



Enacting entrepreneurship as social value creation

International Small Business Journal
29(2) 135–151
© The Author(s) 2011
Reprints and permission: sagepub.
co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0266242610391936
isb.sagepub.com



Steffen Korsgaard

University of Aarhus

Alistair R. Anderson

The Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen

Abstract

The social plays an important role in entrepreneurship, but one that is not well understood. We argue that the social conditions of entrepreneurs, as well as the social nature of opportunities, affect the entrepreneurial process. Hence it is conceptually useful to understand enterprise as socially situated. Accordingly, this article examines the enactment of a socialized opportunity to explore the process of entrepreneurial growth. We find that a conceptualization of social value creation usefully develops our understanding and challenges the view that economic growth is the only relevant outcome of entrepreneurship. Our case study shows how social value is created in multiple forms at different centres and on different levels: from individual self-realization over community development to broad societal impact. We also find complex interrelations between the different levels and centres, thus, we argue that entrepreneurship is as much a social as an economic phenomenon.

Keywords

enactment, entrepreneurship, growth, social processes, value creation

The purpose of this article is to examine the social, and especially the social value creation, in the entrepreneurial enactment of an opportunity. We argue that the social plays a significant role in entrepreneurship, but one that is not well understood. This lack of understanding is because the social is often treated solely as a background factor, the *ceteris paribus* of the economists. The ensuing focus on economic, personal and technical aspects means that the social in entrepreneurship is often relegated to a conceptual black box, almost a residual. However, in recent years there has been a shift to considering the social. We note how networks and embeddedness (Cope et al., 2007; Jack and Anderson 2002; Jack et al., 2008) have challenged the idea of the solitary entrepreneur (Dodd and Anderson, 2007) and how social capital is seen to play a contributory role (Anderson et al., 2007; Anderson and Jack, 2002; Bowey and Easton, 2007; Casson and Giusta, 2007; Lee and Jones, 2008). Moreover, social constructionist approaches have been enlightening

Corresponding author:

Alistair R. Anderson, The Centre for Entrepreneurship, Aberdeen Business School, The Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen AB10 7QG, UK
E-mail: a.r.anderson@rgu.ac.uk

(Anderson and Smith, 2007; Fletcher, 2006; Steyaert and Katz, 2004) in showing how the social impacts on our understanding of the phenomena. We note too, how the special social circumstances of ethnic and female entrepreneurship have become a focus of explanation (Deakins et al., 2007). Anderson and Miller (2003) have argued that entrepreneurship draws upon the social in two distinct ways. First, because entrepreneurs are a product of their social environment they are conditioned by that environment and may even perceive opportunities as influenced by their social background. Second, each business forms part of a social web of interactions within which the economic elements are conducted. What is missing from all of these studies is an analysis of the social outcomes created in entrepreneurial process, so that the social becomes more than a milieu for enterprise or simply an enabling mechanism. It is our objective to rectify this by examining the social value creation and thereby, increase understanding of the social in entrepreneurship.

We contend that the social is more than context or merely an enabling mechanism. We perceive that entrepreneurship arises from within the social, and that an economic perspective sees only one dimension of opportunity. We claim that entrepreneurship is enacted socially, using socially informed actors to engage within a milieu that can be understood socially. Furthermore, entrepreneurship processes have social outcomes that may well be just as important as the economic outcomes. Thus, we argue that the social plays a role at several different levels of analysis. At the very least, enacting entrepreneurship engages in the social and produces some social outcomes. Accordingly, the examination of entrepreneurial processes should include a focus on the social as an enabler, as context and as outcome. To this end, we examine an unusual entrepreneurial case; the sustainable settlement Friland in rural Denmark. Friland is a settlement of 23 houses and about 70 people which began in 2002 with intense media attention. The case describes the entrepreneurial emergence and development of the sustainable settlement. This revelatory case provides us with considerable theoretical purchase and illustrates the interplay of social, cultural, political and economic actors and factors. We employ the case as a framing device to plot and theorize the social outcomes of the entrepreneurial process on multiple levels.

In entrepreneurship research there has been a strong tendency to see the value being created in entrepreneurship processes as solely economic. As a consequence, when we speak of growth in relation to entrepreneurship we mean economic growth. Growth is regarded as a quintessential aspect of entrepreneurship, but rarely explored in other than economic terms. Our case is theoretically insightful because, at first sight, paradoxically, none of the typical indicators of growth are present. There is no increase in sales, no growth of 'employee' numbers and little evidence of expanding profits. Nonetheless, entrepreneurial growth in some more abstract, yet fundamental forms, is dramatically present. This case thus, allows us to see value created in the process that might be neglected or missed in more conventional examples. Nonetheless, we can still see how an idea is first turned into an opportunity; we see how this opportunity is realized and how it has flourished and grown. Moreover, we can see how the social shapes, forms and engages each aspect of entrepreneurial emergence. Our case illustrates how multiple kinds of outcomes and value are created in the process and that these unfold on several levels. Moreover, there are complex interrelations between them. Taking a social perspective, we are able to show how, as each house has 'grown', so has the village and the local community. But this growth of 'place' is accompanied, indeed accomplished, by a concomitant 'growth' of the individuals involved. This is evident as an increase in skills, but also as a realized self-actualization, a sense of achievement and a sense of being. Ironically, the original motivation for the house builders was to escape from the chains of conventional growth, an emancipation from the pressures of having to earn enough to sustain a conventional lifestyle. Yet, in the context of this entrepreneurial venture, this has resulted in an extraordinary personal growth and the growth of the entire venture. Thus, entrepreneurship has

been enacted socially; this entrepreneurial case shows that we can understand entrepreneurship better by considering the multiple forms of social outcomes. Moreover, given these multiple types of outcomes we no longer need to assign economic growth any form of primacy. This allows us to see growth and firms as means rather than ends in the entrepreneurial process. Thus, we are able to argue that examining social processes may be more useful for understanding entrepreneurship than merely focusing on the economic outcomes of expanding businesses.

Entrepreneurship, growth and value creation

Early entrepreneurial scholars such as Cole (1959) defined entrepreneurship as a purposeful activity to initiate, maintain and grow a profit-oriented business. In 1984, Carland et al. argued that it was growth that distinguished entrepreneurs from small business owners. Similarly, Davidsson (1989) argued that growth was the characteristic of continued entrepreneurship. More recently, Davidsson et al. (2006) asked whether the very concept of entrepreneurship was actually growth. Gartner's (1990) study of how entrepreneurship scholars, practitioners and policy-makers define entrepreneurship also identified growth as an important aspect. Accordingly, growth is considered a defining characteristic of entrepreneurship and the primary outcome of entrepreneurial processes. Moreover, entrepreneurship is also associated with growth in the economy. Certainly Schumpeter (1961), one of the founders of the field, saw a strong link between growth and entrepreneurship. Venkataraman (1997: 133) states that the connection between the individual entrepreneur's profit-seeking behaviour and the creation of social wealth is 'the very *raison d'être* of the field'. To summarize these arguments, it is only because entrepreneurs create growth in the economy as a whole that they become a worthy object of study. Indeed, in many cases growth is seen as the only satisfactory outcome of entrepreneurial activity. So, the relation between entrepreneurship and growth has at least two dimensions: entrepreneurship as driving economic growth generally, and firm growth as an entrepreneurial pursuit and outcome (Wennekers and Thurik, 2004).

The strong focus on growth translates into what Stanworth and Curran (1976) call a growth ideology, where the overall societal goal of growth is translated into a demand that the individual entrepreneur should grow his or her firm. The typical attitude of entrepreneurship researchers is cogently expressed by Wiklund et al. (2003: 266) as a wish to persuade the entrepreneurs to grow. It is argued that:

if relevant information about the positive consequences of growth – and methods to circumvent negative effects – were made available to small-business managers, this could lead to a more positive attitude toward growth.

Indeed, Wiklund et al. (2003) note how the supremacy of the economic motive is taken for granted. Weinzimmer et al. (1998) suggest that entrepreneurship is about economic growth and that growth is seen as a purely economic phenomenon. Economic growth becomes the parameter against which all other relevant issues are measured. In several ways, we can see what Gartner (2001) calls the unstated assumptions about growth, in effect that it is only economic growth that matters.

Nonetheless, there has been some debate as to which measure most adequately represents growth (Delmar et al., 2003; Weinzimmer et al., 1998). For example, Ardichvili et al. (1998) identified growth indicators comprising assets, employment, market share, physical output, profits and sales, but it is significant that this debate unfolds under a general consensus that growth is basically economic growth. This consensus has been challenged sporadically by researchers arguing that researchers and practitioners might have different conceptions of growth (Achtenhagen et al.,

2007) and that growth might not be a goal pursued by all entrepreneurs and therefore, might not be a proper universal performance measure. Indeed, Liao and Welsch (2003) suggest that a common weakness of most growth models is that growth is presented as a desired objective for entrepreneurs. Moreover, even for growth itself, Delmar et al. (2003) argue that it is a multidimensional, not unidimensional, phenomenon, and that not all firms grow in the same way. Indeed, we argue that (economic) growth measures entrepreneurial ventures on a single dimension, thereby making invisible the many other dimensions involved in entrepreneurship (social, personal, spatial, environmental). Yet, entrepreneurship has been seen to produce 'growth' in these areas. For example, Anderson (1998) showed how enterprise can bring about environmental benefits and Schumacher's classic *Small is Beautiful* (1973) argued against getting bigger if it diminished the spiritual dimensions of what it means to be human. At the very least, we note how Wiklund et al. (2003) show that non-economic concerns may be more important than financial outcomes in determining attitudes to growth. If this is the case, the concentration on economic growth may well ignore the critical human and social aspects of the process. This, then, is the area we address in this article. We want to look at the social outcomes of entrepreneurial processes thereby, enhancing our understanding of the social and contextual aspects of entrepreneurial enactment.

Social outcomes of entrepreneurship

We have argued that entrepreneurship is a socio-economic process (Jack et al., 2008; Steyaert and Katz, 2004). As Downing (2005: 196) puts it, 'entrepreneurship, like the rest of social life, is a collaborative social achievement'; thus, the social plays a role in the entire entrepreneurial process. Similarly, context seems important; Johansson (1988) has suggested that social contexts simultaneously contain the ability to constrain entrepreneurship and to catapult entrepreneurs beyond their original contextual boundaries. Accordingly, if entrepreneurship is a multidimensional phenomenon (Gartner, 2001), our conceptualization of the outcomes should mirror that and also be multidimensional. This involves looking for something deeper than what can be seen by positivists (Gartner, 2008). Consequently, a phenomenological approach seems appropriate (Berglund, 2007). By that we mean a phenomenological 'focus', describing what people experience and how it is that they experience what they experience. The basic premise of phenomenology (Cope, 2005) is that human beings cannot be studied in isolation from the world-context (lived-world) in which they interact and live. Our case study provides thick description (Geertz, 1973) upon which to develop our analysis. We focus on value and values as socially enacted, because in the phenomenological tradition, meanings and values are closely related. But also because Anderson (1998) argued that if we reduce entrepreneurship to its essence, we can see that what entrepreneurs do is to create and extract value from a situation. But it is our conventions which may cause us to think of value only in monetary or economic terms; value is a much richer concept. So, we asked: what kinds of value were generated; what relationships exist between things; and what was the role of the social in this?

Methodology

Case studies are often the choice when researching a less well-known phenomenon. As few studies focus on the specifically social outcomes of entrepreneurship, this method is well suited for our purpose. Case studies are likely to generate novel insights, while these insights remain firmly grounded in empirical evidence (Eisenhardt, 1989). A case study embodies a deep understanding of the dynamics of a single setting (Eisenhardt, 1989) but does not invite generalization to other

settings. However, as we have set out to develop the contours of a typology of social outcomes, reflection, exemplification and inspiration are the aims, rather than generalization. The Friland case has been chosen for two reasons. First, the project is a complex entrepreneurial phenomenon incorporating elements of social dynamics, personal development, rural development, environmental and economic sustainability, political processes and media involvement. Accordingly, it incorporates a number of elements that we would find across most entrepreneurial ventures but in a novel setting. Therefore, Friland can be seen as a critical (Patton, 1990) or revelatory case. Second, the availability of data and access to people was very good; the people in and around Friland were very willing to give interviews and telling their stories.

Data collection and analysis

We first came to know Friland through television programmes; but collecting specific data about Friland commenced in 2007 as part of a research project on entrepreneurial processes. First, newspaper articles were read to obtain background knowledge. After initial contact with Steen (one of the original founders of Friland) and Tove (head of the Friland cooperative), we were given permission to collect data at Friland and to interview residents; they also suggested those outside Friland who should be interviewed. All interviews were conducted from October 2007 to June 2008. Because the respondents had differing perspectives, we were able to theoretically triangulate the resulting data.

The interviews were undertaken using an unstructured narrative approach (Mishler, 1986). The purpose of narrative interviews is to elicit a story from the interviewee, describing actual practices and events (Kvale, 1997). Narratives are well suited to yield descriptions of processes as well as values and experiences as they are expressed and enacted in actual practices (Pentland, 1999) and related interdependencies (Smith and Anderson, 2005). The interviews commenced with an initial generative question (Flick, 2006) and were developed with elaborative questions whenever there were events, descriptions or interpretations in the narrative that the researcher felt required further examination. The interviews took between one and two hours, were carried out in Danish, and were transcribed and imported into NVivo 7, where they were coded. Relevant newspaper articles, internet documents and the notes were also added into NVivo 7 and coded using an open coding approach. Codes were established concerning the different goals pursued, types of value created as well as the critical events of the entrepreneurial process of building Friland. A constant comparative method was used for exploring themes and linkages in and across the codes. In essence, the respondents' narratives, largely encountered and delivered in the interviews, provided our 'raw' data. Our preliminary analysis used NVivo to identify recurring patterns in the data. But our own 'sociological' analysis (Watson, 2008) identified these as explanatory themes.

Table 1 describes our respondents.

Friland – an entrepreneurial enactment of sustainable growth

In 1992 Steen, a former organic farmer and folk-school principal started by building a sustainable house using only local and unprocessed construction materials – a straw house. As well as being environmentally sustainable, Steen wanted this house to be economically sustainable in the sense that it would leave him debt-free and without a mortgage. He succeeded and actually turned his house, and his ideas about society, into an attraction such that people would come from all over the country to hear him speak and see the house. Elsewhere, the television reporter Anton was looking for people to portray in a television series about idealists. He heard about Steen, who fitted

Table 1. Data Sources

Interviews:		
Name	Role	Resident at Friland?
Tove	Head of the Board of the Cooperative of Friland	Yes
Steen	One of the original founders, former head of the Board of the Cooperative of Friland	Yes
Anton (interviewed twice)	One the original founders of Friland, at the time employed by DR	No
Helle	Head of Friland Erhverv	Yes
Jonna	Former head of the Board of the Cooperative of Friland	Yes
Lars	Resident at Friland	Yes
Peter	Rural Dean (Provost) of Feldballe parish	No
Jørgen	Politician closely involved in the political process when Friland was established in Rønne Municipality	No

Additional data:
 Television programmes: *Manden i huset* (The Man in the House), *Halmhuset* (The Straw-bale house), *Nybyggerne* (The Pioneers), *Friland tager imod* (Friland Invites) and *Frilandshuset* (The Friland House).
 Newspaper articles sourced through the Infomedia database and internet documents.

the bill perfectly. This resulted in a television programme *Manden i huset* (The Man in the House), which, in terms of ratings, was a great success on national television and was repeated several times. This programme was the beginning of a long friendship and collaboration between Steen and Anton. In the following years Steen wanted to do more in terms of sustainable building, but had grown disillusioned with the Danish grassroots community. He turned to Anton and together they created a three-episode television programme *Halmhuset* (The Straw Bale House) about building a small house with straw bales for €2000 (US \$2500). Again the programmes were popular and paved the way for the large-scale project of Friland. Steen and Anton wanted to elevate the ideas of environmental and economic sustainability from individual to community level, to build an entire small village based on these ideas. Given the success of the TV programmes, DR (the national Danish TV company) agreed to support the project and broadcast it on TV, radio and the internet.

The next step was to convince a municipality to house the project. Five municipalities were contacted and, of these, Rønne was the most eager and cooperative. A location north of Aarhus, near the village of Feldballe in western Denmark, was chosen and, with strong local support, the location proved a good choice. Recruiting participants was easy; the publicity and connections that Steen had built up produced a stream of applicants who wanted to build and live in these sustainable houses in this rural location. In selecting participants, a number of criteria were observed. The applicants had first to be able to build their house without a loan. Second, they had to have a plan for a business that they would start at their new home. Furthermore, a mixture of ages and occupations (knowledge workers, craftsmen and culture-workers) was sought. The settlement was organized as a housing cooperative, which would own the land, and the residents would buy the right to use the lot. The residents, as members of the cooperative, were thus obliged to act and build in accordance with its constitution, which incorporated the formal ambitions and purposes of Friland. The aspirations for Friland, especially the differences between the different groups and people

involved, provide a good starting point for analysing growth and development. In the following section we consider the different perceptions, at different levels, of the value and values that it was envisaged would be generated within Friland.

Aspirations, social actors and social agendas

It is useful to consider the goals of the organization and its actors as a starting point for understanding entrepreneurial growth. But we are advised to be cautious. Sarasvathy points out that ‘entrepreneurs’ goals are assumed to be either homogenous in the sense of some optimization problem (usually profit maximization) or else are assumed to be collapsible into some well-specified ordering that can be smoothly mapped’ (2004: 521). Indeed Hebert and Link (1989) suggest that the historical record on the nature and goals of the entrepreneur is so diverse that it has failed to yield a clear-cut and unambiguous operational concept. So, in spite of the taken-for-granted assumptions of the literature, we should not be surprised to find diversity in objectives.

The ‘official’ goals of Friland are found in the constitution of the cooperative, as displayed in Table 2.

These organizational aspirations seem straightforward; they want to set up an ‘example’ of sustainable development using alternative technologies and promote it through the media. There is an undercurrent of a social ideology about freedom from debt and sustainability, but one which incorporates the idea of business as a means of achievement. Interestingly, it does not have much to say about the processes or people.

But when we listen to what the key actors say, they tell us much more about social processes.

Then Anton comes along and says he thinks this is interesting. And that he would like to make [a] TV [programme] about it. And I can see, maybe that’s not so crazy. Also because I felt that I was in good hands with Anton. [...] And I say, we’re about to make a reality show, but why not about a reality that is different? And it mustn’t be about this personal rubbish. But looking [at it] concretely [...] how do you do it? How can we make another world, on some other conditions? And we agreed that it would be exciting. [...] And I could see that maybe we could use this to appeal [...] more widely. Also because in my approach to this there is a political vision. (Steen)

Clearly Steen wants to promote his views and expertise and sees the development of Friland as a means to this end. But Anton, the television producer, elaborates:

It is sustainability in society. You could almost say it’s the most important thing in our world. So therefore it’s an important message. [...] And if we want to make a contribution to that, through Friland, well it has to be a contribution that’s appealing to people. (Anton)

Table 2. The Purpose of Friland

To display a sustainable practice for building and behaviour and avoid creating unnecessary garbage.
To develop a lifestyle where there is balance between hand, mind and heart, and inform people about this in cooperation with, among others, Denmark’s Radio.
To facilitate the establishment of independent businesses. The intention is that at least one member per plot becomes an independent business owner, and that the business is run from the plot.
To establish a living and business area that is not based on debt and subsidies.
To develop the simple and transparent at the same time as choosing the technologies that support the purpose of the cooperative.

Steen and Anton saw (and still see) Friland as a socio-political project in the sense that they wanted to oppose some of the dominant developments in western society by creating a social space where these developments were counteracted. Friland is meant to lead by example in a movement towards a more sustainable society. Accordingly, they plan to use Friland to promote a political purpose. The value of Friland for them is the promotion of their values about a sustainable society.

DR, another important stakeholder, saw things in the same way, but in the enactment process and its media presentation:

The purpose of DR Friland is – in cooperation with the residents at Friland – to create an experiment for sustainable building and business development for rural villages. A place where we work with buildings that leave people with less debt – and therefore hopefully more freedom and opportunities to work with what they want – including becoming a freelancer or to start their own business. Low-tech because the houses that we portray the building of are built primarily with unprocessed natural materials. High-tech because we show how the residents at Friland use ICT to organize in new and better ways in relation to work, family and community. With a debt-free self-built house in natural materials we provide an example of how the people in the village of the future can create a local power centre in the information society. We will show how the rural districts can share in the digital development. DR Friland is the villages' response to Ørestaden [a large, prestigious and expensive – €175m – Danish high-tech development near Copenhagen]. (Friland website, 2008)

But others saw different aspects of value:

It was that it had to be something that signalled longevity. Longevity in the project. [...] Steen really emphasized that. We demand that they bring capital, we demand that you go in and start a kind of business. They really demanded a lot from the people moving in. It wasn't just for anybody that needed a place to live. (Jørgen)

So we can see that Friland made significant demands upon the prospective residents in achieving its aspirations. But the potential value was also seen and presented in different ways, by the local mayor for example:

This is business development. It will create life out here. Pull some development to the municipality. The western part, with Rønne and Ugelbølle [other cities in the municipality] are becoming the Whisky-belt of Århus. But the eastern part, where Feldballe is situated, is just as quiet as other rural areas. But the silence will not continue. (Mayor Vilfred Friberg Hansen, in *Jyllands Posten*, 21 October 2001)

Already we see a diversity of social aspirations. The television company saw value in the public interest in the spectacle of Friland; Anton and Steen saw the value in the political statement. In contrast, the local mayor saw the value of development in business and regional terms.

But others saw personal or family values as the main focus:

It occurs to us that with this solution [moving to Friland] everything falls into place ... Jens Peter will build, as he dreams of doing, and I will get my company started. We can see each other a lot more. The kids can spend more time with us... (Helle, in *Jyllands Posten*, 29 December 2002)

There's a third thing, and that's the whole time issue. To have more time for your family, your loved ones, your neighbours, and your life. I'm sure that's very important in the little homes here. (Tove)

Among the residents in Friland private goals proliferated. However, the values associated with these goals all centred on the notion that living debt-free would create the financial independence

needed to have more time for the family and for achieving personal goals and dreams. The dreams would be articulated by starting a business, but one with social aspirations. For example, Helle's business was to offer Polynesian massages, perhaps unlikely to succeed in a conventional way in the rural setting, but one that satisfies a driving ambition. For these residents, Friland becomes a family project, paving the way for an improved family life, where parents have more time for the children as well as a personal project creating financial space to enact their dreams.

In exploring these goals for Friland, interesting findings emerge. First, a great many kinds of value are expected to be generated through Friland. As an example of rural development, Friland is expected to generate economic, social and cultural value in the local area of Feldballe. Importantly, the prospective residents of Friland expect Friland to generate value by creating space and time for their self-actualization as individuals and families. Note how goals were formulated in more than one place, so that there are multiple centres of goal-formulation. The original founders of Friland formulated a very ambitious and highly political goal for Friland, but stakeholders in and around Friland interpret this goal and make their own version of it; adding other goals, highlighting some aspects, downplaying others. Interestingly, each seems to highlight different sorts of values as well. Consequently determining the success of Friland becomes a very difficult task, should one wish to undertake it. Success parameters proliferate across levels and centres and, as we will see below, the goals for Friland also change over time. Despite this diversity of goals, we note how each goal represents some sort of social aspiration articulated as a value formation. We can organize the aspirations of the different centres of goal-formulation as different levels (see Table 3), but note how some are functional, ends in themselves, but most are instrumental as a means to different ends. All, however, can be interpreted as social.

Growing Friland – discussion and evidence

Stating goals at the outset of an entrepreneurial venture is one thing, but actually achieving them and growing the venture is quite another. In the following, we record the kinds of value created in and around Friland and how they have grown as a result of the social interactions of the initiators and the residents who built Friland.

Table 3. Levels and Values

Level		Values
Societal level	Friland as a political project, impacting society by presenting an example of sustainable living.	Sustainability (but challenging some conventions of growth)
	Friland as an example of how development can be created in rural areas.	Instrumentality (growth in the rural)
Community level	Friland will create development in the Feldballe area, both business-wise and culturally. And will do so in the long run.	Local growth, sustainable growth But growth as the residents see appropriate
Personal/family level	Friland as a way of making more time for the family and for achieving personal dreams and goals.	Growth of the self (existential) Development of the family as an institution Self-actualization through business

Growing in numbers

The physical growth of Friland is dramatically evident from the TV images of growth from a bare cornfield to the village with 12 completed houses. Visiting Friland today you will see building activity on a further 11 lots: phase two. Friland has grown from a field to a settlement with houses built or being built on 23 lots; a final phase three is expected to be launched at some future point. The number of people residing in Friland has grown from 0 to around 70 adults and children; Friland has become a social entity.

Value has been created and grown for stakeholders outside Friland. By 2006, DR had produced more than 100 TV programmes from Friland, as well as radio and internet content. The project has created significant value for DR, and also presumably for the many viewers that have watched the shows. Completing the programmes after three and a half years was planned from the outset. The idea was that within three years the programmes would have been able to follow the building of the houses and the starting up of the new businesses thereby, generating insight into what living debt-free actually meant for the participants. However, three and a half years was not nearly enough time.

Maybe that's where the ambitions might have been too high. Because we thought that the whole dimension with starting a company would take off earlier. It's turned out that people have taken a very long time to build the houses (laughs). (Anton)

So, despite the large number of TV shows produced, the content of the programmes, the value created for DR has not been quite as high as expected.

Creating economic value

According to our data, which is probably not complete on this issue, at least two types of financial income have been generated through Friland. First, the guided tours have generated income for the group of residents who provide them. Each visitor pays the equivalent of €8 to take the tour which are generally well attended. When we visited on an ordinary Sunday in September 2007, about 25 people attended generating some €200. Furthermore, some of the residents are paid to give talks around the country on issues related to Friland. Here the fact that they live in Friland is part of the value of the talk so, the concept and spectacle of Friland generates economic value.

Also, the companies started at Friland generate income; for many of these companies it is significant that they would not be able to survive if the owner had to meet conventional living expenses. The revenue needed from the company is lower than is normally the case; several of these companies build on Friland in some way. One example is a resident whose company builds Finish Heating Ovens (an eco-friendly Scandinavian heating system), a skill that he acquired during the building process at Friland. Others make a living building and teaching about straw-bale houses, skills either acquired or refined at Friland using it as part of their 'branding'.

The development of the Friland businesses has not yet grown as hoped with only a few new ventures having been started. Some examples can be found of businesses that have actually created direct value in Feldballe; for example, a Friland-based catering company started delivering healthy food to the local school. Such projects seem to epitomize the notion of creating value of all kinds in the local community. Nonetheless, our informants at Friland have noted that the business side of Friland is now beginning to stir as, most of the Frilanders in phase one have more or less completed

building their houses. Therefore, plans for the five plots assigned to business (Friland Erhverv), are now beginning to form although five plots remain conspicuously empty, it is too early to say what will happen.

Adding value in the community

Friland has helped the local community in Feldballe to grow. Although there are a few concerns about whether the contribution has yet lived up to expectations, people in and around Friland claim it has made a positive impact in the local community.

Well, the people at Friland take an active part in the school, the local associations, they help to keep local grocery shop alive. They helped increase the number of inhabitants in Feldballe in a way that would not have happened if it hadn't been for Friland. I think that's reasonably clear. (Anton)

And since it's proven to be a really good idea because people have come in, and they're strong people taking initiative, affecting the local community in a positive way. And it's actually become quite well known out here, because there were all these TV programmes from here. (Jørgen)

Societal impact

As indicated above, many people have become acquainted with Friland, either through TV or having visited. Therefore, so far as informing people about this way of life – the combining of freedom from debt and environmental sustainability – some success can be seen. Whether it has made any real impact is more difficult to assess. Anton raises some doubt about the impact of Friland, mostly because of the aesthetic impression (or lack thereof) that Friland gives.

That way, if we transfer this to other struggling villages, then it [Friland] might have been a better option for other villages than it is today, because they haven't gotten the aesthetic side of it sorted out. (Anton)

When the second author first visited Friland, he was struck by how each house was different; some were small, some large, but each seemed to make some idiosyncratic statement of style. Some had long, free-flowing, sweeping roof lines, others were sharply angular. Although each house was stylistically distinctive, there was a thread of continuity in the home-spun look which indicated a sense of community. However, the aesthetics of the village were marred by the untidy clutter that surrounded many of the houses. Although some had very productive gardens, the jumble of materials stored for reuse – windows, doors and old wood for fuel, all things that might someday prove useful – demonstrated more of a working village than an aesthetic delight.

Anton also has some reservations about how well the original political goals have been met:

It's just that one Friland, and that's the one out there. And, all right they're happy to be there, and that's fine; we've created a place for some people that have a good life, and there's nothing bad about that, but I think that both Steen's and mine, and also Dorthea Armfred's [Steen's girlfriend at the time, who was much involved in the internal organization of Friland] ambitions were a bit bigger. (Anton)

Nonetheless, according to our most recent talks with Anton, some other rural municipalities are now beginning to take an interest in Friland as a way of getting people to move to rural areas. But again it is too early to say where this development is going.

The personal experience

Needless to say, moving to Friland has changed the lives of the Frilanders radically. Qualitative changes have occurred in the way they live and the way they think and feel. The process has given valuable experiences, knowledge and skills. Many of these could be considered as personal growth:

Basically, we're on the right way. We're not as far along as we would have wanted, but other things have come from living so close [in two house trailers while building the house]. We feel, for example, much stronger now that we are parents. (Helle)

No, we're a new cooperative, and we're 24 adult lot-owners. That gives a lot of questions and ideas, we have each brought our own ideas. And sometimes the sparks really fly. Our personal growth has been really tops, because we've really been through some things. Our strength is that we're as diverse as possible. It's the diversity that creates the bloom. (Jonna in *So Far So Good*, episode 3)

Traditionally it's as if life doesn't begin until your house is finished. But we've chosen to live in the middle of it and ignore the mess. Instead we focus on family life, building and starting up a company. (Helle)

Some have had negative experiences with the Friland process to the extent that they have left the area. While we expect this is normal in any settlement such as Friland, it could be argued that for these people Friland may have generated negative value. As demonstrated above and in the previous sections, personal value has been created in many forms. Perhaps foremost is the value of having built a low-cost house to live in and reduced living expenses. As we saw, many perceived this as providing freedom to pursue other things; furthermore, for those who have started a company (that makes some money) financial value has been created. We note too, how skills have been acquired in the process of building a house and new life; these skills are valuable in themselves, but, for some, have been transformed into other kinds of value. Finally, experiences and knowledge have been acquired in the process, resulting for most in an enhanced quality of life and self-actualization. Interestingly, the actual building of the houses generated benefits that the participants had not anticipated; they found that the family team effort, working together on the construction tasks, bound them much closer as a family. Moreover, considerable satisfaction was gained actually doing the work for themselves, and by themselves. This was in spite of the poor living conditions that many endured during the construction, and in spite of the time that it took to complete each house.

Multiple types of value created

Our analysis of Friland clearly shows that there are multiple types of value created. We did find some economic outcomes in that new companies were started which generated income for the owner. Also, money was made from Friland itself through talks and guided tours. Yet, these kinds of value are completely outshone by non-economic values; as we have seen, Friland has created value on a personal level in terms of skills, knowledge and experiences, with these values highly rated by the residents. Indeed, much more than was the case with the economic values. For the stakeholders outside Friland, we saw that value was being created in the local community, as well as in society. We can see that perhaps some of the ambitions have been too high, and Friland has, until now, not quite lived up to the expectations of some stakeholders. Nonetheless, we note multiple centres of value creation. The individuals and the households at Friland are centres of value creation. But Friland as an entity itself creates value; it has grown, not just in the very tangible

sense that houses have been built, but also in the more intangible sense, where the residents draw value from and give value to the community they have built. Therefore Friland is clearly a centre of social value creation.

Finally, we find that in the complex interactions between Friland and the local community in Feldballe, as well as the surrounding society, value is created. Although these interactions play out through individuals (and we clearly see that some are more active in this than others) the value generated arises largely from the fact that individuals act as mediators (Latour, 2005) in the interaction between Friland and the local community. These interactions form other centres of value creation; but note how the centres of value creation diversify into different levels. Friland was from the outset expected to create value on the levels of the individual, community and society. We have found that value has indeed been created at all these three levels, although not entirely in the way or as much as expected.

Measuring, or even just making some determination of the 'success' of Friland, is not a straightforward matter. Having found multiple centres of goal formulation along with multiple types and centres of value creation, we would need to ask: success for whom and by what standard? These sorts of questions cannot be easily addressed at any sort of universal level; but imposing the typical universal success standard of entrepreneurship, economic growth, simply ignores the multiplicity of values sought after and created.

Relations between types of value created

Looking at the different types, centres and levels of value creation, it is evident that they are interconnected. The specifics of the connections however, are much harder to sort out. Some relations are synergetic, in the sense that one type of growth is conducive to others. We have found examples of such synergetic relations in the that case of experiences and skills learned through building the house have been conducive, if not decisive, to the emergence and growth of companies at Friland. We have also seen examples of this relation extending to the local community, where companies have added value to the Feldballe community. Looking into the future, some informants have suggested that, as more and more companies get started, the societal value created by Friland as an example of rural development may increase. Moreover, the value created for the individual residents at Friland in terms of experiences and skills is in many cases, reinvested into Friland, as the residents often come together to help each other in their building processes. A synergetic circle is, in some cases, established in the sense that the value extracted by individuals in the community building process is re-invested into the community of Friland. We have seen this primarily where stakeholders share the same ambitions but when ambitions collide, we have found examples of counteractive relations between types of value created.

The initial political goals for Friland, set up by the founders Steen and Anton, have yet to be fulfilled. Anton gives a possible explanation; he argues that because Friland does not give out an aesthetic image that is appealing to the broader public, it has not generated the impact hoped for. But why has this aesthetic dimension not been realized? It is not for want of Anton's trying, but because it clashes with some of the other centres of value creation. The slow processual development of Friland, resulting in a permanently 'messy' and 'still under construction' appearance is a source of value creation for some of the residents. We see in this example, how certain types of value creation may counteract other types. And this, in turn, shows how value creation too has different facets that may be contradictory at different levels.

Certainly, the complex relations between types, centres and levels of value creation hold the key to understanding growth as a processual phenomenon. So, we find, in the Friland case, that there is

a synergetic interplay between individual and communal levels of growth, while these dynamics perhaps have yet to translate fully into growth at a societal level. But this is a process, and whether this will come about in the future remains to be seen. Informants expect that more successful businesses will make Friland more attractive as an example of rural development, perhaps regardless of the aesthetic impression given by the housing stock. But then again, perhaps the aesthetics of Friland will grow as the development matures.

Conclusions

We set out to explore the concept of entrepreneurial growth in an unusual context. In contrast to an economic perspective, we argued that entrepreneurship is enacted in a socialized context and produces social outcomes. We employed the creation of social value as a means of understanding outcomes. In our unusual case, we found many rich examples of social value creation that suggest that considering only the single dimension of economic growth as outcome overlooks some critical aspects. Neglecting these aspects seems to reduce our understanding of the phenomenon of entrepreneurship. We found value created on multiple dimensions; in a horizontal sense, where we find different types of social value created; and in a vertical sense, where different centres of value creation spread across different levels, from individual to societal level. We found that these dimensions of value creation are interrelated in complex ways. Some types of value creation are conducive to others, while others inhibit them. The interrelations between the types of value creation are, presumably, unique to each individual venture. However, it is clear to us, having examined the Friland case, that it is in these interrelations that we can find out more about entrepreneurship as a social and processual phenomenon. We note how value creation could be seen in, and related to, the private and public, with internal and external dimensions. On the one hand, the private skills and satisfaction of residents, and their enjoyment of life and family expanded; and, for Anton and Steen, in the sense of fulfilling ambition, it all came together in the entrepreneurial project. On the other hand, on the public side, we saw not only the growth in public interest but also growth in the value created in the local settings.

Finally, we found that apart from the growth of Friland as an entity, it is perhaps first and foremost, a medium for value creation. All of the above seems to confirm that the social is a viable and useful framework for examining and understanding entrepreneurship. We saw that enterprise was drawn from the social, in the sense that new ecological values are embedded in social change; thus, the opportunity of Friland emerged socially. We saw that the way this opportunity was enacted involved several levels of social participation. Moreover, the enactment, as a television spectacle, as a community development, invoked the social at many different levels. Such was the involvement with the social that Friland would simply not have happened without these different interacting layers of social engagement.

This last point seems particularly significant when considering more conventional enterprises. We saw that the business of Friland was the medium for value creation. While the growth of Friland was an end in itself, much of the growth that we found was in different areas, so that Friland was actually the means of social value creation. If we consider a conventional business, looking at only the growth of the business in terms of increased profits, staff or sales, we may miss the reasons and social processes of why the business has grown and the ways in which it has grown. So, we argue that if we are to understand entrepreneurship better, we need to look at social process, content and outcomes, not just the ends but the means, which might become, as they did in the Friland case, desirable ends in themselves.

We have demonstrated how entrepreneurship is as much social as economic. If we had employed conventional techniques of trying to measure economic growth, we would not have seen very much. But our conceptual standpoint allowed us to observe the many levels where value creation occurred, and to plot some of the social dynamics between these levels. We must finally acknowledge the caveats in this article. The case was unique; although entrepreneurial, it may have had specific qualities that limit our ability to generalize to other enterprises. Our analysis was a subjective interpretation and others might interpret our findings differently. Nonetheless, as a revelatory case, it provided rich data, deeply embedded in the life-world of our respondents. Thus we believe that even if there is disagreement with our findings, we have at least raised some interesting issues about the conceptualization of entrepreneurship as a social phenomenon.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Achtenhagen L, Melin L and Naldi L (2007) Do practitioners and scholars really talk about the same things when they say ‘business growth’? Paper presented at AGSE Conference, Australia.
- Anderson A and Jack S (2002) The articulation of social capital in entrepreneurial networks: A glue or a lubricant? *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 14(3): 193–210.
- Anderson A, Park J and Jack S (2007) Entrepreneurial social capital: Conceptualizing social capital in new high-tech firms. *International Small Business Journal* 25(3): 245–272.
- Anderson AR (1998) Cultivating the Garden of Eden: Environmental entrepreneurship. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 11(2): 135–144.
- Anderson AR and Miller CJ (2003) ‘Class matters’: Human and social capital in the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of Socio-Economics* 32(1): 17–36.
- Anderson AR and Smith R (2007) The moral space in entrepreneurship: An exploration of ethical imperatives and the moral legitimacy of being enterprising. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 19(6): 479–497.
- Ardichvili A, Cardozo S, Harmon S and Vadakath S (1998) Towards a theory of new venture growth. Paper presented at Babson Entrepreneurial Research Conference, Ghent, June.
- Berglund H (2007) Researching entrepreneurship as lived experience. In: Neergaard H and Ulhøi JP (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods in Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 75–93.
- Bowey JL and Easton G (2007) Entrepreneurial social capital unplugged. *International Small Business Journal* 25(3): 273–306.
- Carland JW, Hoy F, Boulton WR and Carland JAC (1984) Differentiating entrepreneurs from small business owners: A conceptualization. *Academy of Management Review* 9(2): 354–359.
- Casson M and Giusta MD (2007) Entrepreneurship and social capital: Analysing the impact of social networks on entrepreneurial activity from a rational action perspective. *International Small Business Journal* 25(3): 220–244.
- Cole AH (1959) *Business Enterprise in Its Social Setting*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cope J (2005) Researching entrepreneurship through phenomenological inquiry. *International Small Business Journal* 23(2): 163–189.
- Cope J, Jack S and Rose MB (2007) Social capital and entrepreneurship: An introduction. *International Small Business Journal* 25(3): 213–219.
- Davidsson P (1989) Entrepreneurship – and after? A study of growth willingness in small firms. *Journal of Business Venturing* 4(3): 211–226.
- Davidsson P, Delmar F and Wiklund J (2006) *Entrepreneurship and the Growth of Small Firms*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Deakins D, Ishaq M, Smallbone D, Whittam G and Wyper J (2007) Ethnic minority businesses in Scotland and the role of social capital. *International Small Business Journal* 25(3): 307–326.
- Delmar F, Davidsson P and Gartner WB (2003) Arriving at the high-growth firm. *Journal of Business Venturing* 18(2): 189–216.
- Dodd SD and Anderson AR (2007) Mumpsimus and the mything of the individualistic entrepreneur. *International Small Business Journal* 25(4): 341–360.
- Downing S (2005) The social construction of entrepreneurship: Narrative and dramatic processes in the coproduction of organizations and identities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 29(2): 185–204.
- Eisenhardt KM (1989) Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review* 14(4): 532–551.
- Fletcher DE (2006) Entrepreneurial processes and the social construction of opportunity. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 18(5): 421–440.
- Flick U (2006) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE.
- Friland website (2008) Available at: <http://www.dr.dk/DR2/Friland/Frilandskanalen/2002/20060102142056.htm>.
- Gartner WB (1990) What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship? *Journal of Business Venturing* 5(1): 15–29.
- Gartner WB (2001) Is there an elephant in entrepreneurship? Blind assumptions in theory development. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 25(4): 27–39.
- Gartner WB (2008) Entrepreneurship—hop. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 32(2): 361–368.
- Geertz C (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hebert RF and Link AN (1989) In search of the meaning of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics* 1(1): 39–49.
- Jack S, Dodd SD and Anderson AR (2008) Change and the development of entrepreneurial networks over time: A processual perspective. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 20(2): 125–159.
- Jack SL and Anderson AR (2002) The effects of embeddedness on the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of Business Venturing* 17(5): 467–487.
- Johannisson B (1988) Business formation – A network approach. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 4(3-4): 83–99.
- Jyllands Posten* (A national Danish newspaper), 21 October 2001 and 29 December 2002.
- Kvale S (1997) *InterView*. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Latour B (2005) *Reassembling the Social*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee R and Jones O (2008) Networks, communication and learning during business start-up: The creation of cognitive social capital. *International Small Business Journal* 26(5): 559–594.
- Liao J and Welsch H (2003) Social capital and entrepreneurial growth aspiration: A comparison of technology- and non-technology-based nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of High Technology Management Research* 14(1): 149–170.
- Mishler EG (1986) *Research Interviewing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Patton MQ (1990) *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Pentland BT (1999) Building process theory with narrative: From description to explanation. *Academy of Management Review* 24(4): 711–724.
- Sarasvathy SD (2004) Making it happen: Beyond theories of the firm to theories of firm design. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 28(6): 519–531.
- Schumacher EF (1973) *Small Is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*. London: Bland and Briggs.
- Schumpeter JA (1961) *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stanworth MJK and Curran J (1976) Growth and the small firm: An alternative view. *Journal of Management Studies* 13(1): 95–110.
- Steyaert C and Katz J (2004) Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: Geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 16(3): 179–196.
- Smith R and Anderson AR (2005) The devil is in the *e-tale*: Form and structure in the entrepreneurial narrative. In: Hjorth D and Steyaert C (eds) *Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Entrepreneurship*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, 125–143.

- Venkataraman S (1997) The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research: An editor's perspective. In: Katz J and Brockhaus R (eds) *Advances in Entrepreneurship*. New York: JAI Press, 119–138.
- Watson TJ (2008) Sociology, narrative and discourse. In: Bargiela-Chiappini F (ed.) *The Handbook of Business Discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 226–238.
- Weinzimmer LG, Nystrom PC and Freeman SJ (1998) Measuring organizational growth: Issues, consequences and guidelines. *Journal of Management* 24(2): 235–263.
- Wennekers S and Thurik R (2004) Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Small Business Economics* 13(1): 27–56.
- Wiklund J, Davidsson P and Delmar F (2003) What do they think and feel about growth? An expectancy-value approach to small business managers' attitudes toward growth. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 27(3): 247–271.

Steffen Korsgaard is Assistant Professor at the Department of Management, Aarhus University. His research interests include entrepreneurial processes, opportunities and the social aspects of entrepreneurship. His work has been accepted in *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* and *Journal of Enterprising Communities*.

Alistair R. Anderson is director of the Centre for Entrepreneurship at Aberdeen Business School, Robert Gordon University. He also has honorary and visiting positions at Aarhus Business School, Aberdeen University and Lancaster University. After trying his hand at entrepreneurship, he became interested in trying to understand how small business and entrepreneurs operate. His research interests include the social aspects of entrepreneurship: the social constructions of entrepreneurship, networking and social capital.