2 Social Enterprise in Denmark

Historical, Contextual and Conceptual Aspects

*Linda Lundgaard Andersen,
Lars Hulgård and Gurli Jakobsen*

Introduction

Until 2006, social enterprise (SE) was not a part of the political and scientific vocabulary in Denmark. In 2006 and 2007, however, the Danish Parliament awarded two important grants in this area: First, the Centre for Social Entrepreneurship at Roskilde University was allocated a €3-million grant to build competencies and skills through the setting up of an executive MA in social entrepreneurship, learning programmes, research and outreach. Secondly, in 2007, the Parliament awarded another grant, enabling the creation of the Centre for Social Economy, launched by the Danish cooperative employers' organisation (Kooperationen). These two events were crucial in the establishment of social enterprise as an organisational, scientific and educational field in Denmark. However, in order to understand the institutional trajectory of social enterprise in Denmark, we must dig deeper into the history of the evolution of the Danish welfare state.

2.1 Institutional Trajectories of Social Enterprise in Denmark: Strong Roots in Social Movements and State Formation

Institutional interest in the SE field has appeared rather late in Denmark, but a broader phenomenon, which could be labelled the social economy, has a long history in Danish society. Grassroot movements and organisations have played a significant and substantial role both in the historic formation of the welfare state and in more recent processes of welfare state modernisation. From a macro perspective, three major periods can be identified in the institutionalisation of SE models in Denmark; such institutionalisation can also be approached by analysing the “individual” institutional trajectories of the main models of social enterprise.

With a view to situating social entrepreneurship, social enterprise and the social economy in the Danish context, we define social entrepreneurship as referring to the way in which non-governmental and

civil organisations implement an increasingly hybrid economic model and diversify their activity profile (Ridley-Duff and Bull 2015). In such perspective, social enterprises are organisations that implement social and economic values as equally important values in a certain governance structure. Social economy could be a more generic term, allowing for the definition and discussion of a multiple and diversified economy (Eynaud *et al.* 2019; Hulgård and Andersen 2019). All three notions have been influential in the history of social enterprise in Denmark and remain important for its current development.

2.1.1 First Period: Development of the Cooperative Sector

At the European and international levels, a first period of emergence of the various types of organisations making up the social economy (co-operatives, mutual societies and associations) can be observed in the middle of the 19th century. In Denmark, as in other European countries, the historical basis for modern social enterprises can be found in the development of cooperative-like enterprises (including conventional co-operatives) that took place from the mid-1800 onwards (Hulgård and Andersen 2015). At the time, the workers and farmers' cooperative movements constituted two distinct and very influential actors, which played an important role in shaping Denmark as a modern constitutional democracy and, later on, as a universally oriented welfare state. The co-operative movement was of significant value for the protection and facilitation of farmers' economic, social and political interests. This movement was also directly linked to social movements with major—possibly even crucial—influence on the making of modern Danish society, namely *Grundtvigianismen* (a social movement based on Grundtvig's conception of nationalism, Christianity and culture) and the Danish Folk High Schools Movement (*højskolebevægelsen*). The national cooperative movement included several small-scale rural cooperative movements as well as urban cooperatives. This movement was the “first strong voluntary cooperative movement in the world” (Svendsen and Svendsen 2004: 1). The main reason for this strength was the cooperative sector's success in generating a specific production factor, that is, social capital, which was partly explained by a well-working collaboration and connections between the local cooperatives and the national cooperative organisation (Svendsen and Svendsen 2004: 86).

2.1.2 Second Period: Interrelated Crises

A long time span separates the first period of emergence of the social economy at the international level, in the middle of the 19th century, from the second period, from the mid-1980s onward. During that period, in Denmark, the importance of social-economy organisations

slowly faded due to the emergence of the welfare state. Public services gradually developed and grew into a quite strong infrastructure, and cooperatives lost ground.

In the Danish case, the period of re-emergence of the social economy was strongly rooted in the social sector and civic society. In this period, three interrelated crises developed, thereby paving the way for different social enterprises to emerge and develop (Hegland and Hulgård 1998; Andersen 2015a):

- a resource crisis, resulting from very rapidly rising public demands for public-welfare spending in health services, education and public administration;
- a functional crisis, which manifested itself in welfare-state services gradually developing into rigid structures and routines. The standardised, functional and organisational forms of the welfare state were no longer fully able to meet the population's nuanced needs in a rapidly changing society;
- a crisis of legitimacy of the welfare state, weakening the popular support for a solidarity- and needs-based social policy.

Adding to this, two political factors influenced the institutionalisation of social enterprise in Denmark: first, the implementation of numerous cross-sectoral development and pilot programmes aimed at facilitating bottom-up solutions to social problems, and secondly, the soft transition from a universal welfare state to a Schumpeterian workfare state. A new type of social enterprise and social entrepreneurs started to emerge as one type of response to the shortcomings of welfare-state organisations. Between 1985 and 2000, many pilot and action programmes within the field of social policy and urban regeneration facilitated the emergence of a new sector of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship. Although similar programmes appeared simultaneously in other European countries, the Danish pilot and experimental programmes were comparatively large. The largest programme was the so-called "Social Development Programme" (with a €47-million budget), which aimed to increase participation and cross-sectoral collaboration in the provision of social services, thereby funding many of the dominant social entrepreneurs and social enterprises in the third development phase of social enterprise. To a certain degree, it is fair to say that a bottom-up movement, facilitated by enthusiastic and talented local social entrepreneurs, dominated this emergence of new social enterprises.

2.1.3 Third Period: Emergence and Institutionalisation of Social Enterprise

The third period, which started in the early 2000s, corresponds to the institutionalisation process of social enterprise in Denmark. In this

period, social enterprises developed, moving from the stage of embryonic initiatives to that of full emergence and institutionalisation. This period was first characterised by the fact that the social economy, social entrepreneurship and social enterprise all received great attention from all agents. Third-sector organisations had to reformulate and develop a balance between traditional forms of advocacy, impact awareness and representation of interests as regards the delivery of welfare services on the market. Secondly, strategies to promote social enterprise were incorporated into Danish public policies and strategies for the renewal of welfare (Andersen and Hulgård 2016). This period also witnessed the emergence of a national strategy for social enterprise, which will be analysed later in this chapter.

2.2 Legal Forms of Social Enterprise in Denmark

A number of business legal forms can be adopted by social enterprises in Denmark; they are presented below. The roots of these legal forms can be traced back to organisational types developed in the 19th century: cooperatives, mutuals, associations and so-called “self-owned” and “self-governed” organisations.¹

2.2.1 Association (*Forening*)

The association (*forening*) is a union of people or organisations with a common aim, managed according to democratic rules and procedures. There is no single act governing associations in Denmark, so requirements depend on specific types and sectors. Since 1849, an association has had legal validity when it fulfils the general condition of having a set of by-laws democratically approved in a member-based general assembly. The law distinguishes between business-oriented associations and non-profit associations; they are subject to different rules of taxation, and are in general governed respectively by the general rules for non-profit and for-profit enterprises and by those for organisations (Jakobsen 2001).

2.2.2 Self-Governing Institutions (*Selvejende Institution*)

Self-governing institutions (*selvejende institution*) include both publicly founded and funded institutions and private ones. Both types have a set of bylaws that defines them legally as being “self-owned” and non-profit. Both are common within welfare service like kindergartens, nursing homes, schools, etc. Private self-governing institutions often function with public contracts. They are defined by their social purpose and managed by an independent board (elected or appointed). They generally do not have volunteers.

2.2.3 Public-Utility Funds (*Almennyttige Fonde*)

Public-utility funds (*almennyttige fonde*) are charitable foundations that usually have a social purpose; they are endowed with assets for a specific purpose, they are governed by a board and they are non-profit. They often award grants or funding for education and research, and organise cultural and sport activities.

2.2.4 Cooperatives (*Andelsselskab*)

Cooperatives (*andelsselskab*) are member-owned organisations that trade economically and are democratically managed to further the common interest of their members (Ibsen and Haberman 2005). There is not a specific cooperative law in Denmark, but the existing legislation follows the cooperative principles of the International Cooperative Alliance regarding membership, ownership and the way in which economic surplus is distributed to members. Companies can benefit from a special tax regime as cooperatives; this is also possible for capital-based companies, provided their bylaws and praxis are recognised as functioning according to these cooperative principles (Jakobsen 2010).

2.3 The Innovative and Entrepreneurial Welfare State

As described above, the Danish welfare state has demonstrated a sustained and long-term commitment to the development of a welfare system able to perform social tasks effectively. In this sense, both innovation and social entrepreneurship have been on the Danish agenda for a long time—even far longer than the rhetorical interest in these subjects. However, in the recent decades, new developments have occurred: interesting Danish—and perhaps even Nordic—(social) entrepreneurial welfare-state position and practice have emerged, that we identify as the “innovative and entrepreneurial welfare state”. We use this term to emphasise how the welfare state positions itself within areas like welfare policy, educational policy and in relation to civil society—in a proactive manner and forming, funding and initiating programmes of “modernisation” (Andersen 2015b; Andersen and Hulgård 2016; Andersen *et al.* 2016).

It has historically been some of the welfare state’s core areas to design and implement welfare and education policies. This is in alignment with international analyses that point to how the state is an understated agent of (social) innovation (Mazzucato 2013). Civil society has not been similarly subject to policy planning, but this is increasingly changing so that NGOs and civil society are now part of public policies and interventions (Andersen 2018). And in the case of Denmark, we are not just talking about a state that analyses, decides and develops through policies, programmes and performance criteria, but also, to a very large

extent, about a government that acts and reacts responsively to its various citizens and stakeholders' needs and desires.

The universal welfare state was an asset of a society that quickly developed in the post-war period (Titmuss 1987). Some indicators of the evolution of the welfare state are the experimental and developmental programmes that have been implemented both at European level and in the Nordic countries, thus creating a renewed and user-sensitive approach in social work, urban development, culture and health. As mentioned above, many of the organisations in Denmark that we today would label social enterprises have their origin in such national and European experimental programmes. Another landmark, and a factor that has paved the way for the emergence of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship, is constituted by the numerous Danish modernisation programmes that have been implemented throughout the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. These programmes have primed public-sector development through performance management and have led to a "trimming" of the welfare state, promoting quasi-market services and more efficient and rationalised services (Andersen 2015b).

2.4 The Danish Ecosystem of Social Enterprise

The Danish ecosystem of support for social entrepreneurship and social enterprise consists of different dimensions. Andersen and Hulgård (2014) argue that four dimensions—namely practice, policy, education and research—are particularly significant in stimulating and consolidating social enterprise in the Nordic countries. Often, ecosystem models focus on entrepreneurial-related issues, such as legal frameworks, social-impact markets and measurements, networks and mutual support structures and mechanisms, as well as on specialist business development (see, e.g., ICF Consulting Services for the European Commission 2014: 6)—which can be considered to correspond to the "practice" and "policy" dimensions. However, the Danish (and more broadly Nordic) case illustrates the fact that, in order to understand the development of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise, the approach to the SE ecosystem must be expanded to include education and research (Andersen *et al.* 2016). Indeed, an educational system permeated by a social entrepreneurial way of thinking and acting generates knowledge as well as social and cultural forms of capital that increase action potential, which in turn can affect practice in many different ways (Hulgård and Andersen 2015: 59). Analysing the current situation in Denmark through the lens of this four-dimensional model reveals a system that both hinders and supports the development and consolidation of social enterprise.

The four dimensions highlighted by Andersen are all well-established features of the Danish societal infrastructure and state capacity, and the subject of public-, civil- and private-driven development. The educational dimension has been particularly important in developing the SE support ecosystem.

In principle, the ecosystem covers elementary school, youth programme training and education, but bachelor/master programmes and doctorates related to social entrepreneurship and social enterprises are probably the most established and consolidated forms of education in the field of social enterprise in Denmark as in the Nordic countries in general. The Centre for Social Entrepreneurship at Roskilde University has been spearheading the educational and knowledge infrastructure in the country, providing a part-time master as well as a full degree programme in social entrepreneurship, social enterprises and management (Andersen and Hulgård 2014; Andersen *et al.* 2016). A number of educational institutions, such as university colleges, Copenhagen Business School and the University of Southern Denmark have also included courses on social enterprise in their curriculum. For the past ten years, the education and knowledge dimension of the ecosystem have been growing more than other dimensions, like the legal and financial framework and support structures (Andersen and Hulgård 2019).

From a legal perspective, in June 2014, the Danish Parliament passed the Act on Registered Social Enterprises;² since 2015, social enterprises have thus been able to register as such within the Danish fiscal framework. According to the Act of 2014, social enterprises have to meet five criteria: they must have a social purpose; they must carry out a significant commercial activity; they must be independent from public authorities; they must have an inclusive and responsible governance; and they must implement a social reinvestment of profits. The fiscal framework targeting social enterprise in Denmark differs according to the legal form adopted by the organisation: associations, foundations and limited-liability companies can all apply to a differentiated fiscal framework. The most important incentive for registering as a social enterprise is the visibility: registered social enterprises are easy to recognise for potential partners and customers (Hulgård and Chodorkoff 2019).

The Danish SE ecosystem has gone through significant changes and developments in the decade between 2007 and 2018 (Andersen and Hulgård 2019). From 2007 onwards, a far-ranging interest for social enterprise has been significant in the country, both among politicians at the national and municipal levels and among interest organisations. All displayed some awareness of the potential and possible outcomes of social enterprise as a new welfare agent. A number of national mapping projects and capacity-building centres were supported by a variety of stakeholders, including politicians at the local and national levels. The period of public attention culminated in 2013–2014 with the ambition displayed by politicians to develop a national SE ecosystem. At the core of this ecosystem was the establishment of the National Growth Centre for Social Enterprise, in 2013; the design of a National Strategy for Social Enterprise, published in 2014; and the creation of the “registered social enterprise” tool (*registreret socialøkonomisk virksomhed*, or RSV).

Whereas the RSV tool still exists today, the government closed the Growth Centre by the end of 2015, the SE ecosystem has become more fragmented, and public interest for this ecosystem at the national level has decreased. However, interest in capacity building remains strong at the local level, and many municipalities as well as interest organisations and social entrepreneurs remain active in the area, developing social economic welfare strategies and providing small seed funding and consultancies (Hulgård and Chodorkoff 2019).

It can thus be said that, in Denmark, the governmental and political understandings, positioning and decisions reveal a somewhat “zigzagging” legal and financial response to social enterprise. At the beginning of the year 2000, a firm and genuine interest in social enterprise could be observed, with a foreseen budget of over DKK30 million (about €4.02 million) over 8 years to initiate and sustain social entrepreneurship and social enterprise pursuing a broad societal interest. Following this, however, the political and governmental route has taken a much more neoliberal turn, with a vague and neoliberal discourse in which social enterprise is seen as part of corporate social responsibility (Andersen 2018). Moreover, an interesting schism has emerged between top-down initiatives and bottom-up ones: the number of top-down initiatives has been decreasing lately, whereas bottom-up initiatives have been flourishing. A growing number of municipalities have been developing socio-economic strategies in order to initiate, feed and strengthen SE initiatives and business as part of local welfare and labour-market strategies (Lund and Sørensen 2018; Hulgård and Andersen 2019).

As far as numbers are concerned, social enterprises have been researched in a number of studies (Schøtt 2009; Governmental Committee on Social Enterprises 2012; Jensen 2012; Jakobsen 2013; Thuesen *et al.* 2013), but the SE field still remains, from the point of view of scientific documentation, a new discipline, not yet defined by consistent criteria or monitoring—it is rather, so far, the subject of various unconnected studies. The fact that the various available studies are based on different definitions of social enterprise and have produced different results in terms of numbers of social enterprises questions the reliability of these results and points to the need for further research.

Most recent studies document that, in October 2018, 282 social enterprises were registered in the VIRK Database—a publicly hosted database on social enterprises in Denmark. Of these, 123 were associations, 46 were foundations, 90 were limited-liability companies and 23 were registered under “other legal forms”. As it is estimated that a good part of the 23 organisations recorded as undefined in legal terms were in reality independent projects implemented under existing associations or foundations, these data show that around three quarters of social enterprises in Denmark have kept their rooting as third-sector entities (Hulgård and Chodorkoff 2019). Another study identified 637 “socially

responsible enterprises”, and it is estimated that 315 among these could qualify for a “registered social enterprise” (RSV) accreditation (Lund and Sørensen 2018: 42).

The policy discourse on social enterprise in recent years has raised interest from both the conventional business sector and the general public; such interest is mainly linked to the central role of work-integration social enterprises (WISEs) in policy frameworks. However, the SE field in Denmark is not limited to WISEs, but is broader and more diversified. This is increasingly true: whereas almost 80% of social enterprises pursuing thematic objectives were linked to employment and social issues in 2013, this figure was down to 57% in 2018. The most significant evolution in terms of objectives concerns environmental objectives: while only 6% of social enterprises pursued such objectives in 2013, this figure reached 14% in 2018. This reflects the fact that social enterprises are in line with prioritised societal problems that are not being addressed adequately by dominant and traditional organisations and policies. Accordingly, there are a great potential and results to harvest for policies that would provide incentives for the setting up of social enterprises aiming to overcome severe societal challenges, such as climate change and health issues. Overall, social enterprises’ objectives have become much more diversified (Hulgård and Chodorkoff 2019: 32).

2.5 Significant Conception(s) and Practices of Social Enterprise: Five Platforms

In the Danish landscape, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship remain a contested phenomenon, which many actors have tried to influence and define. Table 2.1 illustrates how five significant and influential platforms, bringing together various actors, have developed SE-related concepts and practices. The table offers an overview of the different platforms’ definition, strategy and implications, and highlights the existence of different Danish key agents investing in and influencing the emergence of social enterprises. The table is based on the platforms’ self-representations of their objectives, activities and strategies such as they are disseminated through their website, in their mission statements or through information products and annual reports. The five selected platforms are the following:

- the Centre for Social Economy (*Center for Socialøkonomi*, or CSE), a consultancy and knowledge centre supported by governmental social funding;³
- the think tank Monday Morning (*Mandag Morgen*), which promotes social entrepreneurship through analyses and reports to enhance documentation and policy-making;
- the Centre for Social Development⁴ (*Socialt Udviklingscenter*), which has initiated and launched an initiative named “social inventions”;

Table 2.1 Five influential SE platforms

	<i>Centre for Social Economy (CSE)</i>	<i>Monday Morning think tank</i>	<i>Centre for Social Development (SUS)</i>	<i>Copenhagen City Council strategy</i>	<i>Social Capital Fund</i>
Terminology	Social enterprises Social innovation User involvement	Entrepreneurs with social objectives Enthusiastic individuals as innovators	Social inventions = social innovation with particular characteristics that reveal methodology and level of inventiveness	Support to social entrepreneurs and enterprises for improved welfare and welfare solutions	Social change through social business and “social-first” venture fund
Activity	Consultancy, guidance and knowledge centre	Strategy and policy development	Social experimentation: implementation of social inventions	Creation of a framework for social (economic) enterprises	Social-venture capital, subsidies and support structures for social enterprises
Market-oriented activities	Sales of products and services Investing income generated to further activities at CSE	Growth, professionalisation and efficiency based on market conditions Social entrepreneurs = private suppliers on the public market	Involved in partnerships, consortia, cooperatives Social franchising Private and public online platforms for communication	Market orientation Focus on fundraising and networks	Financial support to enhance growth in successful social enterprises and stimulate return on investment

Role of civil society	Cross-sector partnerships User involvement Several actors across branches and sectors as equal partners	Advocating commitment from public, private and civil sector Civil society seen as important for legitimacy and advocacy	Civil society based on values of inclusion seen as important partner	Weak representation of civil society, but cross-sectoral emphasis Annual conference for actors from the three sectors to increase cooperation	Weak representation of civil society Improvement of life and social capital of vulnerable groups Priority to social rather than financial results
Relation to the state	Organisationally independent from the state, hybrid enterprises with public-service procurement and contracts and independent income	State seen as provider of public procurement and investment funds State is both a prerequisite and a hindrance	Public scaling-up and spread schemes based on policy, best practice, standards and “artificial” demand incentives	Municipality operates across sectors and creates framework conditions Establishment of task force in the municipality	Weak representation of the state in strategies and objectives Solution to social problems through business supported by the social capital fund

Source: Andersen and Hulgård (2016).

- the Copenhagen City Council strategy,⁵ as an example of a local-government social-economy strategy initiating social enterprises as a tool for reintegrating marginalised citizens;
- the Social Capital Fund⁶ (*Den Sociale Kapitalfond*), which is the first Danish social-venture fund aiming to provide financial support to social enterprises.

The analysis of the five platforms is interesting in several ways. First, it reveals that supporting social entrepreneurship and social enterprises through platform services is a rather new phenomenon in Denmark, as four of the five platforms have emerged since 2010, while the oldest one (namely the CSE) had been established in 2007 (it had to close down in 2014 due to lack of funds).

Secondly, the platforms reveal a high degree of pluralism and diversity in terms of views and definitions of the SE field. The various agents use different terms in Danish, which may be translated as “social economic enterprises”, “social entrepreneurial initiatives”, “social inventions” and “social entrepreneurship”—all of which have become part of the Danish public discourse.

Thirdly, social enterprise has very rapidly achieved a considerable institutional anchoring in terms of support structures, representation of interests, access to resources and knowledge production. The CSE targets social enterprises, but in practice, its activities are broadly aimed at social entrepreneurs through networking, mentoring, and advice and policy development. Several local community councils (in about a dozen communities) have developed SE strategies and have created support structures like “consultancy and start-up teams”, and they provide small pools of seed money to finance SE start-ups. In such plans and documents, social enterprises are positioned as key initiatives for the development of new welfare strategies (see, for instance, Copenhagen City Council 2009 and Aarhus City Council’s strategy for social economic entrepreneurs in 2012). Likewise, the introduction of social entrepreneurship into the educational system must also be seen as a resource and capacity-building measure.⁷

Fourthly, all platforms are concerned with acting and positioning themselves according to trends in the market and in civil society. All agents view the market as probably *the* most central arena for entrepreneurship, and if the five platforms share a common denominator, it would seem to be the considerable attention given to faith in the market as the primary arena for social entrepreneurs. The market is linked with notions of sales and growth, economic value, incentives, motivation, efficiency, professionalism and return on investment. On the other hand, most platforms are also concerned with involving civil society in their activities and strategies (the City Council strategy and the Social Capital Fund constitute exceptions in this regard). The civil society evokes notions of partnerships, user involvement, commitment, legitimacy, advocacy and vulnerable citizens.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have provided, through a brief overview of the history of the Danish welfare state, an understanding of the institutional trajectory and legal forms of social enterprise. We have outlined the organisational, scientific and educational field of social enterprise in Denmark. Social-economy organisations have a long history in Denmark, and they have played a significant and substantial role both in the historic formation of the welfare state and in more recent processes of modernisation of the latter. In terms of numbers, social enterprises have only been investigated from the mid-2000s onward, but recent figures point to an interesting development, implying that the SE field becomes broader and more diversified; while some of social enterprises' characteristics (such as the fact that they are strongly anchored in civil society) remain unchanged, these initiatives develop activities in new areas, addressing environmental and urban issues. The political interest has lost momentum and the SE ecosystem is not further developing, but the interest and initiatives from social entrepreneurs is still present. It will be interesting to see how the Danish SE ecosystem will develop in the future, and whether this trend towards the diversification of social enterprises will continue.

Notes

- 1 In English texts, "*selvejende institution*" (literally, "self-owned institution") is often translated as "foundation".
- 2 Social Enterprise Law on Registered Social Enterprises, No. 148 (see www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=161853; accessed November 9, 2015).
- 3 The Center for Social Economy was funded from 2007 to 2013 by the Danish Parliament.
- 4 See www.sus.dk.
- 5 See Copenhagen City Council's strategy for social enterprises (2010). https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/edoc_old_format/OEkonomiudvalget/25-05-2010%2015.15.00/Referat/26-05-2010%2012.35.12/5451624.PDF.
- 6 See www.densocialekapitalfond.dk/.
- 7 Social entrepreneurship is growing both in practice and in education. Roskilde University offers an international full master programme on Social Entrepreneurship and Management (<https://ruc.dk/en/master/social-entrepreneurship-and-management-int>) and a part-time open master's level course (<https://ruc.dk/master-i-social-entreprenoerskab>); Copenhagen Business School offers social entrepreneurship as an integral part of core courses and elective courses at Bachelor and Master levels (www.cbs.dk/en/knowledge-society/interdisciplinary-initiatives/entrepreneurship/organization/clusters/social-entrepreneurship); university colleges have introduced social enterprise in their curriculum. The Danish Social Innovation Club (DANSIC; see www.facebook.com/danishsocialinnovationclub) is a voluntary, student-run, non-profit organisation for social innovation and social entrepreneurship among students, and the interest organisation Social Entrepreneurs in Denmark is growing in size and activities.

References

- Andersen, L. L. (2015a) *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation: Human Economy, Governance and Voluntarism Revisited*, CURSIV, No. 15, Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Andersen, L. L. (2015b) "Micro-processes of collaborative innovation in Danish welfare settings: A psychosocial approach to learning and performance", in Agger, A., Damgaard, B., Hagedorn, A. K. & Sørensen, E. (eds) *Collaborative Governance and Public Innovation in Northern Europe*, Sharjah: Bentham Science Publishers, pp. 249–268.
- Andersen, L. L. (2018) "Neoliberal drivers in hybrid civil society organisations: Critical readings of civiness and social entrepreneurship", in Masoud K. & Jönsson, J. H. (eds) *Neoliberalism, Nordic Welfare States and Social Work*, London: Routledge, pp. 43–52.
- Andersen, L. L. & Hulgård, L. (2014) "Social innovation and collaborative learning Roskilde University – a critical and problem-oriented approach", *Sport Journal for University Pedagogy*, Vol. 4, Roskilde University, pp. 22–38.
- Andersen, L. L. & Hulgård, L. (2016) "Social Entrepreneurship: Demolition of the Welfare State or an Arena for Solidarity?", in Andersen, L. L., Gawell, M. & Spear, R. (eds) *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprises: Nordic Perspectives*, London: Routledge, pp. 22–40.
- Andersen, L. L., & Hulgård, L. (2019) "Social enterprise in Denmark: Emerging, institutionalized or colonized?", Paper presented at the 7th EMES International Research Conference on Social Enterprise: Sustainable Development through Social Enterprise, Co-operative and Voluntary Action.
- Andersen, L. L., Gawell, M. & Spear, R. (2016) "Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprises in the Nordics: Narratives Emerging from Social Movements and Welfare Dynamics", in Andersen, L. L., Gawell, M. & Spear, R. (eds) *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprises: Nordic Perspectives*, London: Routledge, pp. 1–18.
- Copenhagen City Council (2009) *Policy for Social Economic Enterprises in 2010*. Available HTTP: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/edoc_old_format/OEkonomiudvalget/25-05-2010%2015.15.00/Referat/26-05-2010%2012.35.12/5451624.PDF.
- Eynaud, P., Laville, J.-L., dos Santos, L. L., Banerjee, S., Avelino, F. & Hulgård, L. (2019) *Theory of Social Enterprise and Pluralism. Social Movements, Solidarity Economy, and Global South. Theory of Social Enterprise and Pluralism*, London: Routledge <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429291197>.
- Governmental Committee on Social Enterprises (2012) *Recommendation Report*, Copenhagen.: Committee on Social Enterprises. Available HTTP: <http://socialvirksomhed.dk/en/files/recommendationreport.pdf> (accessed April10, 2015).
- Hegland, T. J., & Hulgård, L. (1998) "Socialpolitik og forsøgsvirksomhed", *Socialpolitik*, Munksgaard.
- Hulgård, L., & Andersen, L. L. (2015) *Sosialt entreprenørskap og sosial innovasjon. Kartlegging av innsatser for sosialt entreprenørskap og sosial innovasjon i Norden*, Nordisk Ministerråd, Tema Nord 2015:502.
- Hulgård, L. & Andersen, L. L. (2019) "Reconfiguring the social and solidarity economy in a Danish/Nordic welfare context", in Eynaud, P., Laville, J.-L., dos Santos, L. L., Banerjee, S., Avelino, F., & Hulgård, L. (eds) *Theory of*

- Social Enterprise and Pluralism Social Movements, Solidarity Economy, and the Global South*, London: Routledge, pp. 69–89.
- Hulgård, L. & Chodorkoff, L. (2019) *European Commission. Social enterprises and their ecosystems in Europe. Updated country report: Denmark*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Available HTTP: <https://europa.eu/Qq64ny>.
- Ibsen, B. & Habermann, U. (2005) “Defining the nonprofit sector: Denmark”, *Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project Working Paper*, No. 44, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.
- ICF Consulting Services for the European Commission (2014) *A Map of Social Enterprises and their Ecosystems in Europe: Executive Summary*, Brussels: European Commission.
- Jacobsen, H. R. (2013) *Virksomheder med udvidet socialt ansvar*, Centre for Economic and Business Research (CEBR), Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School.
- Jakobsen, G. (2001) “Organisationsformer i ‘den sociale økonomi’ i Danmark og disses samspil med det offentlige”, *Kooperation, Social Kapital och Medarbetare Insatser Kooperativ Årsbok 2001*, Stockholm: Föreningen Kooperativa Studier, pp. 79–100.
- Jakobsen, G. (2010) *Study on the Implementation of the Regulation 1435/2003 on the Statute for European Cooperative Society (SCE): National Report – Denmark*, Brussels: Council of European Union. Available HTTP: <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/494bb15b-c34d-4bdf-8518-75d6bde38cbb> (accessed June 2020).
- Jensen, E. (2012) *Fokus på socialøkonomiske virksomheder. Notat om socialøkonomiske virksomheder med beskæftigelsesfremmende og jobskabende formal*, Århus: CABI.
- Lund, A. B. & Sørensen, K. I. (2018) *Komparative Analyser af dansk socialøkonomi: Sorgfrit udkomme & timeligt velvære?*, Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School, Centre for Civic Studies.
- Mazzucato, M. (2013) *The Entrepreneurial State. Debunking Public vs. Private Sector Myths*, London: Anthem Press.
- Ridley-Duff, R., & Bull, M. (2015) *Understanding Social Enterprise: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Schøtt, T. (ed.) (2009) *Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship in Denmark*, Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag.
- Svendsen, G. L. H. & Svendsen, G. T. (2004) *The Creation and Destruction of Social Capital – Entrepreneurship, Co-operative Movements and Institutions*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Thuesen, T., Bach, H. B., Albæk, K., Jensen, S., Hansen, N. L. & Weibel, K. (2013) *Socialøkonomiske virksomheder i Danmark: Når udsatte bliver ansatte*, Copenhagen: The National Research Centre on Welfare, No. 13:23, Institute of Social Research (SFI).
- Titmuss, R. M. (1987) *The Philosophy of Welfare: Selected Writings of Richard M. Titmuss*, Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.