EMES CONFERENCES

SELECTED PAPERS SERIES

2nd EMES International Conference on Social Enterprise

Trento (Italy) - July 1-4, 2009

SOCIAL EXCLUSION
- AN ANALYTICAL ASPECT OF THE SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

Ulrika Levander
Department of Social Work, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

CONTENTS

1. SOCIAL EXCLUSION

In recent years the tendency to conceptualize disadvantaged positions in society in terms of "social exclusion" has gained acceptance in political as well as theoretical discourse (Steinert 2003a:5, Gilbert 2002:66). According to Esping-Andersen (2002:2), today's preoccupation of "social exclusion" very much seems like an echo of the "social question" that permeated the political debate in the early 1900s. Apart from being endorsed as a central issues of concern in current social policy of the European Union, combating social exclusion today also appears as a focal point in several of the Union's member states (Levitas 2004:43, Giddens 1998:116, Bullen & Kenway, 2000: 443, Schierup 2000:186f, Martin 2004:87, Byrne 2005:53, Steinert 2003b:45). Schierup (2000:187) refers the impact of "social exclusion" in contemporary political discourse to the concept's compromising power, which helps to bridge the gaps between different political traditions within the Union. When a social dimension of the European Union's policy was launched in the early 1980's, the concept of social exclusion was predominantly linked within a framework, which saw poverty as a wider pattern of social inequality, and which could be solved only by a substantial redistribution of resources and by an extension of citizenship rights. However, in the mid 1990's, the meaning of social exclusion was re-defined within the European Union, and was comprehended in terms of labour market exclusion rather than poverty. The overall social policy of the Union – as well as the concept "social exclusion" – has in recent years also come to be associated to the Anglo-American liberal tradition of economic efficiency, governmental retreat and low welfare-costs. A similar ideological turn has not only inspired the New Labour government in Britain. Since the early 2000's it has also shown a predominant impact on policy in social democratic regimes like Sweden (Schierup 2000:183f, 187f, Gilbert 2002, Steinert 2003a:5, Levitas 2004:44, Percy-Smith 2000:2 in Martin 2004:87, Byrne 2005:2, Sahlin & Machado 2008:176).

1.1. A strong and a weak version

In Great Britain a number of social policy scholars have studied the concept of social exclusion and its semantic shifts within the domestic policy (Levitas 1998, 2004, Fairclough 2000, Bullen & Kenway 2000, Byrne 2005, Koller & Davidsson 2008). In analyzing the changes, several scholars refer to a "strong" and a "weak" version of social exclusion (Byrne 2005:4-5, Martin 2004:80, Steinert 2003a:5). The focal point of the strong version is to identify actors causing exclusion in society, and hence it focuses on solutions that can reduce the ability to exclude. The weak version, on the other hand, is predominantly concerned with deficiencies of the excluded ones. Rather than to focus on the process of the wider society, and the extension of citizenship rights, the emphasis within the weak version is on changing the attitudes of the excluded and poor ones, in order to enhance their possibilities to be included in society (Veit-Wilson 1998:45 in Byrne 2005, Martin 2004:81f, Levitas 2004:44).

Ruth Levitas (2004:44f) identifies three different discourses of "social exclusion", in which different meanings of the concept are implied. The strong discourse of "social exclusion" is comparable to a discourse that Levitas calls *the redistributive discourse*, which was increasingly used in critical social policy throughout the 1980s and 1990s to capture the multidimensional consequences of poverty and the dynamic processes involved. In the mid 1990s a *social integrationist discourse* can be identified in the English-language version of EC policy documents on exclusion. Here, the opposite of social exclusion is integration rather than inclusion, and the means of social integration is participation in paid work. Thus, the solution is

presented in terms of labour market participation (Levitas 2004:44, Schierup 2000:192). In the third discourse, *the moral underclass discourse*, social exclusion is used as a substitute not for poverty or non-employment, but for the underclass. According to Levitas (ibid.) this discourse does not address overall inequalities. Rather, it presents the socially excluded as morally distinct from the rest of the society. Here, benefit payments become a moral hazard encouraging dependency.

In a discourse analysis of policy-documents produced by the British New Labour to facilitate inclusion, Koller and Davidson (2008) approach "social exclusion" from a metaphorical point of view. Originally, in it's strong version, the society is metaphorically portrayed as a ladder. However, in the weak version, the society is metaphorically depicted as a bounded space. The metaphor of "social exclusion", portraying society as a bounded space, shapes a dichotomous model. Here, citizens can occupy only two possible positions: they are either inside or outside the society. In this model, the outside is inevitably positioned as a problematic state. In being dichotomous this metaphor also tends to make inequalities and potential exploitative social relations within society invisible (Steinert 2003b:45, Koller & Davidson 2008:308, 326).

Moreover, Fairclough (2000:54) and Koller and Davidson (2008:320-22) prove that the weak version of "social exclusion" tends to be abstracted into a permanent state of exclusion. Active verb forms, such as "we exclude them", are entirely missing in the discourse of social exclusion utilized by New Labour (Koller & Davidsson 2008:324). Hereby "social exclusion" is nominalized, and turned into a noun, which signifies a transformation of the concept into an inherent state, that can then itself become the focus of cultural attention and manipulation (Fairclough 1992:182f). Through nominalization agency, and as a consequence responsibility, can be disguised. In the case of social exclusion, the excluding process is made invisible. Instead, the agency and the possibility to act, is situated on the individuals that are categorized as excluded. Another effect of nominalization is that "social exclusion" is conceptualized as a target for action. Discourse producers, articulating the weak version of social exclusion, can hereby construct themselves as problem-solvers, addressing the now tangible "social exclusion" by various social policies (Fairclough 1992:182f, 2000, Byrne 2005:56, Koller & Davidson 2008:314). The voices addressing issues of social exclusion in the public debates are almost always positioned "within" society. Hence, they represent "the included" people. Koller and Davidson (2008:313f) show how nominalized phrases such as "the most socially excluded" are frequent in contemporary discourse, while corresponding *intensifiers* for the "socially included" are absent. There are no such things as "the most included ones" in our current way of speaking. Thus, to become "an insider" appears as the endpoint of a goal-directed movement in the weak version of "exclusion" (Koller & Davidsson 2008:313, 322f, Levitas 2004: 47f, 1996). According to Gilbert (2002:179f) the measures currently introduced to counteract social exclusion are presented as important social improvements, although they actually constitute dramatic reductions of the welfare state. The danger – an quality – with the interdiscursive facet of the concept "social exclusion", Martin (2004:88) and Levitas (2004) claim, is that the term may be used by policy makers to endorse ideas of the underclass discourse as a new label for negative claims about individual agency, which could reinforce political incentives.

In recent years the Swedish term "utanförskap" (approx. "outsidership", being outside) has become frequently used in political discourse in Sweden. According to Davidsson (2009) "*utanförskap*" appears as synonymous with the weak version of "social exclusion". Just like in the latter discourse, society is constructed as a defined space, containing people defined as

culturally different from the majority. In contrary to the people in *utanförskap*, the majority is never constructed as problematic. The concept "inclusion" hardly exists in the Swedish debate. Moreover, *utanförskap* is linguistically constructed as a noun, which has led the state of *utanförskap* to be interpreted as a "real" and permanent position. Hence, in this paper, the Swedish term *utanförskap* will be referred to as "the weak version of social exclusion", and terms like "exclusion" or "social exclusion" will be used.

1.2. Social enterprises for inclusion

Today, problems of social exclusion are not explicitly an issue of concern for state bodies and national policy-makers. Viewed in the light of difficulties of traditional social policies and current transformations of the welfare state, the third sector is currently expanding in the industrialized world. This growth is mainly appearing within organisations representing a renewed expression of the civil society. The concept "social enterprise" – providing goods or services for social objectives by mixing principles of the market, the voluntary sector and the public sphere – is one of the renewed third sector expressions now emerging (Defourny 2001:1, Wijkström & Einarsson 2006:7, Nyssens 2006). In several European countries legal provisions have recently been set up to facilitate the establishment and growth of social enterprises, and in the UK a new characteristic of the third sector under New Labour has been to increase in the number of social enterprises in order to tackle social exclusion. In Sweden, the National Agency for Economic and Regional Growth, *Tillväxtverket* (former *Nutek*) is assigned by the government to contribute to the creation and growth of social enterprises – also as a way to counteract exclusion in society. In the definition of a social enterprise provided by the OECD[1] the capacity of bringing innovative solutions to the problems of social exclusion is central (Defourny & Nyssens 2006:13, Haugh & Kitson 2007:975).

1.3. Theory, methodology and selection

According to Hasenfeld (1983:1) all organisations "*whose principal function is to protect, maintain, or enhance the personal well-being of individuals by defining, shaping, or altering their personal attributes*" could be defined as Human Service Organisations (HSO). In its capacity as a HSO the social enterprise constructs a range of varying institutional identities in its interaction with people (Gubrium & Holstein 2001, Järvinen & Mik-Meyer 2003). These identities are of vital importance for the kind of work that is being conducted with individuals within the enterprises. As the social enterprise is gaining more and more relevance as a legitimate way to combat social exclusion and to empower marginalized groups, to deconstruct the identities, boundaries and power relations that are institutionally constructed within the enterprises, and to analyse what kind of social consequences these constructions might imply, is of great relevance.

In this paper, the discursive constructions and redesigns of social enterprises' work against social exclusion are outlined in a Swedish context. Due to a national process of institutionalization, the general understanding of the social enterprises is presently undergoing a change. Hence, the paper starts off in identifying the discourses – and the discursive changes – present in the general talk on Swedish social enterprises. The analysis is based on documents produced by national state agencies and policy-makers. To examine the practical implications of the discourses, I will then present a case study of a project initiated in 2005, aiming to develop a social enterprise. First, the relation between the initial project description and the general discourses is identified. Next, the

---

[1] Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

re-negotiations of the project's aims and objectives in the everyday practice of the enterprise are unveiled. Finally the implications of the enterprises' overall aim to tackle social exclusion are discussed in regard with the case examined, and the prevailing discourses at a national level. Analysing possible discursive reconstructions of social enterprises' work against exclusion, as well as their implications, can hopefully make a relevant contribution to the development of a comprehensive conceptual framework able to overcome national specificities.

The discourse analysis approach in this paper draws on Fairclough's (1992, 1995, 2001, 2002, 2001) critical discourse analysis (CDA), and Laclau and Mouffe's (1985/2008) discourse theory. Discourse theory is partly used to show which *subject positions* are made possible within the discourses that appear as central in the Swedish talk on social enterprises. The term *subject position* refers to how some identities are assigned a specific position within a discourse, which always has social implications. Partly, discourse theory is also used to identify the central "*nodal-points*", the knots around which the discourses are constructed. In the analysis of how central concepts, connected to the social enterprise, are charged with a specific meaning, the linguistic dimension of CDA is applied (Chiapello & Fairclough 2002, Fairclough 1992, 2001). Here, *modality, transitivity, agency, nominalization, interdiscursivity* and *hegemony* are used as central analytic tools. The term *hegemony* describes a certain way of talking about a phenomenon as culturally dominant. When analyzing *transitivity*, the agency employed by different actors in various processes of the text is of significance. An issue that is always important in analyzing transitivity is whether agency, causality, and responsibility are made explicit or left vague. According to Fairclough (1992:178) a social reason for analysing transitivity is to examine what social and cultural factors determine how a process is signified in a particular type of discourse. *Nominalization* is a form of transitivity that signifies the conversion of a clause into a nominal or a noun, which has the effect of putting the process itself in the background. Hence, who is doing what to whom, is left implicit. As a result, one finds nominalizations taking the roles of goals and even agents of processes (Fairclough 1992:182f, Van Leeuwen, 1996:32-35 i Wagner & Wodak 2006:394). According to Fairclough (1992:159ff) *modality* indicates the degree of affinity used within a proposition. Different types of discourse employ different forms of modality. When using *subjective modality*, the subjective basis for the selected degree of affinity is made explicit within the text. In using *objective modality*, on the other hand, it may not always be clear whose perspective is being represented. Hence, the use of objective modality often implies some form of power. It is also a preference for objective modality, which can allow partial perspectives to be universalized (ibid:161). *Obligational modality*, realized in terms like "must" and "need" promote an implicitly normative force (Fairclough 1992:159ff, Fairclough & Chiapello 2002:197). Finally, the term *interdiscursive* denotes the possibility of a concept to be comprehended differently in various discourses.

Empiri

As previously mentioned, the initial analysis is based on Swedish documents dealing with the concept of social enterprises in a national policy context. In choosing samples for the analysis, I have carefully selected a number of texts available from national public or government bodies. Two governmental public reports, or government white papers (Statens offentliga utredningar, SOU), are included in the analysis. The reports, titled *SOU 2003:95* and *SOU 2007*:2, are inquiring the possibility of social co-operatives or social enterprises to handle work barriers issues of work integration. Another document included in the analysis is the report "*Social Co-*

operatives, published in 2002 by *The Swedish National Institute for Working Life*[2]. The aim of the report is to describe and demarcate the field of practice for social co-operatives in Sweden. This report is mainly focusing on disabled target-groups, in order to construe how to promote a growth for similar organisations. Finally, two information sheets and a national policy-report on social enterprises produced by Nutek[3], The Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth, are included in the analysis. The information sheets were published in 2005 and 2008. The national policy-report, called "*Programme Proposal for More and Growing Social Enterprises[4]*", was published in May 2008 and has been prepared in association with the Swedish Public Employment Service[5], Social Insurance[6], and The National Board of Health and Welfare[7]. The case study, finally, is partly based on official documents of the project, and partly on transcribed interviews with employees of the social enterprise.

2. THE TALK ON SOCIAL ENTERPRISES

In the Swedish talk on social enterprises, two pivotal discourses are appearing. The one emerging first chronologically is *the self-governing discourse*, in which social enterprises are presented as a possibility for disabled groups and people who have been subject to "care or measures taken by other people" to "take (or regain) power of their lives". The other discourse, *the exclusion discourse*, is especially visible in contemporary documents. In several ways, this discourse coincides with what previously has been referred to as the "weak version of social exclusion". Here, "exclusion" is primarily spoken of in horizontal metaphors, where people are positioned as being either inside or outside the society.

In the two main discourses identified, the terms *exclusion*[8] and *participation*[9] are appearing as two vital *nodal-points*. While "participation" is used to refer to various methods or solutions attributed to the enterprises, "exclusion" is constructing boundaries around problem-areas and target-groups associated to social enterprises. Taken together, this has implications for both the general comprehension of the social enterprise, and it expected outcomes.

From work barriers to exclusion

"Social enterprise" is a fairly new concept in Sweden. Like "social entrepreneur" it just started to turn up in Swedish documents after the year 2000. An official definition was not established until 2008, though, when leading actors and national authorities working to promote the establishment of social enterprises agreed upon the following definition:

---

[2] Laurelli, Eva (2002) *Sociala arbetskooperativ*, Arbetslivsinstitutet

[3] Nutek, which since April 1:st 2009 is called Tillväxtverket. As the documents referred to in this paper was published under the authority's time as "Nutek", this name will still be used in this paper.

[4] The Swedish' title: *Programföslag för fler och växande sociala företag*, Nutek 2008, Dnr 012-2007-4248

[5] Arbetsförmedlingen (in Swedish)

[6] Försäkringskassan (in Swedish) is the authority, which handles the national social insurance system in Sweden.

[7] Socialstyrelsen

[8] The Swedish term *"utanförskap"* is exclusively applied in the texts referred.

[9] The Swedish term "delaktighet" is applied in the texts.

- Social enterprises are pursuing business with the aim to integrate people in society and in the labour market
- They enable participation for their co-workers
- They re-invest their profits in their own, or in similar, activities or organizations
- They are organizationally independent of the public sector

In many contexts, the concept "social enterprise" is referred to as synonymous to the concept "social work-cooperative". Up to the year of 2004 "social work-cooperative" was almost exclusively used for the phenomenon that today is more generally referred to as "social enterprise". In Sweden the cooperative tradition has more than a 100 year long history, and can be described as a form of economic cooperation, where members both own and operate the activity they have a need for[10].

The possibility to use initiatives like social enterprises and social cooperatives as a labour market programme for disabled people or people with work barriers, is investigated in the government white paper published in 2003 (SOU 2003:95). In the report published by The Swedish National Institute for Working Life in 2002, these kinds of organizations are also described. Both of the reports call the initiatives "social work-cooperatives". In the way the reports talk about "co-governance", and "a co-owned and democratic company", the connection with the cooperative tradition is obvious. Foremost, the organizational initiatives are described as targeting disabled groups and people within the psychiatric care.

> Primarily, the social work-cooperatives have engaged people in the psychiatric care. /…/(The social-cooperative project) aims to stimulate disabled people to establish cooperatives as a method to create work on the basis of (the users') own conditions.
>
> (SOU 2003:95 p. 241, my translation)

> Social co-operatives are freestanding associations of people cooperating to satisfy needs of work and social fellowship through a co-owned and democratic company. Making economic profit is subordinated the interest of developing and cultivating each and everyone's capacity for work and influence in the matters concerning the company. /…/ People outside the ordinary labour market due to disabilities /…/ are the predominant member-group.
>
> (The National Institute for Working Life, 2002, p. 3, my translation)

Once again, the matter of social enterprising is reviewed in a government white paper in 2007 (SOU 2007:2). Now, these kinds of initiatives are referred to as "social enterprises". The term "social work-cooperative" is still applied as a synonymous concept. Hence, as a wholly new concept refers to the phenomenon, a clear discursive change can be observed. At the same time, the social enterprise is also located to a wider context then previously. Four years ago, similar initiatives were portrayed as a method to accomplish social fellowship and common work based on the users' own conditions. Now, social enterprises are told to pursue "*work-integrated activities*". Furthermore it is stated: "*the European Social Fund has made it possible for social enterprises to develop within the labour market area*" (SOU 2007:2, s. 219-20). Thus, in the early

---

[10] www.coompanion.se

reports it is not labour market participation that is in focus, but the social connections and fellowship that work can lead to. In the government white paper from 2007, labour market policies are more obviously in the centre of attention. The title of the paper "*From benefit payments to paid work*" also point to this contextual disarticulation. Simultaneously, the target-group of the enterprise appears as unclear in the publication of 2007, being described as follows:

> People that in different ways need support from the society operate social enterprises. By participation in the companies they get the opportunity to enhance their life situation and re-gain the power of their lives.
>
> (SOU 2007:2)

In the report it is not made clear who these persons who "*need support from the society*" are. Nor is it made clear what kind of support is at stake. However, the needs are supposed to be satisfied by "participation in the company", although the significance of "participation" is not specified. In the writing of 2003, the significance of "participation" is made explicit, though.

> Participation is based on voluntariness, and a personal responsibility for decisions and concerns of the work effort. To people who, during a long time, have been outside the fellowship of labour, and in addition may have been subject to other people's care or measures, this is a possibility to regain power over ones life.
>
> (SOU 2003:95 p. 241)

Also, in the writing published by the National Institute for Working Life in 2002, "*co-governance in the concerns of the company*" is put forward as a core element in the principle of participation. Hence, in the early reports "participation" is linked to ideas such as "co-governance" and "a personal responsibility in decisions and concerns of the work effort" as a way to "regain power over ones life". However, in the government white paper published in 2007, the sense of participation is not made clear.

It is also obvious that some kind of disarticulation, concerning the people populating the enterprises, has taken place between the two publications of the government white papers. In the report of 2003 (SOU 2003:95, p. 241) the social work-cooperatives are illustrated as a method based on the users' own conditions and needs. The will "to regain power over one's life" is associated to the fact that the groups at hand may have been "subjected to other people's care or measures". Here, the possibilities to highlight welfare needs for groups, whose needs previously have been defined– or neglected – by others are in focus. Rather than applying the bureaucratic and expert-like perspectives of welfare-officers, the users now have the possibility to shape solutions based on perspectives of relevance to themselves. Thus, the discourse appearing is founded on a belief that the target-group "can" and "is able to" do on their own, which alludes to a critical stance towards the prevailing hegemonic discourse of the Swedish welfare state. This discourse is based on the premises of the precedence of experts' and officials' assessments, and on the aspiration of human service organisations to "teach" and "change" people who are not yet considered to "be able". Hence, a *self-governing discourse* emerges in the early publications, where participation is associated with concepts like "power" and "can/is able to" with regard to the user-group.

Instead of referring to "the users' own conditions", the 2007 report talks of "*people who (…) need support from the society*". The target-group is no longer categorized as "able", but now enunciated as a group of people that has a need for support. Thus, the target-group is no longer

categorized as a group who "are able" or "can" themselves. Paradoxically, the work within the social enterprise is now related to principles placing "the human being as central" in order to enhance the individuals' abilities to "regain power of their lives".

> A clear empowerment-perspective placing the human beings as central within the social enterprise forms a basic principle of the organisational form.
>
> (SOU 2007:2, p 220, my translation)

Thus, the ability of the target-group is re-defined in the latter report, while at the same time "empowerment" is entering the discourse, probably in order to legitimize the social enterprise as a user-based organisation. In stating that the enterprises use empowerment to "integrate people" in society who "stand outside the labour market", an *integrationist discourse* appears (see Levitas 2004). As it is mainly appearing "in between" – both connecting and separating – the other pivotal discourses outlined, *the self-governing discourse* and *the exclusion discourse*, the integrationist discourse will not be examined any further in this paper.

The entrance of exclusion

In the documents published by Nutek in 2008, a new concept is introduced: "*exclusion*" (in Swedish "*utanförskap*"). This concept will prove to be of central importance to the overall comprehension of the social enterprise – as well as its aim – in contemporary discourse, and constitutes a nodal-point of the emerging *exclusion discourse*. The programme proposal by Nutek (2008a), states that "*one of the largest societal challenges of today"* is to "*break the social exclusion embodying many peoples lives*". In the same context, the social enterprise is described as an agent, who can "*create integration in the labour market and in society*" (Nutek 2008a, foreword). This ability is stated with an objective modality. Thus, the statement claims to be "true". Hereby, the social enterprise is constructed as an initiative, tackling a common, general and public societal problem: social exclusion. From initially being pictured as a single method to challenge the situation of specific groups, the phenomenon has – via an integrationist discourse – now been promoted to the status of a general solution to an extensive and large-scaled societal problem. As in the weak version, social exclusion now appears as a nominalization and hence as a target of action. Consequentlly, the actors behind the discourse – the social enterprises – appear as the problem-solvers.

While "exclusion" takes the role of a central concept in the talk on social enterprises in Sweden, the state of exclusion to be tackled is subjected to linguistic *intensifiers* within the discourse appearing (Koller & Davidsson 2008). People who previously were "standing outside the labour market" are now categorized as people who "*are having a very hard time in the labour market*", "*are standing far from the labour market*", "*are having the hardest time in the labour market*", "*are having severe difficulties in the labour market*" and "*have great difficulties to find and/or keep a job*" (Nutek 2008a[11], s. 13-20). Not only does the intensifiers applied, contribute to construct "social exclusion" as an urgent societal problem per see, but the state of "intensified exclusion" also helps to legitimize the social enterprise as an important socio-political initiative. As the problems, which social enterprises are supposed to handle, are constructed as large-scaled societal issues, the individual is increasingly focused as the carrier of the problems at hand – and the social enterprise as their solution.

---

[11] 2008a = The Programme Proposal for More and Growing Social Enterprises/Programförslag för fler och växande sociala företag

> One of the largest societal challenges today is to break the (state of) social exclusion embodying many people's lives, which often leads to increased illness, economic difficulties and a feeling of powerlessness.
>
> (*Nutek*, 2008a, Foreword)

> To the society, investments in a social enterprise is not only an investment in the individual's quality of life and health, it is also an eminently socio-economically profitable investment.
>
> (*Nutek*, 2008a, p. 13)

In the text, social exclusion is told to lead to increased illness and economic difficulties, problems that are solely related to issues of the individual. To the society at large, "social exclusion" more particularly seems to be of significance as an economic affliction. In referring to social enterprises as "*an eminently socio-economically profitable investment*", the language is also embossed by a market-rationality, which adds to legitimacy of the social enterprise. It sin not only a socially important initiative, but also economically rational.

The information sheets published by Nutek, highlight that many who "*stand outside the labour market*" "*are able and willing to work*" (Nutek 2005, 2008b[12]). However, the ability and willingness to work are not mentioned in the programme proposal. The fact that the target-groups of the social enterprise are categorized as people who are able and willing to work, may be due to the fact that several user-driven enterprises took part in the production of the information sheets. The programme proposal, on the other hand, is explicitly made in association with representatives of public authorities. The need for the enterprises to portray their member or target-groups as willing to work, and as "good" citizens, might be important among users, especially among groups with former experience of criminality or substance abuse. In this way a "public apology" from previously destructive life forms is presented, which might be a prerequisite for user-driven organizations to be regarded as legitimate actors in the work against social exclusion.

In the information sheet published by Nutek in 2008, excluded people's willingness to work is associated to a statement, which says, "*The road to the labour market is closed*". In the same context, the social enterprises are spoken of as organisations, which "*bring*" people "*back into society*". Not only does this figure of speech add to the construction of social enterprises as important agents in the work against social exclusion. It also helps establishing a worthy position for the people "in exclusion". Since the road into the labour market is closed, the excluded ones are not responsible for their excluded positions. They are simply just locked out. However, no responsible actor in the excluding process located to the closed labour market, is identified. Who, or what processes, that have closed the gates into the labour market, is left implicit in the booklets. Instead, the *willingness* of the excluded individuals to do something about their situation emerges as a central aspect for inclusion within the exclusion discourse. In this paper, I will refer to this principle as the *repertoire of will*.

Personal development as participation

Both of Nutek's documents, as well as the government white paper published in 2007, articulate that "human beings are placed as central" within the social enterprise. According to the programme proposal published by Nutek (p. 13) the social enterprises are "*creating new job openings that takes advantage of the individual's personal conditions*". In the information sheet

---

[12] Nutek 2008b = The information sheet/Informationsbroschyren

published in 2008 the social enterprise is claimed to both "*operate business with the co-workers in the centre*" and to give "*everyone a possibility to work 100 percent of their personal capacity*". In the exclusion discourse, the individual focus of "placing the human being in the centre" is closely connected to the interpretation of the concept "participation", which is exemplified in the following quote:

> The demand for *participation* separates the social enterprises from public activities (and) private rehabilitation-companies /…/. They are based on the solid conviction that *participation* in work, in personal development but also in the operation and decisions of the enterprise creates unique conditions for personal development, empowerment.
>
> (*Nutek* 2008a, p. 20, my emphasis & translation)

Here, *personal development* is supposed to be the outcome of participation. Yet, the specific meaning of participation is not specified. In the self-governing discourse participation was said to contribute to people's ability to gain control over their lives. Moreover, the power relationships between users and officials were both made clear and implicitly criticized. In the way "participation" is being referred to within the exclusion discourse, these relations are now made invisible. In yet other parts of the programme proposals, participation is being outlined in the following ways:

> By creating jobs and vocational training where people are made *participative* their empowerment, self-esteem and ability to take responsibility is straightened.
>
> (*Programme proposal…*, Nutek 2008, Foreword)

> …the goal /…/ is to create conditions for more social enterprises to be established and be able to grow, in order for more people to get a job in social enterprises and thereby be *participative* in the working life and to get increased possibilities to support themselves.
>
> (*Programme proposal…*, Nutek 2008, p. 14)

Rather than to focus on the opportunity to take part in the decision-making of the company, as in the self-governing discourse, power is now mainly elated to self-development and self-esteem. In addition to the repertoire of will previously identified, the focus of development and personal change, articulated within the exclusion discourse, suggests that "participation" as a nodal-point now also seems to have been drawn into a *repertoire of change*, where the individual – in order to "end the exclusion" – has to undergo some sort of personal change.

Within the exclusion discourse the agency of the process of change aspired is repeatedly located to the social enterprise. Rather than to *be* participating, as was articulated in the self-governing discourse, the individuals are now *made* participative. Moreover, a new outcome is ascribed to the concept "participation", namely "*the ability to take responsibility*". In the second example above, participation is made equal to be a part of the working life, and hence, to have a job. This, in turn, is supposed to contribute to "*increased possibilities to support*" one-self. Thus, the concept "participation" is in the two last quotations also placed within a more paternalistic grammar, and is now supposed to result in "responsibility" and "self-support", which are supposed to be achieved through personal development and change. At this point, the exclusion discourse clearly coincides with the weak version of "social exclusion", as it is the individual and his or her lack of ability that is the focal point of the social change supposed to take place.

The talk on social enterprises

To sum up, the content attributed to the social enterprises within the exclusion discourse, tends to be articulated out of a discourse that broadly corresponds with the weak version of "social exclusion". In this discourse, inclusion is chiefly linked to the ability of excluded individuals to change and undergo personal development in order to "break" their positions as excluded in society. Moreover, the need for the individual "to be willing" to change emerges as a new central component within the discourse. Thus, the *repertoire of will* and *the repertoire of change* are identified as central components of the discourse. Moreover, the agency of the change to be accomplished is located to the enterprises. The agency of the willingness however, is located to the individuals. They need to be willing. This implies that the "can" or "being able to" that was articulated in the self-governing discourse becomes less legible – or invisible – in the exclusion discourse. The constructions of discourses identified in the Swedish talk on social enterprises are summarized in table 1 below.

Table 1 – The Swedish talk of social enterprises

	Self-governing discourse	Integrationist discourse	Exclusion discourse
Target-group	disabled (able to/can)	un-employed	excluded people (willing)
Focus	co-governance	empowerment	personal development
The target-group...	is acting	"needs societal support"	is taught and developed

3. A CASE-STUDY: UMA BAZAAR

Now, an aspect of the initiative that started in 2005, aiming to develop a social enterprise, will be analyzed. The relations between the initial project description and the general discourses previously identified at a policy level will be outlined. Then, the re-negotiations of the project's ideas in the everyday practice of the social enterprise are unveiled. Finally the implications of the enterprises' overall aim to tackle social exclusion are discussed in regard to the case examined, and the prevailing discourses.

The case examined, Uma Bazaar, was run as a project during the years of 2005-2007 by a non-profit organization in Malmö, Sweden. Since 2001 the organization had also run the street journal "Aluma", which is sold by homeless vendors. The original idea of the project to be initiated was to offer homeless people an opportunity to "*take a step further*", in starting vocational training in a fair trade store, called Uma Bazaar, which was to be initiate by the project. Participants, who by the end of the project had trained well enough to become employees in the store, were also supposed to operate the business further – as a social co-operative. Hence, the vision was to start a social enterprise, to be run by formerly homeless people. By their work in the enterprise the hope was further that the participants would "*take the final step into society*" and end their "exclusion"[13]. Uma Bazaar was originally counting on admitting 14 participants in to the project, whereof approximately half of the participants were to be employed in the store before the end of the project[14]. The total budget was 8 million Swedish kronor. The project was funded partly by The National Board of Health and Welfare and partly by the European Social Fund.

---

[13] According to the project description from 2005
[14] According to the project activity report of 2005

The vocational training was conducted in four phases, which according to the project description were personalized and based on the individual participants' conditions[15]. The employed staff consisted of one project manager, one store manager, one supervisor and one project coordinator. *The project manager* was responsible for purchase of goods to the store, and had an overall responsibility for the budget of the project. *The store manager* was accountable for the development and operation of the fair trade store, and was also accountable for the participants that were either trainees or employed in the store. Both of those positions can be characterized as having a commercial charge of the project. *The supervisor* was responsible for the vocational training of the participants, and *the coordinator* was working with tuition, methodological development and organizational issues. Hence, the last two positions could therefore be categorized as accountable for primarily "social" objectives of the project.

During the project period, two different project managers were engaged in the project. Both of them supplied the store with goods that were initially purchased by their own private firms, which implied economic risks, especially for the first project manager. At the end of the project, her firm had a claim of 80 000 kronor for goods that were sold to, but yet not paid for by, the store.

3.1. The project discourse

The project discourses outlined in the project description, are broadly in line with *the exclusion discourse*. The target-group is described as people having "*developed exclusion*". Like the exclusion discourse, intensifiers are also occurring in the descriptions of the group being in "exclusion", for instance it is stated that the target-group have "*a prolonged benefit dependency*". In the exclusion discourse, "exclusion" was related to statements such as "the road to the labour market is closed", which helped to construct the target-groups as being without guilt for their exclusion. However, talking of people who have "developed exclusion", like the project description of Uma Bazaar do, locates the agency – and the implicit blame – of the exclusion to the excluded themselves. Yet, who or what processes that have created the exclusion is still left open, in a similar way as in the general discourse of exclusion.

Similar to the exclusion discourse, the way to challenge social exclusion is set up through a horizontal movement. The participants are, in the plan outlined by the project, supposed to move from an excluded position to be included in society. In the project description, this is articulated as follows:

> The sales of street journals have proved to be an excellent tool for homeless people to take a first step into society. /…/ We are convinced that more (salesmen of the street journal) will take a step further when offered vocational training within their best skill: namely sale.
>
> (Project description p. 1)

In this part of the description the agency of the goal-directed movement supposed to take place within the project, is located to the potential future participants: they will take a step further. Moreover, in this description Uma Bazaar claims to diverge from traditional problem categorizations of client groups, typical in human service organisations. Instead of focusing on problem identities, they focus at the ability of the target-group: they are skilled salesmen. However, the street journal is categorized as a "low-threshold" activity. Uma Bazaar, on the other

---

[15] According the project description of 2005

hand, is classified as "the step forward", which means that new boundaries are drawn around the vocational training project. In the project description these boundaries are realized in requirements on the participants to have been clean on drugs for at least three months, and to be able to show documentation on this in order to enter the project. In addition, it is "motivated persons of the target-group" that the project is designed for. By referring to motivation as a requirement to enter the project, the *repertoire of will* is clearly reflected in the project discourse, just like in the exclusion discourse.

Similar to the exclusion discourse, "participation" is also linked to ideas of development and change, which is supposed to take place through principles of "placing the human being as central". For example, the project description talks about the project as "personalized and based on the individual participants' conditions". Likewise, the project is said to work with "personalized action-plans", which is supposed to lead to development and learning.

> With an individual action plan and the right kind of support, they will learn how to cope with and keep a job.
>
> (Project description p. 2)

According to the project description, the work conducted also aims to "direct motivated persons in the target-group towards a worthy and meaningful life". Moreover, the application form to the financiers states that "the individual development" of the participants will be documented during the project. The articulation of aspirations to "direct", "learn" and "develop" participants demonstrate that the project has some sort of aim to change, make an impact on and developing its participants. Thus, the *repertoire of change* is also clearly visible in the project documents.

Thus, Uma Bazaar portrays the activity conducted as an initiative to develop abilities among *willing* participants to *be able*. In addition, the repertoire of change is linked to an idea to straighten the participants' capability to take responsibility. Phase one, in the vocational training, is described like this:

> During this phase the participants learn how to take responsibility in their housing. /…/ To move on to phase number two requires that the person in question is ready. This means that the person can take responsibility, work properly at the working place, and that psychosocial factors are assessed.
>
> (Project description, p. 2)

Like in the exclusion discourse, the ability to take responsibility is emphasized as an outcome of the work conducted by the social enterprise. Hereby, the enterprise gains agency in the processes of directing and changing the excluded people.

However, the idea to let participants who "qualify" well enough, get the opportunity to operate the business further, can be linked to the self-governing discourse. Here, participation is associated to "co-governance" and a "personal responsibility in operating the company". Within this discourse precedence of assessing the state of development of users or clients are not given to employed or professional staff. Yet, according to the project description the staff-members will assess the individual change accomplished within the project. Hence, the aim to let the participants operate the business further collides with other principles outlined in the project discourse. On the one hand, the project documents portray the participants as capable actors able to "take a step forward" and able to operate the business initiated. On the other hand, the documents state that the supposed development to take place is to be assessed by professional staff. The staff-members are hereby given the power to decide weather the participants are

"ready" to take a step forward, and hence if they eventually are "ready" to operate the business. How this remodelling of power relations is supposed to take place within the enterprise, is not mentioned in the project documents. Thus, issues of power are, like in the exclusion discourse, made invisible in the project documents of Uma Bazaar.

3.2. Reconstructions in the everyday practice

The National Board of Health and Welfare contributed with 1,2 million kronor of the total project budget of Uma Bazaar. The funding was part of a national pot of totally 30 million kronor, which the government assigned to local initiatives to counteract homelessness in Sweden during the years 2005-2008. Thus, the funding was assigned the project on behalf of its focus of homeless people; A group that according to the project description also was referred to as "*people who has developed exclusion*". Yet, in the everyday repertoire of the project utilized by the staff, they tend to speak of "exclusion" in wholly other terms.

> Well, now when I sit down and read through the project application… There is a lot I don't recognise. For instance, the focus on (homeless salesmen of the street journal) /…/ I mean, homelessness… That hasn't really been in focus. Rather, the focus has been on exclusion. So, we have changed… I have myself been a part of the change of focus along the way. For instance, when I got a request from a… Not substance abuser, if it was possible for her to be admitted into the project. And I high-lightened this issue at a staff meeting, and then it was decided that since the target is on exclusion, there wasn't supposed to cause any problem.

Another person of the staff describes the project's target-group as follows:

> CSM[16]: Well, we explain it as people, who have a prolonged exclusion or long-termed unemployed with some sort of exclusion.
> I: What is exclusion to you?
> CSM: Well, in this case it /…/ can be psychiatric, the inability to find and keep a job on your own, and then we have the former substance abusers. There, it is possible to already have come a long way and be back in a normal life, even if one has a background as a substance abuser. But one has a "stamp" that often creates a position of exclusion.
> I: In regard to what? I mean, what is it one is excluded from?
> CSM: Well, the labour market, first and foremost.

Here, both staff-members refer to "social exclusion" as being outside the labour market. In order to enter the project, it is enough to be unemployed. Hereby, the target-group of homeless people is clearly made invisible. In the assessment of the project, conducted by the National Board on Health and Welfare, five of the totally 23 admitted participants reached the goal to be employed in the store operated by the project. Four of these persons did not have either a background of homelessness or substance abuse (Levander 2007).

According to the project description, the participation in Uma Bazaar was supposed to lead to "*a worthy and meaningful life*". Apart from employment this would also include housing and social

---

[16] CSM signifies a "commercial staff-member", SSM signifies a staff-member with responsibility for social issues in the project

fellowship. In the end of the project, in referring to the lack of ability to accomplish these goals – especially work integration – "exclusion" is once again redefined.

> SSF: What the participants have expressed to me, are that they have enjoyed this very much. Just to come here and to belong to a group of people have been very rewarding to them. And to somebody who has grown up as a dandelion child and who just have witnessed criminality and abuse a new world has opened up.

Previously the staff talked about exclusion as more or less synonymous with being unemployed. Now, in referring to the project's lack of achieving the claimed objectives, exclusion is redefined to an intensified form of exclusion. Simultaneously, the project's objectives to achieve employment, housing and social fellowship are revised. Now, "just to /…/ belong to a group of people" applies as good enough to end exclusion. Here, labour market inclusion is not even mentioned. In this way the lack of achievement is not viewed as a failure. A similar interdiscursivity of the concept "exclusion" is identified in another interview with the staff.

> CSM: And then there are many being without social relations. I mean, here you are entering a social context, which ends that exclusion.

Hence, exclusion can be employed differently in different contexts, which allows the concept to be used arbitrary in order to legitimize different aims in various situations. In the case of Uma Bazaar, the consequences are partly that the intended target-group, homeless people, is excluded and made invisible within the project, and partly that the initial objectives are redefined.

Participation

In the project description "participation" is described as a way to accomplish development based on the individual conditions of the participants. Hence, *participation* is regarded as central in the project's work against exclusion. One of the "socially" responsible staff-members talks about the method like this:

> The vocational training, if that is what we call it, is individually based depending on what kind of experiences one has. If one is newly clean from drug, one is in one way. If one has been unemployed for a hundred years, one is in another way. Yet, you can have common individual problems to assimilate in this structure, and that is way there are an individual thinking and an individual structure. That's important.

Here, the individualized talk gets a collective dimension, realized through a principle of "communion and fellowship" within the group of participants. The same person further states:

> It's a part of the project's methodology to create a fellowship. One creates frames for communion, so that communion can happen. And that is taking place in the phases. If one has the ability to relate, one has an opportunity to take part in community building structures /…/ The initial thought was for the people coming here to take over and form a cooperative. That was the thought.

Here, the ability to "relate" and "take part in community building structures" is linked to the project's methodology of ending exclusion. This recalls of the way that the social co-operatives were described in the early reports, where people were ascribed to "cooperate to solve the need of work and social fellowship". However, within the self-governing discourse the individual focus

and the ambitions of change were not high lightened. Hence, elements from both the self-governing and the exclusion discourse are employed in the interview quoted above. In Uma Bazaar, it is the participants that together and in communion – but under guidance and assessments of "other people" – shall cooperate to solve the need for work and fellowship. This hybrid discourse paradoxically contains both professional social-work aims of changing and assessing people, and ideas of a collective self-governance.

However, the commercially oriented staff-members construct "participation" in yet far different ways. Rather than to see participation as a way to accomplish development and change, participation is talked about as something you gain – after developing your abilities.

> If we are producing something, we are contracting "pros" to that matter, cause that's what you do. That's the whole idea that they shall learn from somebody. If we are to produce something, we let somebody come in who will learn them (the craft), who is a educated designer, who knows the market, who kind of understands the whole… In that sense, we think merchantable, which I think that we have to. If we are to do something, we pick somebody who is educated in that matter. Even if the participants think that they have that knowledge, that kind of education or experience isn't there at all.

Here, an obvious "us and them" appears. "We" are producing, doing, acting and contracting consultants. "They" are to be taught and learned. "We" or "us" are linked to the project management, which have the decision-power of the enterprise. "Them" is linked to the participants. The one to teach is to be a "*pro*". The subject-position "pro" is linked to somebody who is educated, who can and who understands. The subject-position "them" is constructed as those who think they can, but who actually doesn't have the experience or education "*at all*", which is also the opposite of "the pro". "They" are constructed as amateurs and as pupils – as such who aren't able.

The decision to contract professional consultants is articulated with an objective modality, "*that is what you do*". The same modality is applied concerning the thinking in market-terms "*we think merchantable*". The latter statement is uttered with an obligational modality "*we have to*". Hereby, the professional and marketable principles are expressed as impossible to negotiate or oppose. Moreover, the participants are appearing as less knowledge and as not able to do realistic judgements on their own, as they don't have the right educational training or experience "*at all*". This repertoire reappears several times in the interviews with the commercially oriented staff.

> We have to run it. We have to seize things and be in charge of that process, cause they don't do it. There is a will to do things. /…/ But it is really about grabbing the whole picture. /… (And) that part somebody else has to… They are in need of help to, like, sort that out.

Again, an obligational modality is used to talk of the participants as being without initiative and not able to be responsible, "*we have to*", "*they don't do it"*. Here, the categorization of the participants in the project prescription is also relocated. People who initially were supposed to be taught how to be "able to work" are simply portrayed as people who "want to" but not "are able". Hence, not letting the participants participate in issues of concern of the everyday practice is in this – and similar – statements legitimized by a collective categorization of the group as people who are not able. Moreover, through establishing "us and them" in the interpretative repertoire utilized by the commercial staff, it is also legitimized to let the participants take part *first* when

they "can" and "are able". The training and development within the project was according to the project documents supposed to take place through participation. Without the possibility to participate, one could wonder how the participants are supposed to be able to learn and develop at all. If no learning is taking place, how will they ever be admitted to participate in the every day activity in the firm? Obviously, the talk of participation as a way to include people in society, is here deconstructed and rebuilt in a way that excludes the project's participants from any kind on participation.

The changing aspiration to change

Uma Bazaar's project description talks about offering the participants training in a skill they are already good at, to conduct sale. Hence, offering training in sales is also a part of the methodology that is meant to develop and change the participants – and hence, a part of the previously identified *repertoire of change*. Here, the enterprise, the store and the business conducted within it, is the platform in focus and the tool at hand for the change aspired to be accomplished. As earlier sated, the agency in the repertoire of change is ascribed to the project. Uma Bazaar offers the training, through which the participants will learn "*how to cope with and keep a job*". Thus, Uma Bazaar is ascribed as the acting agent in this process. In the mid-time of the project, the project manager decides not to offer the participants the opportunity to run the enterprise further after the project time has come to an end. Instead, the non-profit organisation operating the project will keep on running Uma Bazaar, and will try to find new funding for the activity conducted. The project manager explains her decision as follows:

> PM: The initial idea was to find out if this can survive as an independent business. Can they run it? And, of course it has shown… No, it would… At least three more years would be needed in order for them to start something. /…/ There is no entrepreneur among them, who has got the go, who is prepared to work late, who seizes things. There is no such person here, within this project, who has that role.
> I: What was it like from the very start, then, when you thought that it would be possible? What has failed?
> PM: Well, if you get one or two really energetic persons in the project, than… Then, you would have the driving force. Many former addicts have had business of their own and has been really energetic and going even if they have been criminal at the same time. We don't have that group here.

The blame of the project failure is located to the participating group. They don't have the entrepreneurial ability necessary. If they had, the future of the business would have looked different. Hereby, the agency previously located to the project within the repertoire of change is redirected to the participants. Instead of making development available through a personalized and individually designed form of participation, as the project description claims to offer, now, entrepreneurship is referred to as a fixed entity, and as a skill you either have or don't have. Hence, it is the participants who have failed. Not the project. A similar way of talking is identified by another commercially oriented staff-member.

> From the very start, we had a lot of thoughts about what we wanted to do here. But I mean here isn't the same… It's a different group to work with. It's not the same abundance of initiative that we are used to when we work with younger

designers. /…/ …there weren't enough with interest, and somehow if that is the case then I guess you would have to give it up.

According to the quote, the lack of the "right" kind of will and initiative among the participants, led the commercial staff not to follow their intentions through. One again, the blame for the project's inability to achieve its objectives is located to the participants. As previously, the subject-position of the participants is also located to an opposite position as the professional position – here articulated as "younger designers" – and consequently the participants are not viable within the logic of the market.

At the end of the project the store is not breaking evil. Here, the lack of achievement in the commercial part of the project is by one of the commercial staff-members also returned to the participants, in constructing their identity as hard to bring together with the commercial aim of the business.

> To become a stronger brand, and in order to survive as a store, I guess one would have had to weed among the participants admitted into the project. /…/ Cloths are so value… Well, it is all about identity and image and all of that. And it may be hard to mediate that kind of values, if you don't have that kind of identity yourself. /…/ Above all, it creates a conflict in the commercial part, to try to create a shop with a strong brand when it's not possible to niche the collection. That's the hard part. The hard part is to be there for all and everyone. Then you kind of loose the customers who are trendy.

In the project description, market principles were in focus as the platform of change for the participants. The store and the business conducted within it were identified as the practical areas in which the vocational training was to take place. But now, market rationality is employed to explain why not the social, neither the commercial, objectives were reached within the project. Instead of educating and training the participants to become well performing salesmen, and thereby "ending their exclusion" in line with the claims of the project application, the participants are being excluded precisely because of the market principles governing the enterprise. The repertoire of change, clearly articulated in the project description, is at the end of the project glowing with its absence. And hence, the participants are one again subjected to excusive forces within the project, originally initiated to "break exclusion."

CONCLUSIONS

Being described as a phenomenon mixing principles of the market, the voluntary sector and the public sphere (Nyssens 2006), the social enterprise appears both as a hybridized organisation, and as a hybridized sector affiliation phenomenon. In the early Swedish reports social enterprises were emphasized as being a part of the social economy or the third sector. In contemporary documents the sector affiliation of the social enterprises are no longer specified. However, in the official Swedish definition established in 2008 they are still said to be "organizationally independent of the public sector". Simultaneously the aims and objectives linked to the enterprises are drawn into an institutional field of socio-political issues, and the practice of social work conducted by Human Service Organisations (HSO's). Thus, two simultaneous movements can be discerned: one moving away from the previously legible affiliation of the voluntary *sector*, and the other moving towards *an institutionalized field* of social work practice. Accordingly, a less legible sector affiliation and a more distinct institutionalized affiliation occur within the discourses identified at a policy level in Sweden.

Implications of third sector affiliation

In the pivotal discourses identified the one appearing chronically first, *the self-governing discourse,* is mainly affiliated with the third sector. Applying to criticism of the welfare state as being inflexible and paternalistic, this discourse is founded on a belief that users, out of perspectives relevant to themselves, can create better and more appropriate welfare solutions than experts of the public sphere. A question of power between welfare-officers and user-groups are also at stake within this discourse. According to new institutionalism, organisational structures tend to reflect contemporary societal expectations (Scott & Meyer 1991). In the organisational model of social enterprises the market, the civil society and the third sector – rather than public authorities – are reflected as legitimate actors to handle issues of socially vulnerable groups. In Sweden, contemporary research also shows that terms like "the third sector, "the social economy", and "the civil society" have positive connotations and are expected to make contributions of a distinctive quality in today's society. Paradoxically, a reduction of openness in the Swedish third sector is discerned (Wijkström & Einarsson 2006). Among other things, this development is being manifested by the exclusion of vulnerable groups, the decline of democratic values and by increasing professionalism within the third sector organisations (Svedberg 2005, Wijkström & Einarsson 2006). Hence, between the positive connotations connected to the third sector – as well as to social enterprises – where terms like participation, democracy and inclusion are used as watchwords, and contemporary movements that are taking place within the third sector, a growing discrepancy, and a paradox appears. This paradox tends to indicate a rupture of the position of vulnerable groups within the Swedish third sector. While these groups were previously needed, and participated as volunteers in non-profit organisations, the vulnerable groups of today's third sector seem to be positioned rather as users or consumers – and hence, as objects for ambitions of change. The reduction of openness within the Swedish third sector reflects the discursive shifts in the everyday practice of the case examined, Uma Bazaar – as well the discursive change at the policy level – quite well.

Implications of institutional affiliation to social work practice

In the second pivotal discourse identified, *the exclusion discourse*, the social enterprises were constructed as a general solution to an extensive and large-scaled societal problem: social exclusion. As in the weak version, social exclusion here appeared as a nominalization and as a target of action. Hence, the actors behind the discourse – the social enterprises – appeared as the problem-solvers. The focus of development and personal change, identified within the exclusion discourse, suggested that "participation" as a nodal-point was drawn into a *repertoire of change*, where the individual – in order to "end the exclusion" – had to undergo some sort of personal change. Rather than to *be* participating, as was articulated in the self-governing discourse, the individuals were in the exclusion discourse *made* participative. To "be participative" is in Swedish also possible to express as a noun: "delaktighet" (approx. "participativness" being participative). Thus, "participation" also tends to be transformed into a nominalization. The two nodal-points analyzed within this paper, "exclusion" and "participation" are in Swedish both appearing as nominalizations within the exclusion discourse, which implies that inequalities and potential exploitative social relations also tends to be made invisible.

The appearance of "*the repertoire of will*" and "*the repertoire of change*" within the exclusion discourse also reflects a process of institutionalization taking place among the Swedish social enterprises. The two central repertoires now entering the exclusion discourse have in previous Scandinavian research been identified as main principles, or discourses, in social work practice

and in implementation of social policy. Within the logic of those discourses the welfare costumers are not only subjected to ambitions of change, they are also expected to show a willingness to be changed in order to be admitted into the "helping hands" of today's human service organisations (Järvinen 2002:253f, Järvinen & Mik-Meyer 2003: 233-35, Mik-Meyer 2004, Börjesson & Palmblad 2008). Hence, the appearance of these repertoires clearly point at a process of institutionalization of the social enterprises towards a field of social work practice.

By examining how Human Service Organisations (HSO) create and influence constructions of identities, Järvinen and Mik-Meyer (2003:231-35) states that institutionally produced identities of users and consumers in HSO's are typically constructed in negative terms. However, the social enterprise seems to offer a contrasting, resourceful identity: the entrepreneur. In the exclusion discourse of the social enterprise the conversion into a resourceful identity seems to emerge through means of *participation* and *empowerment* within the organisation. However, the contemporary strive to interact with users and clients based on ideals of equality and service contain some conflicting matters. According to Järvinen and Mik-Meyer (2003:21) similar ideals are often manifested in concepts mentioned above like empowerment, user-involvement and participation. However, as user-involvement and participation presupposes positions of equality between professionals and users, these strives can be challenging. In social work these are prerequisites that actually don't exist. Consequently yet another paradox appears. Thus, human service organisations that work with principles of empowerment and participation must necessarily consider what supposition those ideas explicitly hold – "you are in control of yourself and have the power to create your life the way you want to" – and what the institutionally constructed boundaries of the organisation implicitly admit – "the power to make diagnoses is ours, in order for us to be able to help you, you must adjust to our boundaries, categories and institutionally constructed identities". Hence, ideas of participation in social work easily conflicts with unequal structures of power between users and professionals, just as shown in the everyday practice of the case Uma Bazaar.

In conclusion, in the case examined, Uma Bazaar, the affiliation to institutionalized social work practice is obvious. Yet two conflicts appear. The first is due to the mixture of ideas from the self-governing discourse on the one hand, and the exclusion discourse on the other hand. Then, a conflict between the project's affiliation to the institutionalized field of social work practice and principles of a market-based rationality occurs. In the case of Uma Bazaar, this conflict mainly shows in the interpretive repertoire utilized by the commercially oriented staff members in regard to the participants "participation" in the commercially everyday work of the enterprise. The latter forms yet another paradox, to my knowledge yet not theorized, which hence appears as an exciting project to elaborate further in my forthcoming thesis – and in regard to the two other cases I am following.

REFERENCES

Bullen, Elizabeth & Jane Kenway (2000) "New Labour, Social Exclusion and Educational Risk Management: the case of 'gymslip mums'", British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 26, No. 4, p. 441 - 456

Byrne, David (2005) *Social Exclusion,* 2nd edn. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press

Börjesson, Mats & Eva Palmblad (2008) Strultjejer, arbetssökande och samarbetsvilliga. Kategoriseringar och samhällsmoral i socialt arbete, Malmö:Liber

Chiapello, Eve & Fairclough, Norman (2002) "Understanding the new management ideology: a transdiciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism" *Discourse & Society* Vol. 15(5): 553-578

Davidsson, Tobias (2009) *Utanförskapandet – en diskursanalys av begreppet utanförskap* Materuppsats, Göteborgs universitet, Institutionen för socialt arbete.

Defourny, Jaques (2001) "Introduction: From the third sector to social enterprise" i Borzaga, Carlo and Jaques Defourny(eds), *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*, London/New York: Routledge

Defourny Jacques and Marthe Nyssens (2006) "Defining social enterprise" i Marthe Nyssens (ed.) *Social Enterprise At the crossroads of market, public policies and civil society*, London/New York: Routledge

Esping- Andersen, Gösta (2002) "Towards the Good Society, Once Again" i *Why We Need a New Welafe State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Fairclough, Norman (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Fairclough, Norman (1995) *Media Discourse*, London: Edward Arnold

Fairclough, Norman (2000) *New Labour, new language?*, London: Routledge

Fairclough (2001) "Critical discourse analysis" in A. W. McHoul, Mark Rapley (eds.) How to Analyse talk in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods, London/New York: Continuum

Giddens, Anthony (1998) *The third way; the renewal of social democracy*, Maiden Mass: Polity Press

Gilbert, Niel (2002) *Transformation of the Welfare State. The Silent Surrender of Public Responsibility*, Oxford: University Press

Gubrium, Jaber & James Holstein (2001) *Institutional selves: troubled identities in a postmodern world*, New York: Oxford University Press

Hasenfeld, Yeheskel (1983) *Human Service Organisations*. New Jersey: Prentice & Hall.

Haugh, Helen & Michael Kitson (2007) "The Third Way and the third sector: New Labour´s economic policy and the social economy", *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 2007, 31, 973-994

Järvinen, Margaretha (2002) "Hjälpens universum – ett maktperspktiv på mötet mellan klient och system" in Meeuwisse, Anna & Hans Swärd (red.) *Perspektiv på sociala problem*, Stockholm: Natur & Kultur

Järvinen, Margaretha & Mik Meyer, Nanna "Institutionelle paradokser" i Järvinen, Margaretha & Mik Meyer, Nanna (red.) (2003), *Att skabe en klient. Institutionelle identiteter i socialt arbejde.* Köpenhamn: Hans Reitzels Forlag

Koller, Veronica & Davidsson, Paul (2008) "Social exclusion as conceptual and grammatical metaphor: a cross-genre study of British policy-making". *Discourse & Society* Vol.19(3): 307-331

Laclau, Ernesto & Chantall Mouffe (1985/2008) *Hegemonin och den socialistiska strategin*, Stockholm:Glänta/Vertigo

Levander, Ulrika (2007) *Företagande i civilsamhället – minskad slutenhet eller urholkad öppenhet*, Lunds universitet: Meddelanden från Socialhögskolan, ISSN 0282-6143

Levitas, Ruth (2004), "Let's Hear it for Humpty: Social Exclusion, the Third Way and Cultural Capital" in Cultural Trends, Vol. 13(2), No. 50, June 2004, pp 41-56

Levitas, Ruth (1998) *The inclusive society? Social exclusion and New Labour*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Martin, Sonia (2004): "Reconceptualising Social Exclusion: A Critical Response to the Neoliberal Welfare Reform Agenda and the Underclass Thesis", *Australian Journal of Social Issues* vol 39 nr. 1 s.79-94

Mik-Meyer, Nanna (2004) *Dömt til personlig udvikling. Identitetsarbejde I revalidiering*. Köpenhamns universitet: Soiologiska institutionen

Nyssens, Marthe (2006) " Social enterprise at the crossroads of market, public policy and civil society" i Marthe Nyssens (ed.) *Social Enterprise At the crossroads of market, public policies and civil society*, London/New York: Routledge

Sahlin, Ingrid & Nora Machado (2008) "Diskriminering och exkludering. En introduktion" i *Socialvetenskaplig tidskrift, Temanummer: Diskriminering och exkludering*, Årg. 15, Nr 3-4, 2008, s. 174-184

Schierup, Carl-Ulrik (2003): "Social exkludering och medborgarskap i Sverige och EU". Blomqvist, P. (red): *Den gränslösa välfärdsstaten. Svensk socialpolitik i det nya Europa*, Agora

Scott, Richard W & Meyer, John (1991) *Institutional Environments and Organizations. Structural Complexity and Individualism*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks

Steinert, Heinz (2003a) "Introduction: The Cultures of Welfare and Exclusion" i Stenert, Heinz & Pilgram, Arno (red.) *Welfare Policy from Below*, Aldershot, UK: Ashgate

Steinert, Heinz (2003b) "Participation and Social Exclusion: A Conceptual Framework" i Stenert, Heinz & Pilgram, Arno (red.) *Welfare Policy from Below*, Hampshire: Ashgate

Svedberg, Lars (2005) "Det civila samhället och välfärden – ideologiska önskedrömmar och sociala realiteter" i Amnå, Erik (red.) *Civilsamhället – Några forskningsfrågor*. Stockholm: Gidlunds förlag

Wagner Ina & Wodak Ruth (2006) "Performing success: identifying strategies of self-presentation in womens's biographical narratives" *Discourse & Society* Vol 17(3): 385-411

Wijkström Filip och Einarsson Torbjörn (2006) *Från nationalstat till näringsliv? Det civila samhällets organisationsliv i förändring*, Stockholm: Ekonomiska forskningsinstitutet vid Handelshögskolan i Stockholm

Reports and brochures used in the analysis of the paper

Statens offentliga utredningar (SOU) 2003:95, Betänkande från Lönebidragsutredningen, Stockholm: Fritzes

Statens offentliga utredningar (SOU) 2007:2 *Från socialbidrag till arbete*, Stockholm: Fritzes

Laurelli, Eva (2002) *Sociala arbetskooperativ*, Arbetslivsinstitutet

Programföslag för fler och växande sociala företag, Nutek 2008, Dnr 012-2007-4248

[1] Arbetsförmedlingen (in Swedish)

Socialt företagande – en väg till arbetsmarknaden, © Nutek, Stockholm 2005

Socialt företagande – en bransch i tillväxt, © Nutek, Stockholm 2008