur, their role in the larger structure (especially in relation to the public sector), and what this is an indication of.
4. Background

This chapter is meant to provide the reader with a contextual understanding of the case of Stadsbruk and as well as urban farming on a more general scale.

4.1 Urban farming

As mentioned in the methodology, my choice of topic for this thesis was influenced by a research report I wrote a few months ago, during my research internship with the project group of Malmö växer. In this report I included an extensive chapter explaining urban farming as concept, what it entails, as well as a selected description of the context. The following section is to a large extent inspired by that chapter and describes what urban farming is on a more general level.

In the most basic of definitions, urban farming is exactly what one would expect, i.e. cultivation of crop etc. within a city or urban area. It includes all kinds of forms and versions of cultivation, such as horticulture, aquaponics, vertical farming, animal husbandry, beekeeping, agroforestry etc.

It would be directly incorrect to argue that urban farming as a general activity is a particularly new, since there are examples as old as civilization. It is also not an interest of the few, as urban farming also includes parks, private gardens, allotment gardens etc., which is a popular leisure activity for those who have the opportunity. I do argue though, that what has changed is that there is currently a strong trend in finding new, innovative forms and procedures of urban farming. The surge in interest is quite indicative of the green evolution that has been taking place for the last few decades, where sustainability and ecological awareness will be significative of our fraction of history. Moreover, this increased interest in urban farming can also be understood as a reaction to the global issue of urban sprawl largely caused by urbanization, i.e. previously fertile farmland in close proximity to urban areas is “swallowed” by the city, as it expands to house the often strong influx of people (Deelstra and Girardet 2001:43f).

Urban farming also involves ecological benefits; by opening up for urban farming, a greater space for ecology is created in urban areas. Examples of factors that it can contribute to or improve are a better balance between CO2 and O2 and on a larger scale counter air pollution, water management, nutrient recycling and soil conservation, capture dust and fumes, work as sound buffer, etc. On a social level, it is generally believed that by being close to nature one increases his or her levels of wellbeing. Urban farming can create meeting places or nodes of connectivity for a neighbourhood, and provide a sense of fellowship. Also, it is optimising the use of land in a city as, even though land values are usually higher in urban areas, there are always some vacant plots of land. Urban farming can be used as a tool to enhance, the otherwise possibly lacking sense of safety in these areas. The aesthetic point is often emphasised;
however, this is not a certainty. I have personally seen many examples where farms look a bit scruffy, messy and aesthetically displeasing. Finally, several studies and cases indicate that engaging in farming or gardening seem to positive psychosocial effects.

Commercial urban farming is a growing branch of business, and is thus creating positive economic effects. This will be explored in more depth in the next section. Do note the reading between urban farming and *commercial* urban farming; the former include gardens, allotments, parks, farming associations etc., while the latter refer to urban farming being made into a business, i.e. there is some sort of exchange of goods or services in return for money. Within commercial urban farming there is usually some sort of plan or business strategy, and it is associated with some sort of profit, whether it is a wage or re-investment in the organisation.

4.1.1 Urban farming as social enterprise

The information presented in the following section is a combination of what I consider to be general knowledge and knowledge gathered from meetings, interviews etc. with people part of the urban farming community.

Effects of industrialisation, globalisation and an increasingly capitalist society has contributed to food provision having grown from self-sufficient level, to huge industrial levels. Most of us growing up in the 80s, 90s and later have very little understanding and relation to where our food comes from. Urban farming can be used to counter this. It is more than merely cultivation of food, it is also a way to spread knowledge and understanding of what it is to grow vegetables and the work it entails. This field is relatively unexplored, and is therefore a possible business opportunity for social entrepreneurs. The social aspects are then production and spreading of knowledge, promotion of a more environmentally aware and sustainable approach to food, and the production of it, both physical and psychological health, creating points of attraction and meeting places, etc.

The consumers who are willing and can pay extra for their food to be grown locally, because it is often a bit more expensive than in the supermarket, claim that their choices are more than a mere exchange of good for money; many see it as an investment in sustainability and even a lifestyle choice. Moreover, these customers tend to express a higher level of engagement, both in terms of paying more, but also making an effort of pre-ordering goods, creating relationships with the farmers, travelling further to retrieve their goods and acting as ambassadors for their local farmers. Commercial farmers depend on a more devoted circle of customers; a smaller company need some security; relying on most of their produce will be sold, and when it comes to fresh vegetables etc. it is only good for a shorter period of time.

Another important point to note is that a large proportion of the money made in urban farming is not from the produce; it is from other services and activities related to the business, like workshops and other forms of additional value. As described in the theoretical chapter on social entrepreneurship these kinds of activities are often sustained by different forms of hybrid financing, which in the case of urban farming could include sell of produce, either to private
individuals or local restaurants, projects with schools, workshops for companies, study visits by public representatives; Swedish or international, etc.

To conclude; both customers and entrepreneurs have chosen their particular setup because they feel it contributes with more than a direct benefit to themselves, it has a greater, social impact. Many of the farmers for instance make it no secret that running an urban farm is not necessarily a very lucrative business, and it involves a lot of hard work and personal risk.

4.2 Stadsbruk

Stadsbruk is an independent actor with social objectives, and an innovation project. They are an incubator for green entrepreneurship in an urban setting. The project is owned by Xenofilia, an enterprise focused on social sustainability and diversity. It was started in 2008 by Lena Friblick, a swedish journalist. Stadsbruk as a project is running from May 2014 to November 2018, and is funded by the national innovation authority Vinnova, and is currently in the third stage of challenge-drive innovation process. The cities of Växjö, Gothenburg and Malmö are co-applicants in the project, and thus receive 25% of their investment in return from the Vinnova budget, for a certain number of hours. The city administrations also contribute with money from their own budget to support the project, however it is difficult to differentiate between the money invested in Stadsbruk efforts and other urban farming-efforts, since these are often connected. Other stakeholders include SLU, the city of Kristianstad, Hushållningssällskapet, Skånes Livsmedelsakademi, Judiska förskolan i Malmö, LRF Skåne, the national board of agriculture, the local congregation of Västra Skrävlinge (where the headquarters of Botildenborg and Stadsbruk in Malmö), and the society for conservation of Nature etc. (Stadsbruk 2016:3).

4.2.1 Activities and objectives

Stadsbruk’s objective is to use urban farming as a tool to create sustainable and attractive cities. During the course project Stadsbruk has mainly cooperated with the city administrations Malmö, Gothenburg and Växjö, and ‘testbeds’ have been set up in the all cities. By creating a platform for green entrepreneurship, it activates otherwise not used urban areas, it creates opportunities for new entrepreneurs, builds and spreads knowledge on local food production and strengthens the ecological diversity. Organisationally it is structured in three work packages; 1. Green Magic, 2. Green Inc. and 3. Green Future. The first is a network and a platform for interested stakeholders, where they meet regularly to share ideas. This package also includes the farming activities in different cities. The second is the development of a new model for incubation, which is operationalised in Malmö, Gothenburg and Växjö (i.e. the testbeds). The focus is financially sustainable urban farming. The third package, Green Future, is a think tank, where the challenges of the project are treated and viewed from a strategic perspective. The result is meant to be shared nationally and internationally.
A more practical description of the setup: the arrangement differs depending on the city. For example, in Malmö the farmers need to set up a business before they are eligible candidates for renting land, and hence taking part of the incubator activities. In addition, the entrepreneurs are not renting their land directly from the city, but Stadsbruk acts as the middleman. In Gothenburg on the other hand, it is different: the farmers do not have to register a business before they get involved, and the Gothenburg-branch of Stadsbruk is not directly involved in the leasing-agreements of land.

Within Green Magic there are three different scopes or levels in which the farmers can farm: 1. Urban 2. Soil 3. Countryside. The first covers urban spaces, where the setup is on a more short-term basis. Much of the cultivation is done in mobile and/or temporary construction (i.e. rarely in the ground), as the land itself might not be arable. The second level involves land within the urban border. On this scale, slightly larger investments are justified, as the tenant-agreements stretches over longer periods of time. These areas are of at least 1 hectare. The final level is as the name suggests refers to land located on what can be considered peri-urban areas, which in some cases is actually even already dedicated as farmland in the municipal master plan. The countryside-scale investments are even larger, as agreements are, in terms of urban planning, long term. These areas are of 5 hectares or more (Stadsbruk 2016).

4.2.2 Vinnova

Vinnova is the Swedish national authority for innovation, and their task is to contribute to sustainable growth by improving the conditions for innovation. This is done by funding innovation projects and other research necessary to develop solutions and creating a good foundation for research and innovation. One of the modes of realising these aims is by stimulating and promoting cooperation between the private- and the public sector, educational institutions and other stakeholder, both internationally and on a more national level. Every year around 3 billion Swedish crowns is invested in projects, research and activities promoting sustainability and innovation. Organisationally it belongs to the Swedish department for Enterprise and Innovation, and are also the national authority within the EU programme for research and innovation (Tell 2018). Vinnova has invested 6 557 000 SEK in the Stadsbruk project (Vinnova 2016).
5. Empirical data and analysis

The following chapter is structured in a manner slightly different from the traditional academic form; the empirical material is presented concurrently with the analytical perspectives. There are several reasons for this structure; the main one being that the nature of the material and the method of collection is inherently biased, both from the respondents’ and the researcher’s point of view. The reasons given is in no way meant as an excuse to not maintain a scientifically sound approach to the research, it is merely an attempt to be transparent. So, the theoretical framework provided in the second chapter will be applied to the empirical material as it is presented. Great effort is made to avoid speculation, misrepresentation or in any other way mislead the reader. The chapter is structured in two different sections; the first treating three themes relating Stadsbruk, their role and their approach. The second section considers themes relating to the public sector, i.e. the city administrations, their relation to urban farming and to Stadsbruk.

5.1 Stadsbruk

This first section out three is primarily based on the interview made with the project manager Cyrille Gaubert. During the interview we treated topics relating to Stadsbruk’s intentions and ambitions, their view on their role as a social entrepreneur and how they experience their relationship to the city administrations. The purpose is to apply some of the theoretical perspectives presented in chapter 2, to Stadsbruk as a case and in the role of a potential social entrepreneur.

5.1.1 Stadsbruk as a social entrepreneur

As mentioned in the section 3.2.2 (case study), I was initially introduced to social entrepreneurship via the case of Stadsbruk. During the interview with Gaubert, I asked him if they consider themselves to be a social entrepreneur, and his answer was ‘most definitely’. He even elaborated and how it was a suitable epithet for their activities; “[we try to] create something socially sustainable, interesting but still balance it out and make it economically viable.”

When comparing Stadsbruk’s activities with the indicators of a social entrepreneur listed in section 2.3.2, it seems to correspond quite well. First of all, they supply a form of service, both by the incubator, as a facilitator, with the network and by conducting workshops etc., and are thus directly involved in creating a social impact. Secondly, Stadsbruk can be considered independent, as it was started by Xenofilia before the city administrations were involved and the project application to Vinnova was made, and they are the project owners. Thirdly, from the insight I have acquired through my work, I would deem Stadsbruk to have high levels of participation; those involved seem to have a strong personal engagement in the project, both from the city administrations’ side and Xenofilia’s. The fourth indicator refers to there often being a combination of paid and voluntary work; my knowledge of this matter is unfortunately
limited. However, I expect, for instance, the urban farmers to put in more work than ‘they are paid for’. The fourth indicator is a struggle for funding. According to almost everyone I have spoken to (the exception being the respondent from Gothenburg city administration) this seems to be one of the prime struggles, despite the project having received a large share of the funding from Vinnova. This does not seem to be completely sufficient, and it is not a long term solution, as the funding will terminate in November. The final feature listed is the objective of supporting the community, which Stadsbruk claim to do both by creating opportunities of employment, but also offering meeting places, placemaking, increasing safety etc.

Moreover, the assumption that Stadsbruk’s model is social entrepreneurial suits well in with Defourny and Nyssens’ (2010) conceptual understanding of social entrepreneurship (see section 2.1.5); ‘entrepreneurial dynamics influencing the activities of the third sector’. With their objectives of creating social impact, Stadsbruk is not the typical private actor, nor are they a part of the public sector. This naturally does not automatically qualify them as a third sector actor, but there are other aspects that support this assumption, e.g. their solidaric approach (see section 2.1.3). Since their aim is to develop and facilitate new entrepreneurs, I would also argue that Stadsbruk are infusing, thus influencing, the third sector with entrepreneurial dynamics. In addition, Stadsbruk have adopted a model of hybrid financing, which is typical for so many other social entrepreneurs. As explained in 2.1.6 (Funding) it is a combination of external funding (in this case Vinnova) and generating their own streams of revenue; workshops, membership fees to the network, etc.

Digressing slightly, it is also interesting to consider the second tier of social entrepreneurship, i.e. the commercial urban farming. Most of those seeking support from the incubator, do so to realise their dreams of farming, and being an entrepreneur is simply the way to achieve this. Gaubert claim that there is also so much information and knowledge available on how to farm, so what Stadsbruk contribute with is almost exclusively the mind-set of being a ‘green social entrepreneur’. This entails tools, setting up a business plan and strategy, finding other types of revenue, and creating extra-value for their work.

Since the concept of social entrepreneurship remains quite fluent and fairly vague, it is hard to argue that Stadsbruk should not be considered a social entrepreneur. Moreover, from the framework presented in chapter 2 they seem to fit with most of the indicators. To clarify, the aim of this section has not been to determine whether Stadsbruk is a true social entrepreneur, rather if they are a suitable case that is relevant to consider when attempting to analyse and discuss the concept and the role of social entrepreneurship. This section will be used when referring to the first research question in the discussion (chapter 6).

5.1.2 The balance between social impact and commercial approach
The role of the social entrepreneur can be thought of as an oxymoron; how can the same actor have commercial i.e. capitalist interests, while claiming to have the objective of creating social impact. However, it can also be interpreted as finding a form of balance between the commercial interest and the social impact (this is not to suggest that an actor intentionally
exploits positive social change to make a profit, rather that the two objectives are not countering each other).

When asked if finding this balance requires some sort of compromise in ideals or values, Gaubert answers that most pieces are falling into place now when the project has been running for a while. However, since they are currently project-based, they are dependent on external funding. If this funding is cut and it cannot be found elsewhere, the project is also terminated. What makes it an even more pressing issue, is that the participants in these kinds of projects are emotionally involved and sometimes financially dependent on the outcome, meaning that a termination of a project can have serious consequences on an individual level. Gaubert goes on to say that this is probably true for anyone engaged in social work.

As mentioned in chapter 2, social entrepreneurship has become more and more central as the third sector has expanded. Gaubert believes that this is because social aspects have previously been overlooked by ‘traditional’ entrepreneurs and that a sound approach would be to take environmental, social and economic aspects of sustainability into consideration. Considering the neoliberal backdrop; it has created conditions favouring prioritising the maximising of profit etc., and that is probably the reason why social and environmental aspects have been overlooked for so long. So when an actor like Stadsbruk focus on the social aspects, Gaubert says, they are automatically a ‘social’ entrepreneur. He means that since social aspects can have large economic implications, the social entrepreneurs should be seen as ‘holistic’ or complete, while the traditional type is in reality the ‘economic’ entrepreneur as they are only considering one aspect. This is of course merely a generalisation, since many entrepreneurial actors today also have social and environmental consideration, but I found Gaubert’s reasoning worth to consider.

It is interesting to relate this reasoning to Nicholls’s (2010) ideas on reflexive isomorphism and the narratives promoted by different types of social entrepreneurs, to shape the paradigm so it suits the respective actors’ interests. The author refers to the ‘hero’ narrative and the ‘social change’ narrative. However, the narrative of the ‘holistic’ entrepreneur, could be reflected on as an alternative third narrative. Stadsbruk is merely one actor, which is not representative of the social entrepreneurial community, nor is there any evidence of a larger movement supporting this idea, in the scope of this study. Though, if more and more adopted this view, which is not too far-fetched as there are tendencies suggesting that both single entrepreneurs and larger companies are putting more emphasis on their social and environmental impact, the holistic narrative could become an important influence in the shaping of the paradigm. Not only that of social entrepreneurship but of entrepreneurship at large.

5.1.3 Space and place in relation to power: placemaking
As mentioned in section 2.3, due to Stadsbruk’s inherent dependency on access to land to farm on, aspects of space are of great relevance to this analysis. Urban farming is only one of many contenders competing for access to land. In addition, there are some criteria that need to be fulfilled for the location to viable and sustainable; 1. Even though some of the testbeds are planted in boxed and not in the ground, I get the impression that Stadsbruk prefer to see the city
dedicating some plots of land that are arable for farming (i.e. not covered in concrete or contaminated), 2. Some of the plots of land are preferably relatively centrally located and in close proximity to public transport, so it is accessible, 3. It can be used for urban farming for a period of time, for the investments made to be worthwhile.

However, simultaneously Stadsbruk have created a niche in their quest for land; it is temporarily available (at least for a few years) and is after that intended for other purposes, e.g. real estate development. First of all, this makes the use of land more efficient. Second of all, they believe that the presence of Stadsbruk can have effects of placemaking. This is naturally an attractive offer for many cities, since these kinds of plots are often located in an area of the city where there are not so many other points of attraction.

This line of reasoning relates to Massey’s (2005) conceptualisation of space and place, i.e. that we have made a binary conceptualisation where ‘place’ signifies the here-and-now, the local and familiar, and thus charged with more meaning, while ‘space’ is the opposite; i.e. distant, unfamiliar etc. (see section 2.4.1). One can then argue that Stadsbruk by making use of some plots of land, in some sense, is making space into place - placemaking. They provide people with a reason to go there, and for those who are merely passing by, you give the impression that this is actually a place, where there is activity, people and some sense of life. If one was to adopt Massey’s theory of power-geometry Stadsbruks’ presence, in a previously unused space, would also infuse the area with more, or at least different, sets of power relations. As written in section 2.4.2; place will inevitably affect relations of power, and it can be used as a tool to observe struggles of place. In this instance, it seems as though there is some sort of struggle of space, either because there is a lack of it, or because it has been argued that is an undemocratic use of space, when it is only dedicated to some, and the produce and services are only meant for some. As mentioned in section 4.2, the crop grown by urban farmers are usually more expensive, since it is costlier to produce and the consumers are also paying for the added value. In several of the cities, the residents living in close proximity to the testbeds generally are not considered to belong to the intended socio-economic group of consumers. One the other hand, one could also argue that there are other areas available to everyone, where the socio-economic status is less relevant; parks, farming associations etc. In addition, Stadsbruk is in some sense presented as a work integration effort, mainly targeted at those standing far away from the labour market. Several of the farmers live in the residential areas close by.

What also need to be taken into consideration is that Massey (2005) dismiss this binary conceptualisation, and argue that place should rather be understood as relational to space; the meaning, identity and values connected to a place depends on the perspective of the beholder. Hence, considering Stadsbruk’s use of land will create identity to some, will create meaning to some, and be a contender in the struggle for place for another. In addition, being granted space, and especially certain space, will affect Stadsbruk’s position of power; by being seen and thereby reach more people, being awarded space provides a sense of legitimacy and the possibility to make good examples of the model of social impact that is promoted.
5.2 The city administrations

5.2.1 The political support
As described in the previous chapter, Stadsbruk offer a model and concept of commercial urban farming. Co-applicants in the Vinnova-funded Stadsbruk project; Växjö, Gothenburg and Malmö have also been influential in the molding of said model. They have gathered experience and have been pioneers in the field. Still, the position of Stadsbruk and the setup of the project differ quite a lot between the different cities. Some cities had already established their own commercial farms when they got involved with Stadsbruk, others had non-commercial farms that were then, fully or partially, commercialised with the support of Stadsbruk, and in some cities Stadsbruk aided in building a structure and strategy for urban farming in general. Stadsbruk’s approach, position and possibility of realizing their model of urban farming seems highly dependent on the public policy of the respective city, which is set by the city council, i.e. the political level in the city.

Gothenburg is an interesting example; the policy for urban farming is quite extensive, and include a yearly budget of several million Swedish crowns dedicated to creating conditions for urban farming around the city, both for the public and to spur commercial farming. This policy is based both on ecological consideration and aspects relating to food security. Worth noting is that Gothenburg is a geographically fairly dispersed city, and have relatively much land planned as farmland - preconditions making it suitable to invest in urban farming projects. The Property Management department is primarily responsible for all commercial farming activities - it is a part of their political mission. Some of the civil servants has as their main task to tend to the Stadsbruk project and activities relating to it. Gothenburg is what I interpret as being ‘most successful’ in their efforts (not suggesting that one can objectively compare, as the circumstances are very different for the different cities) - it seems as though this is an effect of the strong political support. Several of the other respondents have indicated that the political support is an important factor, as it makes urban farming a prioritised matter within urban planning. This includes access to land, financial investments and organisation within the city administration. Gaubert suggest that it could be the, that when a certain assignment or matter are not considered a priority on the political agenda, the civil servants are in a sense forced treat it as an ‘extra’ task. This brings us to one of the overarching aims of Stadsbruk; ‘making urban farming part of urban planning’.

5.2.2 Urban farming in relation to planning
I asked Gaubert why the efforts to influence the public sector was mostly directed at the civil servants, and not the city council, when making urban farming a political priority seems so crucial for the local Stadsbruk farms to be successful. The answer was that they are 1. Hoping that the new handbook will, indirectly, also have an influence on a political level, 2. Working with the cities, Stadsbruk are attempting to create and gather good examples that show that their model has the intended effects. These will then be used to demonstrate that it can be done, how it can be done, and that the effects are larger than simply farming.
In some respect, they have made progress; several cities’ visionary plans contain ambitions of urban farming, though it might not be specified in terms that match the Stadsbruk model. What Stadsbruk seem to have achieved in terms of influence thus far is the cities adapting to Stadsbruk’s ways; by adopting a larger strategy to consider different types of farming, in particular commercial farming. Some of the respondents indicate that their city administration has adapted their way of working with both the farmers and the concrete set-up, for example the test beds, the added value, workshops etc.

However, is it counterintuitive to on the one hand argue that they are making use of temporarily available land, while simultaneously lobbying to make urban farming part of urban planning? It might seem obvious that it is to Stadsbruk’s advantage that urban farming is actually treated as an activity that is to be included when planning the future urban development. Though, if the temporality is one of the key aspects, then the equation does not add up. Yet, in the longer time frame it might make more sense, when urban farming is acknowledged as more than a leisure activity.

In addition to this, it is also relevant to consider the location of the farms. It is possible that the more central locations, are established on a more temporary basis, since that set-up is often more mobile, and the investments are often smaller. I would argue that from Stadsbruk’s perspective, also establishing farms on more central locations is key in terms of ‘promotion’ - it makes them visible, provides their activities with elements of urbanity, the produce is close to the consumers etc. Also, if the urban locations were completely taken away, then what makes them urban farmers? Are they not small-scale peri-urban farmers? On the other hand, the value of that set-up should not to be overlooked either; depending on the size of the city, the production of food is local, it does provide opportunities of entrepreneurship, etc.

5.2.3 The stakeholder’s different incentives urban farming
The different stakeholders seem to have different incentives and reasons for joining or working with Stadsbruk; the farmers receive support, knowledge, access to land and platform to grow their business; Stadsbruk get to realise their aims of creating a social impact, and spread their model to more and more cities, and the city administration are offered a strategy to develop urban farm to also include commercial elements.

Gaubert claim that to the cities, farming is a tool, and entrepreneurship is the aim, i.e. to create opportunities for employment, along with factors of health, green spaces etc. Several of the respondents indicated in their interview however, that commercial urban farming is given low priority in their respective cities. I perceive it as not recognised as a serious opportunity for entrepreneurship and thus employment. This is probably because it is still quite rare and therefore does not employ so many, and the city administrations are thus quite unfamiliar with that field of business. The focus seems rather to be on eco-system services and other environmental factors, in addition to providing the citizens with services they are requesting. What I found quite curious was that even if the department of business and industry (Näringslivskontoret) were often engaged in their city’s Stadsbruk-project, it was only to a limited extent; in none of the cities were the Stadsbruk-projects run from that department,
instead they were consulted on some issues. This could be an indicator of commercial urban farming being acknowledged as a business opportunity, but not appreciated as one - at least to same extent as Stadsbruk is presenting it as.

What is interesting, is that according to some of respondents representing cities that are new adopters (the cities that have not been part of the Stadsbruk-project) name the social entrepreneurial aspects as one of their prime incentives. This seems to suggest that Gaubert and the others have been successful in influencing the city administrations to not only value the ecological aspects, but also the opportunities of social entrepreneurship that urban farming can bring. This has been done by creating good examples; as mentioned in the previous section, Gothenburg seems to be a city that inspire. Moreover, Stadsbruk’s function is intended to be temporary; the incubator is meant to support the entrepreneurs in the beginning, to allow a chance to get established before they become completely self-sufficient. The same applies for the support of the city administrations; they want to be a motor, and then withdraw as much as possible. Granted, there probably needs to be some sort of relationship between the farmers and the city also later on, but not in the same capacity. This seems as a sign of the effect of the public sector adopting a NPM approach; i.e. more governance, and less steering - creating a setting in which actors, for good or bad, are independent.
6. Discussion

The following chapter is dedicated to treat the research questions posed in section 1.3, by considering them in the light of the results of the analysis (ch.5). The questions will be treated in the same order as they were posed.

6.1 What makes a social entrepreneur and can Stadsbruk be considered an example of a social entrepreneur? If so, then how?

The intention of the first research question is to provide the reader with contextual understanding of the concept of a social entrepreneurship, what it entails, how it can be applied etc. This is meant to work as a form of foundation for the following two research questions, since without a clear, multifaceted and deeper understanding of the concept, other aspects and reasoning might seem intangible or superficial.

As described in the first sections of chapter 2, the neoliberal backdrop has spurred the development of the third sector, which in turn is the setting of the social entrepreneur. What sets the third sector apart from the public and the private is the conscious intent to contribute to society via voluntary action. To describe what a social entrepreneur is more specifically, I would again like to refer to Cornelius and Wallace’s (2013: 4) definition: “a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and owners” - in a straightforward manner, their definition explains the intent, while also setting it part from more ‘traditional’ entrepreneurs. However, this definition is phrased in a fairly universal manner, as are most of the other attempts to pin down what a social entrepreneur is or is not. In fact, it seems quite difficult and rare to try to determine who is not a social entrepreneur, as long as the actor in question has some claim on making a social impact - a term which in turn also has quite varied application (see 2.1.5 and 5.1.1). What can be derived from the analysis is that an actor needs to balance the commercial interests with a return to society in the form of social impact. What this balance looks like seems to relate quite well with Nicholls’ (2010) ideas on narratives, i.e. is the commercial approach means to an end, or is to maximise return while including or exploiting social efforts?

In section 5.1.1 the theoretical framework of a social entrepreneur was applied to the case of Stadsbruk; the list of indicators by EMES were especially signifying (section 2.1.5). My conclusion from the analysis is that there are several factors supporting the assumption that Stadsbruk can be considered a suitable case for the scope of this research. As previously mentioned, the focus is not whether Stadsbruk are a ‘true’ social entrepreneur. It is rather if it can be considered a relevant case. Tying this to Nicholls (2010) theory on reflexive isomorphism; the project manager, Gaubert’s, description of Stadsbruk’s ambitions seem more similar to those of ‘social change’, than the ‘hero’ entrepreneur: in order to spread their ideas of commercial urban farming, and the social impact it is seemingly associated with, they have
adopted an entrepreneurial approach. Though, if one were to consider the next tier of entrepreneurs, i.e. the urban farmers, their ‘balance’ might look slightly different. I would not suggest that the ambitions of creating social impact are not central to the urban farmers, rather that the urban farmers are to an even greater extent than Stadsbruk dependent on attracting consumers, finding alternative streams of revenue, and other ways to maximise their profit – simply to ‘survive’ as entrepreneurs. Stadsbruk is a larger actor, that has now had a few years of being financially supported by Vinnova, allowing them to get established. Applicants are eligible for funding from Vinnova when they are legally registered as a business. Some of the urban farmers tied to Stadsbruk are registered as businesses, others are not. But the administrative burden of applying and managing such funding is too resource-demanding for many of the smaller enterprises. The urban farmers are instead members of the incubator, and do not receive direct financial support, rather tools that can enable them in their efforts.

In conclusion, how Stadsbruk is creating a social impact is multifaceted, due to their role as a sort of ‘meta’-social entrepreneur: first of all, they are providing the urban farmers included in the incubator with job opportunities, i.e. ideally contributing to society by reducing unemployment, and also marginalisation to some extent as several of the aspiring entrepreneurs are struggling to enter the labour market. Secondly, Stadsbruk are providing their ‘protégées’ with tools to contribute to society; this includes biological diversity, creating points of attraction through their farm, spread knowledge on local food production etc. Thirdly, they are actively attempting to steer the local city administrations, and by extension the local city council, to develop their strategies for urban farming, including but not exclusively commercial urban farming.

6.2 What is the relationship between Stadsbruk, as a social entrepreneur, and the public sector?

As has been illustrated and explained in this thesis, Stadsbruk is an independent actor in relation to the local branch of the public sector, i.e. the city administration. Stadsbruk (as an actor), and the co-applicant city administrations (Växjö, Malmö and Gothenburg) have had slightly different approaches to the project, as their approach is directed by their different ambitions and goals. Like any rational actor, each will act in the way that best tend to their interests.

As an outsider, in this case a form of consultant, Stadsbruk has the advantage of bringing in their own set of tools, their own process and their own structure for establishing the urban farms, while some of the city administrations seem to have a hard time making it fit with their more rigid, and possibly outdated, structure of treating these kinds of matters. When considering Stadsbruk as an example of a social entrepreneur, in relation to the public sector it becomes evident that both parties are dependent on the other granting certain conditions; the public sector need the input of a more flexible system and a more flexible actor to act as the motor when putting the effort into action, while the social entrepreneur is dependent on the public sector for resources; in the case of Stadsbruk the resource of land seems as pressing, if not more, than
financial support. One could then pose the question of whether the public sector is in ‘need’ of a social entrepreneur? Even if they seem to spur innovation and development, it does not necessarily need to be in the form of, for example, a model for commercial urban farming. Stadsbruk on the other hand, are currently limited in financial resources and can therefore not acquire private land. Nor does acquiring land seem to fit their agenda, since their aim is to set up the platform for commercial urban farming, i.e. creating a structure, and then withdraw and pursue other innovative projects and efforts. It is in a sense the spirit of an entrepreneur; always in the process of starting something up.

As indicated above, the different relations of need and dependency are the foundation of relations of power; I would argue that the public sector are in a position of power in relation to the social entrepreneur, i.e. the social entrepreneur is in a sense subordinate the public sector. One can then ask oneself what kind of societal structure this creates? Legitimacy, in terms of trust and high taxation, has been awarded the public sector for them to deliver public services and welfare. Following effects of neoliberalism, there is a tendency towards delegating the responsibility of these services, in exchange for payment. As mentioned in section 2.1.7 the state in Sweden is obliged to give public contracts to the lowest offer, which is often not within reach for a third sector actor like a social entrepreneur. These factors combined leaves the social entrepreneur at a disadvantage, especially compared to private actors; struggling to find funding, possibly forced to lower their charge to be competitive, while also not attempting to maximise profit. There is thus no monetary benefit in combination with a limited position of power; hence the only driving forces and incentives remaining are social impact, and a sense of creativity or innovation. The result of that equation is that; a neoliberalist society giving contracts to social entrepreneurs are to some extent relying on (partially) voluntary action.

Moreover, it is relevant consider the factor of longevity; the public, which has been awarded the responsibility of delivering certain services, is delegating this responsibility to an actor that is driven by the short term process of starting something. Who takes over in the long term then? In the case of Stadsbruk, most of the respondents claim that their city administration has the intention of withdrawing once the set-up of Stadsbruk is up and running. Would that leave the responsibility to another tier of entrepreneurs - the urban farmers? However, one can also pose the question whether these projects necessarily need to be long term? How long of a period is considered to be ‘long’ term? Most of the investment plans for Stadsbruk are between 5-10 years, and some don’t have an expiration date at all.

6.3 What is the role of a social entrepreneur, and how is this role positioned in the urban context of space and power?

The phrasing of the question is not intended to suggest that there is an all-encompassing answer applicable to social entrepreneurs in general. The ‘role’ of a social entrepreneur also seem to suggest some sort of responsibility or function. However, what is more interesting to consider
in the scope of this study, especially in the light of aspects of power and land, is how a social entrepreneur like Stadsbruk are sort of ‘situated’ in the urban structure.

As explored section 5.1.3, in order to realise their ambitions Stadsbruk are in need of land. The need of some sort of resource provided by the public sector is most likely applicable to most social entrepreneurs, since due to the nature of their mission (contributing to society), they are inherently placed in a form of give-and-take relationship to society. For them to be able to ‘give’ something, they are in need of something to ‘work with’ – for example land. In the case of Stadsbruk, access to certain land can be thought of in terms of Nicholls’ (2010) hero narrative; i.e. even if the business ambitions are not prioritised over the social change, a social entrepreneur needs to be ‘seen’, for them to be successful and thus reach their target group. In the urban context this is often equal to centrality, since the level of activity is commonly densest at the core of the city. Stadsbruk are in need of visibility, i.e. central location, because in order to affect the local community they need to be in touch with the local community. ‘Affec’t refers to their contribution of social impact on a larger scale; spreading knowledge of food production, positive externalities of health and wellbeing, etc. Of course, this is also possible to achieve if the Stadsbruk farms were placed in more peri-urban locations, which they also are, although not to the same extent. It is reasonable to assume that less central locations makes the activity less accessible, both mentally and physically. To express it bluntly: a central location translates to a form of marketing, which can then possibly be complemented by larger plots of land in less central locations.

This is, in a sense, supported by Massey’s (2009) theory on power-geometry; central locations generally have denser clusters of power, as the level of interest and stake on a location seem to correlate to the centrality of its location. One of the points that has continuously been made in this thesis is that commercial farming is merely one out of many possible uses of land. Even though the advocates of commercial urban farming claim that it can be combined with other functions and uses, it is seemingly not at the top of the politicians’ list of priorities. What the political level does prioritise, naturally, differ between different cities; it is set by the vision and preconditions of the city in question. When this is the general tendency, it might seem less complicated for Stadsbruk to simply settle with less sought after plots of land. That would of course be a compromise of the level of visibility, and thus reachability of the local community. In the scope of the case of this thesis, a mid-way seems to have been found; in the cities where there is land already dedicated to urban farming or other ‘green’ functions, Stadsbruk can become involved to influence the character of the activity. Moreover, there are several examples of more mobile structures in the city centre, while the farms in less central, but still urban areas of the city are more long term. As indicated in chapter 5, this might change when the cities which has not yet implemented the Stadsbruk model are presented with good examples of the implementation of it. Also in central locations. Maybe this could lead to Stadsbruk achieving a more advantageous position in the power-geometry. The same goes for social entrepreneurship in general; the more ‘good’ examples there are, the more recognised it will be. Thus the social entrepreneurs can have a greater influence - on the public sector and the development of society, on a larger or a smaller scale. This reflection is also applicable to the conceptual development, which stands in interdependent parity to the role of the social entrepreneur; if or when the
paradigm proceeds from its current pre-paradigmatic state, into a more permanent state, it will become more generally acknowledged and recognised as a concept, which will in turn determine the position of the role of the social entrepreneur.
7. Conclusion

This thesis has treated the concept of social entrepreneurship, as well as the role of the social entrepreneur. This has then been concretised by applying the theoretical framework to the case of Stadsbruk; analysing their relationship to the public sector and their position in the urban context, including aspects of space and power. Social entrepreneurship has been considered in the structure of the third sector, with neoliberalism as the backdrop. The contribution of this study is relevant, since the concept is lacking a set scientific framework, while simultaneously the social entrepreneur has come to play a more central part in the provision of public services. The intention of this final chapter is to present the reader with the conclusions made based on the research presented in this thesis. This is done by taking a standpoint in the aim (section 1.2), with reference to the research questions (1.3).

First of all, the social entrepreneur is an actor balancing objectives of creating social impact with a business-like approach. What this balance looks like depends on the kind of actor. Narratives are used as a tool to influence the currently unset paradigm in the direction most suitable for the actor in question. A more clearly defined understanding and application of the concept would emanate if or when the paradigm is established, which in turn could create a more established balance between entrepreneurial ambitions and social impact.

Second of all, a large degree of the activities of a social entrepreneur are to some extent related to the public sector. It seems as though the determining factor of whether a social entrepreneur is able to establish its activity relies on how it is prioritised by the public sector. This creates relationships of dependency, which in turn determines a structure of power. In this structure, Stadsbruk seems subordinate to the public sector. Assuming this is applicable on a larger scale, the social entrepreneur is set in a position to compete with the private sector, where they lobby their vision to the public sector, and are driven by the incentive to make positive social change. Acknowledging this driving force, make Gaubert’s ideas of a new more holistic approach to entrepreneurship seem more relevant – i.e. added value and other streams of revenue is potentially a way of making to ‘holistic’ entrepreneur competitive towards the ‘economic’ (traditional) entrepreneur.

Third of all, the role of a social entrepreneur and how it is positioned in the urban context; it is difficult to make a general distinction since how a social entrepreneurial actor is ‘situated’ is entirely context-dependent. In the case of Stadsbruk, claims on central locations were not expressively mentioned. However, there are several indications on that being a key aspect in their model; e.g. the first out three levels of farming, is the ‘urban’, i.e. areas with higher land value etc. What can be considered on a more general level though, is the importance of the position of a social entrepreneur. Since the urban sphere is the most likely arena for that kind of actor, aspects of space (in this case location) are fundamental. Position is thus key in both a spatial, concrete sense and in the sense of institutionalization, that is setting the paradigm – the role and the concept of social entrepreneurship.
8. Future research

As established and repeatedly mentioned throughout this thesis, the paradigm of social entrepreneurship is not set, and there is therefore much research needed to explore and challenge the existing knowledge. As Kuhn (1962) wrote; we need to be open to scientific revolutions. I too believe that there needs to be room for critique of the epithet of social entrepreneurship – who can carry it? Why and why not? It has also been indicated in this study, that even though many actors could be described as such, it is difficult, if not impossible, to discern who is not. When attempting this research, it is important to reflect on why it would be important or simply interesting to make this distinction, and in effect – exclusion.

A next step in the specific scope of this thesis, could be investigating and analysing the public policy of the different cities working with Stadsbruk; to make some sort of comparison in an attempt to determine the effects of respective cities’ policies on investing in and implementing efforts or projects like Stadsbruk? The results of this thesis suggest that the political support is elementary. However, can lobbying of a social entrepreneur affect, steer or even shape the policies? Even if it is over a longer period of time, also the largest visions and plans tend to shift in one direction or another.

And to conclude, it would be a great contribution to the field of academia to explore the social entrepreneurs’ ambition and approach to social impact. What does it entail? In what sense are they making a positive change and why is it important? If compassion is becoming key in the dynamic and development of society, then it should be viewed from a scientific perspective.
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X. Appendices

X.1 Interview guide: civil servants

The following guide was prepared and provided by White architects, as part of their production of the handbook in collaboration Stadsbruk. As described in chapter 3, in accordance with the method of semi-structured interviews, follow-up questions were asked where it was deemed relevant. Some of those questions were more relevant to the scope of this study, i.e. not for the content of the handbook. The guide was provided in Swedish, thus the guide below is translated by the author.

Background
- What type of Stadsbruk has been conducted in your city/municipality?
- From who or what level did the initiative to start collaborating with Stadsbruk come from?
- What was the main argument for establishing a Stadsbruk farm?

Preparation/setup for the work
- What type of public planning policy supported the establishing of Stadsbruk in your city/municipality?
- Has some sort of inventory of public land been made? Has your city/municipality made efforts to reach out to private land owners?
- What has the organisation of the team looked like? Competencies? Cooperation with associations etc.?
- Has there been any cooperation between different departments?
- How has this been financed?
- For how long is to project planned to continue?

Implementation
- How long did it to implement the project? (From when it was brought up for discussion to when the farmers could start their activities?)
- On what kind of land has the farms been established?
- What has the situation been with the farmers in the city/municipality? How many? Has it been the same people involved throughout, or have new entered?
- How were the test beds managed in your municipality? Any inventory done to find the location?
- How did you acquire permits etc.? What kind of permits have been applied for?
- Approximately how much time has been devoted to the project? Whose time?

Feedback on experience – project specific
- What kind challenges have you been faced with?
- What kind of feedback have you received? Has this initiated more projects?
- What advice would you give to other cities and municipalities in Sweden who are planning on implementing Stadsbruk?
Feedback on experience – Stadsbruk in general

- What will happen after the Stadsbruk project concludes?
- Do you have other plans of Stadsbruk in your city/municipality? Why? Why not?
- What is your view on permanently established Stadsbruk projects?
- On what kind of land is it suitable to implement Stadsbruk? Park land?

X.2 Material collected from other interviews: civil servants

For three of the municipalities/cities; Lund, Lerum and Landskrona the interview guide was not applicable. Hence inspiration was taken from the interview guide, and the questions asked were regarding the general attitude towards urban farming, other urban farms in the respective city and their intentions and hopes of adopting the Stadsbruk model or joining the network. The transcription of the interviews with Janine (Lund) and Andreas (Lerum) are presented below. Almir (Landskrona) was not comfortable with the format of a transcription and therefore an overview of the interview is provided instead. This material is provided in Swedish.

X.2.1 Janine Österman, Lund

(Samtalen börjar med presentation etc.)

Louise: Som du skrev i ditt mejl, är ni inte delaktiga i själva projektet, utan ni är delaktiga i nätverket?
Janine: Ja, precis. Vi har precis gått med i nätverket, vi har inte varit på någonting som har anordnats alls av Stadsbruk.
L: Nej. Men det är också de enda planerna ni har för närvarande? Att endast vara medlemmar i nätverket?
J: Ja, det är det. Vi har inga planer på att ha ett sånt här projekt nu, eftersom vi har ett område för kommersiell odling här i Lund där man kan odla...
L: Kan du berätta lite mer om det kanske? Hur det ser ut för er idag?
L: Var ligger den här kommersiella odlingen i Lund idag?
J: Ja, det är ett vanligt odlingsområde, men dem som odlar där har möjlighet att sälja. Det ligger på Brunnhög.
L: Är det kommunal mark eller är det det...?
J: Va sa du?
L: Är det kommunal mark eller är det privat mark?
J: Ja det är det, absolut det är kommunal mark.
L: Parkmark då?
J: Nå, det ligger utanför detaljplanerat område.
L: Okej, yes.
L: Nej, precis. Nu när ni har blivit medlemmar av det här nätverket, vad hoppas ni få ut av det? Vad ser ni för fördelar av att gå med?
J: Ja, det är att utbyta information med andra kommuner och för att träffa andra som är intresserade, helt enkelt. Det är enklare för oss, att dem som är intresserade är ju med, och det har ju Stadsbruk gjort
det jobbet. Att söka upp kommuner och folk som är intresserade. Så vi tror att eh, jag räknar väl med att det blir ett väl värt nätverk att vara med i, förhoppningsvis.

L: Det ni hoppas att lära från andra kommuner, är det då på något slags organisatoriskt plan eller hur ni skulle kunna utveckla det nuvarande...?

J: Ja, men det är hur andra kommuner organisatoriskt har lagt upp sina satsningar. Så det är mest på, ja det är på det organisatoriska planet kan man väl säga. Och hur man har, ja till exempel hur man har finansierat, vilka förvaltningar som är inblandade, vilka personalresurser det kräver, såna grejer, som är svårt att räkna på. Alltså odlingsområden i sig, och kommersiell småskalig odling, det har vi bra koll på här i Lund skulle jag säga. Så praktiska grejer har vi inte alls lika stort behov av som organisatoriska.


J: Eh, ja... Alltså kommersiell urban odling, om det är det vi pratar om?

L: Ja, precis.


L: Mm, precis. Var kom initiativet att gå med i nätverket ifrån? Var det dem som kontaktade er eller var det ni som kontaktade dem?

J: Dem kontaktade oss.

L: Mm, och hur såg den här kontakten ut? Vad var deras pitch eller vad man ska säga?

J: Eh, jag har väldigt bra koll på Stadsbruk, så jag har odlad själv som odlare eh arrendator inom Stadsbruk. Så vi, ja deras pitch är väl nätverksmötena, vad dem kan erbjuda, och att det är kostnadsfritt nu under detta året är väl en stor del i det. Så att man får lov att testa och se vad man får ut av de här två träffarna. För sen är kostnaden på 45 000 kr, så nätverk är ju verkligen något vi får fundera över, om det är möjligt. Per år alltså.

L: Ja, det förstår jag.

J: Det är bara två nätverksträffar så, in princip, och det finns ingen dokumentation från tidigare år och så det finns inget att kolla på som jag eh, det finns inget arkiv som jag får tillgång till uppenbarligen.

L: Nä.

J: Det finns inga minnesanteckningar eller så heller. Så det handlar ju bara om de här nätverksträffarna.

L: Ett slags prova på-erbjudande.

J: Och då är inte våra personalkostnader eller resor inräknade.

L: Det är inte det eller det är det?


L: Mm, naturligtvis.

J: Så får man se vad Stadsbruk har att erbjuda, haha. Jag hoppas att det känns värt det.

L: Ja, du har ju lite erfarenhet i alla fall, så du har ju säkert en idé om vad det skulle kunna medföra. J: Ja.


J: Det kan jag inte säga, för det är ingenhet vi har utvärderat.

L: Nå okej.


L: Nej, det förstår jag ju. Jag tänker att det finns ett visst kommunalt engagemang i den här urbana odlingen, hur ser finansieringen av den ut i dagsläget?

J: Eh du menar odlingslotter och kolonier och så?
Ja, då eh... precis. Det är kanske svårt för er att särskilja mellan det kommersiella och det icke-kommersiella, men ja finansieringen av urban odling i stort.

Alltså det är påstått att kommersiell odling är svårt för er att särskilja mellan det kommersiella och det icke-kommersiella, men ja finansieringen av urban odling i stort.


Så där har vi haft en rätt så väl tilltagen projektbudget under många år. Och vi får också pengar från vår exploateringsbudget på ett område som ska komma att bli bostäder, företag och så där. Så vi har exploateringspengar i det, och sen har vi lite samordningspengar från våra, ja odlingsamordningen också. Jag vet inte om det säger dig något, haha.

Ja, nä jag förstår ju vad du menar.

Ja, vår vanliga parkbudget och Tekniska förvaltning.

Ja, precis. Den här odlningen i Brunnhög, du nämnde att ni har fått projektpengar för det. När startade det projektet?

Ja, det har gått mellan 12 och -16 tror jag. Som vi har fått pengar för eh, projektpengar.

Och det fortsätter nu? Alltså det är självständigt efter att projektet är avslutat? 2 år senare.


Det är ju roligt att det projektet har mynnat ut i att det blir ett permanent urbant odlingsområde, med växthus och skogsträdgård och ängsfruktodling och så.

Ja precis. Och det är självförsörjande nu då? Finansiellt sätt? Att dem säljer sina grönsaker och kanske...?

Nej nej nej, alltså man får sälja om man vill.

Ahaha, okej.

Men det är ju få som gör det. Men en del gör ju det för att finansiera sin egen verksamhet eller olika projekt dem driver. Men det drivs med exploateringspengar och parkbudget.

Ah okej, just det. Och hur lång tid tog...?

För att att vi har ju en rätt så liten efterfrågan på kommersiell odlingsmark skulle jag säga. Det är inte så efterfrågat.

Mm. Nå jag förstår. Hur lång tid var det från att projektet startade till att odlarna kunde börja odla? Hur lång tid var den här etableringsfasen eller vad man ska säga?

Ja, jag har fått uppfattningen att dem började odla direkt när lotterna var anlagda.

Okej, jag förstår. Men det låter ju jättespännande.

Men det är liksom, nån eh under en vår så var den ju fyllt, den odlingen.

Och den är fylld? Det finns så pass intresse för odling överlag att det finns liksom inte platser över till...?

Nej generellt sätt i Lund har vi köer från 1 år till 5 år ungefär på odlingslotterna. Det beror väl på, men de flesta får väl vänta 1 till 2 säsonger kanske, på odlingslotter.

Jag förstår. Nu nämnde du att ni kommer flytta den här odlningen till parkmark. Trots att det inte finns så mycket intresse för kommersiell odling, kommer de som gör det kunna fortsätta sälja sina grönsaker eller är det...?

Nej, det kommer de inte kunna göra.

Nå, för då är det ju på planerad parkmark.

L: Mm. Och ni tycker inte att det finns tillräckligt intresse för att erbjuda andra möjligheter.

J: Ja, om tre år är det inte helt otänkbart att vi har igång ett annat område där man kan odla kommersiellt. Det är ju så vi ser det. Det är ju därför vi inleder också arbetet nu med och kolla vad det finns för möjligheter och hur olika kommuner har lagt upp det. Och det finns ju inte jättemånga som har det, småskalig kommersiell odling, alltså på frilant. Inte i staden liksom, i och med att vi har plan- och bygglagen som reglerar hur man får använda allmän mark, och eh… ja tappade bort mig lite i frågan.

L: Nå men det förstår jag absolut, det är ju rätt ovanligt som du säger.


L: Mm, precis. När ni kartlade marken för att kunna hitta den här icke-planlagda delen, som odlingen befinner sig på nu, hur såg den kartläggningen ut och ja hur såg processen kring det ut?


L: Nej.


L: Varför då?

J: Vad sa du?

L: Varför ska det finnas en jordbrukare i anslutning? Varför ser ni det som viktigt?


L: Men det är jätteintressant att vi använder eh, det blir ju också en form av lokalt företagande som dras in i den urbana odlingen.

J: Ja. Nå men det kan jag säga, att det är väl ett av Stadbruks eh, i Malmö då, det är väl ett av dem eh den stora problematiken som har varit där, att det inte har funnits en sådan facilitator som har kunnat erbjuda sådana tjänster på ett effektivt och kostnadseffektivt sätt.

L: Mm, precis. Ja det är ju jätteviktigt för att kunna få det att gå runt, det blir ju stora kostnader.


L: Men, vet du om det har funnits några former av utmaningar med den här odlingen? Antingen något som har varit problematiskt eller som har varit en lärande erfarenhet?

bra, även vill man veta flera säsonger vad man eh, hur man ska planera sin växtföljd, vad man har tillgång till för liksom tekniska hjälpmedel.

L: Mm, precis. Den här att det har blivit så pass lång tid, beror det på förseningar i exploateringen då?

L: Mm, jag förstår. Du nämnde placemaking, när dem då kartlägger området så blir den här odlingen inte bara något att fylla marken med medan man väntar, utan ett verktyg för att göra området mer attraktivt.
J: Ja precis.

L: Och det är också på ett sätt identitetsskapande, tänker jag. Att genom att använda sig av odling för placemaking, det säger något om den typen av område man tänker sig att skapa och typen av människor man vill attrahera.
L: Ja, det kan jag förstå absolut. Jag har ju fått den här listan med frågor från White, men det är ju mycket av det som inte är relevant i och med att ni har en lite speciell position så jag har gjort om lite, och det är också därför jag inte har skickat de här frågorna till dig i förväg för det kändes inte relevant för din del. Men något som jag tycker är väldigt intressant och som dem kommer värdesätta också är vad ni har fått för typ av respons på era satsningar inom odlingen överlag?
J: Vi har växlat upp på odlingssidan rätt så mycket, till exempel med min tjänst som är ny. Och vi nyanlägger områden, det har vi inte gjort under rätt så lång tid tidigare, och restaurerar gamla områden. Och det som händer då är inte att köerna kortas, har vi märkt nu, vilket man ju hade kunnat önska sig. Våra köer blir längre för att det är ändå många som vill olisa, och ser också att det finns förutsättningar och att det möjliggörs liksom odling på olika sätt. Så vi har folk i kö trots att vi satsar mer.
L: Ja, en positiv förstärkning kan man säga.
L: Ja, det är absolut. Det tror jag att man kan ser över hela Sverige nu, både i Göteborg och Växjö och överallt att trycket fortsätter, eller ökar till och med.
J: Ja.
L: Har du eller ni någon form av tips eller lärdomar för dem som vill etablera urban odling i framtiden, för andra kommuner som skulle vara intresserade av detta? Odling överlag, nu har ni ju en del erfarenhet av det.
J: Långsiktiga placeringar är ju jätteviktigt, där man kan vara länge. Och att man tänker igenom infrastrukturen med vatten och sådär, och om man vill växla upp det och så, så tycker jag att det är väldigt viktigt att fundera igenom hur odlingskonkurrensen egentligen finns. Om det är då, alltså vika ska utbildas avlarna. Vi har sett den stora visken av att ha stora utbildningsprogram, och där är en folkhögskola kopplad till vår utbildning som bedriver grön entreprenörskap, ekologisk odlingsutbildning och så. Och det är jätteviktigt att ha den konkurren och, eh också, att växla upp det då om man ska fundera på vem som eh, vart kompetensen finns. Och det är ju hos lantbruken som det finns fettetigt mycket att hämta, som jag tycker att det glöms bort i väldigt många odlingsprojekt.
L: Att dem besitter en del kompetens, som kanske ser annorlunda ut än andra odlares?
J: Ja alltså de har en tillgång till saker, redskap då framförallt, eh kan väl säga. Och dem har ja mycket kunskap om marken och så. Det behöver inte vara de här stora lantbruken, alltså dem

L: Nej. Och det har ju också många spännande effekter, kan jag tänka mig. Ehm, egentligen är jag färder nu men jag har en sista fråga. Hur, ehm, det är ju främst då din förvaltning som är ansvarig för det, men har ni fått eh, har det varit förvaltningsöverskridande på något sätt? Har det varit något samarbete mellan förvaltningsarna?


L: Ja, absolut. Och har ni nå haft eh, nu nämnde du att lantbrukarna, dem bidrar med sin del på ett sätt eh, att dem hjälper till med maskiner och så vidare. Men är det andra föreningar eller aktörer i Lund som har bidragit i detta?

J: Uhm, nå…. Vi har nog hållt oss rätt så mycket, förutom folkhögskolan och så som vi har samarbetat mycket med, och Studieförbundet, så har ju inte vi någon kontakt med företag och så, eftersom vi inte håller på med någon kommersiell satsning än så länge.

L: Nå, för jag tänkte på nätet och dem och så vidare det…?


L: Det påminner väldigt mycket om, det är inte direkt Stadsbruk, men Xenofilias arbete med Odla kompis, det har du kanske hört om?

J: Ja precis.

L: Det är ingenting som ni har tänkt samarbetskring? Jag tänker att det har på många sätt samma syften, och att dem har en del erfarenheter och ni har kanske en del erfarenheter?

J: Nå, det här driver ju av en förening här i Lund, så vi stödjer dem liksom med praktiska grejer på odlingen, och dem har sina kontakter själva med andra föreningar och så. Så det är inte min förvaltning i allmänhet som har kontakterna kring projektet, utan det är, eh nu ska vi se vilka det är… Om det är också Service…? Integration…? Ja, det är en annan förvaltning i allmänhet. L: Mm, ja jag förstår.


(Samtalen avslutas och jag informerar Janine om att hon kommer få möjlighet att godkänna transskriberingen innan den skickas vidare till White arkitekter och Stadsbruk).

X.2.2 Andreas Benkel, Lerum

(Intervjun börjar med presentation etc.)

Andreas: Tyvärr så har vi ju inte gått med officiellt, som kommun. Men det kanske Cyrille sa?

Louise: Nej, men jag blev cc:ad in i ett av era mejl där jag då såg ditt svar om att ni ser fram emot att göra det i framtiden.

A: Ja, precis, ja.
L: Det är ju väldigt spännande för dem, både i sin handbok och för min del, att höra er position nu, när ni har tankar om att gå med i alla fall. Och era förutsättningar i dagsläget, för att kunna jämföra lite mellan de olika kommunerna.
A: Ja.
L: Jag vill bara, som jag skrev till dig tidigare, vara helt tydlig med att jag speler in det här samtalen och jag kommer transkribera det.
A: Mm. Det är inga problem.
L: Jättebra. Har ni några odlingar i Lerum i dagsläget? Urbana odlingar.
A: Nej, inte mer än traditionella odlingslotter.
L: Mm.
A: Och skulle gärna titta på Stadsbruk, eller stadsodlings-varianter med lite modernare tappning. Så lite friare former kanske.
L: Ja. Varför känner ni att ni vill utveckla detta?
L: Ja, men absolut. Det låter verkligen som om det finns både dokument och genomförda studier och så vidare för att stödja detta.
A: Mm, absolut.
L: I min forskning så arbetar jag med det här med socialt entreprenörskap och då är det ju intressant att tänka på den kommersiella ibiten. Finns det även politiskt stöd för det?
L: Ja, hur det politiska stödet, eller intresset egentligen för kommersiell urban odling. Det här med att skapa arbetstillfällen.
A: Just det. Ja, vi har ju bland annat den närlivsstrategi som finns, och i närlivs-strategierna så pratar man ju om socialt entreprenörskap och sociala företag och så, så att det finns absolut en öppenhet och positiv inställning till det. Och så klart också om vi pratar om utmaningar på arbetsmarknaden eller vid sysselsättning och så, att vi tror att det är något väldigt positivt. Ja, det finns

L: Ja precis. Finns det andra anledningar till att ni är intresserade av Stadsbruk än dem nämnde nu? Nätverket?


L: Förklar, du nämnde ett modellområde? Kan utveckla det lite?


L: Ja, nä men jag sakta skriva det sen efteråt. Det låter ju jättespännande.

A: Så där finns en bra eh, där kan du läsa lite gränder.

L: Ja, men det kommer jag absolut göra. Det är ju en väldigt prioriterad fråga i Göteborg, har det på något sätt påverkat Lerums intresse tror du?


L: Hur ser intresset för urban odling ut för boende i Lerum?

A: Jo men det känns som om att det finns ett stort intresse. Det finns olika så här medborgarundersökningar och annat som görs, och där upplever vi att det finns ganska stort stöd för vår vision, och att jobba med hållbarhetsfrågor och miljöfrågor, och även intresse för odling. Både för
estetisk trädgårdssodling och mat-odling tror vi är stort. Jag får skjuta in det att det finns ett eh, vi har något som heter Växtrum i Lerum. Har du stött på det eller hört talas om det?

L: Nej, inte än.


L: Nå jag har bilder på det här växtrum framför mig, det ser ju helt fantastiskt ut.

A: Ja, precis. Det har varit i snitt nu eh, det har varit 2 per år som har skapats, så jag tror att i år är det väl trädgård nummer 7 och 8 som skapas, och som invigs sista maj här. Så det är trevligt. Det kommer då och då lite publicitet och så där, kommer med i lite olika tidningar och så.

L: Ja jag förstår. Nå, men Lerum måste vara jättevackert.

A: Men jag kan säga det också att vi hade ehm första året och till viss del även andra året så var ett av växtrumen med flera sorters ätbar odling, men det var så i sin linda då så att det fanns kanske inte riktigt något klar bild av hur den platsen skulle förvaltas och skötes och, ja det var ju också ätbar odling men skapad på ett oehört vackert sätt av Simon Irving som är en sån specialist på potager. Vet du vad det är eller?

L: Nej?

A: Nå, det stavas potager, och det är estetisk matodling.

L: Ja!


L: Jo ska vi komma in lite på det. Nu har ni tänkt att ni ska bli medlemmar av nätverket. Det kanske inte finns några konkreta planer, men hoppas ni då också Stadsbruks modell i form av testbäddar och så vidare?

A: Ja, alltså det har vi bland annat inom Labb190, så har vi sådana projektankar. Så det kan absolut bli aktuellt. Nu är det ju så eh, jag hade ju hoppats att vi kanske redan hade varit medlemmar eller att vi hade haft beslut på att vi ska bli medlemmar, men det har inte gått igenom hos politiken ännu. Vi kan inte säga att vi som kommun är redo att gå med eftersom det inte har gått igenom på politisk nivå.

L: Som tolkar dig så finns det potential i framtiden men det är ingenting som är bestämt ännu?

A: Nä, precis.

L: Vad spännande. Jo, när det kommer till odling och så, det nämnde ätbara odlingar tidigare och Växtplats och så. Vilken typ av mark använder ni för de odlingarna?


A: Det är ofta sådana platser som det inte har funnits någon plan för överhuvudtaget, utan bara allmän platsmark liksom. Ingen av de här platserna har varit på planerad jordbruksmark eller sådär. På en plats fanns det ett tillfälligt bygglöv för en förskola, ehm förskolepaviljonger som stod och som sen flyttades, och sen fanns det ingen plan för fortsättningen där, så skapade man en trädgård där istället.

Men tänker jag framåt, med Stadsbruk och så där, så kan det absolut bli aktuellt med att man tittar på
om det finns kommunal mark som jordbruksmark som arrenderas ut, där någon har hästar eller ja, det finns nog lite olika varianter.
L: Ja, jag förstår. Det här är kanske ett lite tidigt stadiet men vilken förvaltning faller detta under och har ni planer på förvaltningsöverskridande samarbete?

Kort avbrott.

L: Finns det något samarbete med ‘näringslivsenheten’ eller motsvarande i Lerum?
A: Ja precis, vi har en näringslivsenhet med en näringslivschef, och den ligger organiserad på samhällsbyggnad, och det blir absolut en naturlig partner. Så det är viktigt att ha med.
L: Ja, det förstår jag.
A: De är också delvis drivande inom Labb190.
L: Okej. Finns det andra lokalna organisationer eller föreningar eller så, som ni kan tänka er att samarbeta med i framtiden också?
L: Ja jag förstår.

(Avslutar intervjun och informerar Andreas att transkribering kommer först skickas till honom för godkännande, och därefter till White.)

X.2.3 Almir Hodzic

(Almir godkänner att intervjun spelas in, men föredrar att materialet inte delas som transkribering)

- Urbana odlingar i Landskrona i dagsläget
  o Det finns för tillfället inga urbana odlingar i den omfattningen, men det har funnits tidigare. Det sköttes då av Folkuniversitetet tillsammans med Landskrona stad, och låg inne på Citadellsområdet. Det var tyvärr tvunget att avslutas då man inte nådde önskat resultat.

- Initiativet att gå med i nätverket
  o Det var på Citadellrådets initiativ som man valde att gå med i nätverket. Citadellrådet innefattar bland annat Landskrona stad och Statens fastighetsverk.
  o Anledningen till att man valde att gå med är att man hoppas lära från Stadshusk och andra städer som har erfarenhet av urban odling, särskilt de delar som är kopplade till näringslivet. Man önskar vägledning. Om det fungerar i en stad finns det ingen anledning att fortsätta försöka uppfinna hjulet. Naturligtvis kommer man anpassa modellen efter Landskronas förutsättningar.

- Lokaliserings av de nya odlingarna
Det är inne på Citadellsområdet som man har tänkt att anlägga de nya odlingarna, i samarbete med Stadsbruk. Anledningen är att man hoppas skapa arbetstillfällen för dem som står långt från arbetsmarknaden, samt vidare aktivera ett redan levande och vackert område.

Idéen att anlägga odlingarna på Citadellsområdet kommer ifrån att man tidigare odlat där. Annan mark i området är parkmark, den har man inte tänkt använda till odling. Den ska vara tillgänglig för allmänheten.

Om det visar sig att de första odlingarna uppnår önskat resultat, så finns det annan tillgänglig mark för fler odlingar på området.

Stöd för projektet
- Det finns politiskt stöd.
- Kommunen vill stötta projektet i starten, för att det ska komma igång. Därefter tänker man sig att det kommer vara självförsörjande.

Projektet
- Landskrona har nyligen gått med i nätverket och man har därför inte hunnit ta beslut kring en del frågor:
  - Huruvida man tänker anlägga en testbädd.
  - Vilken kommunal budget som ska finansiera projektet.
- Arbetsgruppen är tänkt att inkludera enheten för fritids- och kultur, enheten för stadsmiljö, enheten för teknik och service, samt näringslivsenheten.
- Man planerar även att samarbeta med en lokal förening som heter ‘Enkla jobb’. Föreningens syfte är att hjälpa dem som står långt från arbetsmarknaden, att etablera sig på arbetsmarknaden.

Framtiden
- Det finns för tillfället inga planer för andra Stadsbruksprojekt i framtiden. Man vill starta med Citadellsområdet, och sedan utvärdera projektet. Om det skulle vara framgångsrikt kan man eventuellt överväga att fler Stadsbruksprojekt på andra platser i Landskrona.

X.3 Interview guide: Cyrille Gaubert

- What is the vision of Stadsbruk?
  - What do you hope to achieve?
    - Farming or entrepreneurship
    - Filling a need?
    - Is urban farming the goal or the tool of achieving your goals?
  - Do you have any plans of developing the concept?
  - Is one part trying to influence the public sector, and if so how?
    - (Carina called it ‘lobbying’)
  - In reality you can be compared to a private actor as you are ‘selling’ a service?
    - How are you different from a NPO?
- What are your greatest challenges?
  - Issues of land?
  - Financing?
- What does the incubation-process look like?
  - Do the new entrepreneurs stay as your protegees for a certain period of time and then continue independently?
- Your relationship with the public sector, what does it look like?
  - Is it a give-and-take kind? Are they responsive to your efforts?
At what level do you put your main focus, the city council or the city administration?
The handbook is, as I’ve understood it, directed the city administration, but their mission/work is directed by the political level. Why is the focus not the politicians?
Do you feel that there is a lack of understanding from the public sector’s part of the value that is created by Stadsbruk’s work?
  - What do you think their view on Stadsbruk is?
Do you experience some sort of resistance (from the public sector)? What does this look like? What are the reasons for it?

The state has in recent years delegated/outsourced some of its responsibilities. Work integration efforts seem to be closely associated with social entrepreneurship.
  - This is also your focus, why?
  - Social enterprises are receiving more focus/is taking up more place today, why?
    - Is there a greater need for efforts associated with social entrepreneurship?
    - Why?
  - Would you consider youself social entrepreneurs/ is Stadsbruk a social enterprise?
    - How?
    - What makes you a social enterprise?

Your social mission is in fact aiding/building other entrepreneurs. You have taken a meta-perspective, which suggests a will to promote it.
  - Why do you believe in social entrepreneurship?
  - How do you feel that your sector differs from the more traditional private sector? There are still incentives to make a profit?
    - Is it merely for economic sustainability, or expanding/developing your work.

How is it financed?
  - What is your relationship with Vinnova?

How do the urban farmers finance their business?
  - Preferably in concrete terms, if possible

What does Stadsbruk’s relationship with White architects look like?
  - Is it purely client-consultant based? You write on your homepage that you are partners, what does the partnership look like?
  - Do you feel that you have common goals?
  - Does it aid you in any particular way to work with them?

Stadsbruk in societal context
  - Why now? How?
  - What does this suggest of our time?
  - What do you think the development will look like?
  - Apart of creating a new economy?
  - A support-system for marginalised groups?