"Parole, parole, parole" – discourses and innovative social entrepreneurship

Von *Danielle Gluns* (M.A.) und *Prof. Dr. Annette Zimmer*

1   Introduction

The title of this paper indicates its focus: "parole", meaning "words" or "languages" in Italian. The article focuses on the question: what kind of influence do discourses exert on social innovations and social entrepreneurship? It thus concentrates on the embeddedness of social entrepreneurs in their local contexts, while most of the literature on this phenomenon so far deals with examples of successful entrepreneurs and their characteristics (cf. Austin et al. 2006; Faltin 2011; Martin/Osberg 2007). The local context comprises, on the one hand, structures and the respective political, social and economic setting. This part has already been taken on by researchers (Mair/Martí 2006; Klein et al. 2009). However, the power of words has so far been underrated in social innovation research while it has been advanced for the functioning of civil society in general (Katz 2006). Results of the WILCO project[1], particularly from the Münster context, will be used to demonstrate the role discourses can play for social innovations and entrepreneurship.

First of all, an application of the concept of "hegemony", based on Gramsci, to the field of discourses will be sketched. Following this, some general information about the WILCO project will be provided. Section 4 examines some of the main features of the structural and cultural background of Münster, which forms the basis of the current discourses. The dominant frames of the welfare discourse and their historical emergence in the local context will be delineated afterwards (section 5). Even though they stem from the broad area of economic policy, they have important implications for the local welfare discourse as will be depicted in this part. Following this, an example of a social innovation in Münster will be analysed in more depth in order to demonstrate the effects of the discursive hegemony on social entrepreneurship.

In a concluding section, lessons to be learned from this case study will be reflected. The influence of discursive structures on the potential success of social innovations as well as the possibilities of social entrepreneurs to in turn influence them will be outlined.

2   Hegemony and discourses

According to Gramsci, hegemony implies the dominance of a mode of living and thinking over alternative modes in a specific society. It influences prevalent norms of behaviour, values and social relations (Katz 2006: 335). As such, hegemony denotes a dominant rule, which is generally based on consent and needs to exert power by force only in few exceptional cases. The more the hegemony of a class is not only tolerated, but actively supported by other classes, the more securely the hegemony will be established (Scherrer 2007: 72f.). In addition to this, a class can reinforce its hegemony through forming specific state structures as a form of political leadership and thereby increase its influence in the society (Opratko 2012: 36-39; Scherrer 2007: 73f.).

In the context of such an existing, well-established hegemony, change can only be generated by the formation of a "historic bloc", in which several actors from different classes join forces and develop an alternative ideology (Katz 2006: 336f.). However, the more the interests of the dom-

---

[1] Further information regarding the project will be provided in section 3 of the paper.

Forschungsjournal Soziale Bewegungen – PLUS
Supplement zu Heft 2/2014
Erhältlich unter http://www.forschungsjournal.de/fjsb-plus

Forschungsjournal
Analysen zu Demokratie und Zivilgesellschaft
Soziale Bewegungen

inated classes can be obtained through or within the hegemonic system, the more difficult it will be to initiate change (Scherrer 2007: 73). Those interests are, according to Gramsci, not pre-determined by class status, but are formed in a historic process and therefore alterable (Scherrer 2007: 75). In a process of universalisation, the particular interests of the dominant group diffuse into the ideologies and experiences of the subaltern groups and thereby adapt them to the hegemony. At the same time, the dominating ideology integrates certain elements of the interests of subaltern groups and thereby enhances its validity. The boundaries of such compromise are drawn by issues which challenge the basis of social power of the dominating class(es) (Opratko 2012: 43).

The ideas and perceptions of the hegemony are (re)produced by so-called intellectuals. These are persons who work at different levels of civil society to organise – deliberately or unconsciously – the world view, self-conceptions and norms of the hegemony (Opratko 2012: 48f.). Through this focus on (public and civil) actors, Gramsci's conception of hegemony can be adapted and applied to politological questions. While Scherrer (2007: 75) differentiates between the Gramscian focus on the hegemony of groups of persons and the Foucaultian notion of the hegemony of discourses, we argue for a combination of the two since discourses are socially constructed and thus dependent on social action. We understand discourses as systems of rules, established by a series of statements ("*énoncés*"), which delineate the kind of statements that can be uttered (Foucault 1997). Those rules are formed by discourse coalitions which are defined as follows:

"*people from a variety of positions (elected and agency officials, interest group leaders, researchers, etc.) who share a particular belief system – that is a basic set of values causal assumptions and problem perceptions – and who show a non-trivial degree of coordination activity over time.*" (Sabatier/Jenkins-Smith 1993: 25).

Thus, we apply the concept of hegemony to the interplay of different actors forming discourse coalitions and establishing discursive rules. Those rules form the context in which social entrepreneurs need to present their ideas in order to build coalitions and implement their plans successfully. Social innovation is in this paper understood as new processes and/or products helping to solve social problems and/or to create societal value (Phills et al. 2008). Social entrepreneurship denominates one possibility through which social innovation can be implemented. It describes an innovative combination of social and entrepreneurial elements that transcends traditional notions of the economic/civil society sector divide (Defourny 2001).

In our application, we conceive of hegemony as a situation in which a group of actors establishes a dominant set of the rules of discourse: what can be said, regarding argumentation, legitimate (policy) goals and the assumed connection between causes and effects of certain measures. These rules are implicitly contained in the frames of the discourse. This term comprises the underlying norms and values of statements within the discourse as well as actors' beliefs about reality and typical goals pursued (Majone 1989; Rein/Schön 1991). Those frames are cemented by coalitions of "intellectuals" (as defined above) advancing the ideas and by their influence stemming from the institutional positions they hold in society.

The views and interests of opposing groups can be actively integrated by the dominant coalition through adaptation of the frames. This process is defined as co-optation in a (discursive) hegemony, by which support of subaltern groups is secured. Another strategy of the dominant group could be to exert influence on the argumentative corroboration of the opposing interests in order to align them with the dominant frames (cf. Scherrer 2007: 72f.). As such, the hegemony is

established and maintained through a balance of consensus and (structural) coercion (Scherrer 2007: 77f.). The range of influence of such hegemony both in terms of topics covered and in spatial terms is an empirical question. Our case study focuses on the local level since most innovations and enterprises start small in a specific context.

3   The WILCO-project[2]

Within the WILCO-project, a detailed analysis of different local contexts has been undertaken. WILCO is the abbreviation of "Welfare Innovations at the Local Level in Favour of Cohesion", a project which was funded by the 7th research framework of the European Commission. The project was implemented by a consortium of research institutions in 20 middle-sized and large cities in ten European states. The internationally comparative perspective allows the analysis of 79 innovations in different political, economic, social and cultural contexts and thereby gives a good insight into the establishment and functioning of social innovations and social entrepreneurship. The project concentrates on the policy fields of labour market, child care and housing. Most of the innovations (80 per cent) studied in the project are new services to enhance social cohesion and participation of different target groups. In many cases, this comprises the establishment of new networks of service-providing institutions in order to bridge gaps between existing facilities and to offer one-stop concepts to access information and services.

The contextual embeddedness of innovations in the respective local contexts is one of the main research areas of the project. Through this, anecdotal evidence of successful innovations shall be supplemented by questions regarding conditions of success and failure. These, in turn, shall help social innovators and entrepreneurs in establishing and scaling successful undertakings in different contexts. Therefore, apart from establishing the general context of welfare policy in Germany and its historical development, local discourses were studied. In order to establish the frames underlying the welfare discourse in Münster as well as its structures, a document analysis of local newspaper articles and documents of the city council was complemented by expert interviews and focus groups with stakeholders from local politics, public administration, civil society and local entrepreneurship. Before presenting the findings of this analysis, a short overview of the locational context of Münster needs to be given.

4   Münster as a middle-sized city in a rural area

The local context of welfare policy in Münster is, on the one hand, influenced by the national welfare regime, categorised by Esping-Andersen as conservative-corporatist. This implies a traditionally strong role of welfare organisations and their incorporation in public service provision. The welfare state shall ensure maintenance of achieved standards and statuses through rather broad social insurance systems (Esping-Andersen 1996).

On the other hand, specific local circumstances form the basis of distinctive local systems within the German welfare state. Münster is a middle-sized city of app. 280,000 inhabitants in the north-west of Germany and serves as the centre of the rural region of *Münsterland*. The city has a long tradition as a city of administration and services, or "white-collar" city since the 19th century. By this, it forms a contrast to the neighbouring Ruhr area which is predominantly an industrial region. This is reflected in the local labour market today, which is characterised by predominance of employment in education, administration and services, leading to a high demand for well-educated workers. The unemployment rate is comparatively low (Bundesagentur für Arbeit 2013). In contrast to the general trend in North Rhine-Westphalia, the population of Münster is

---

[2] For more information on the WILCO project see http://www.wilcoproject.eu.

increasing. The quota of non-German inhabitants is lower than the average of the *Bundesland* (Information und Technik Nordrhein-Westfalen 2012). All in all, Münster's economic situation can be rated positively and it has not been hit as hard by crises as other regions.

Culturally, Münster is strongly influenced by its tradition as a catholic centre and diocesan town. For a long time, a conservative core dominated Münster's culture, which can still be seen today in the predominance of catholic social organisations. Accordingly, the party of the Christian Democrats (*Christlich Demokratische Union, CDU*) dominated the local city council for a long time. However, since the 1970s this position has been challenged by a growing importance of the Social Democrats (*Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, SPD*). Also the Green Party (*Bündnis 90/Die Grünen/GAL Münster*) gained a stronghold within the student milieu. Today, the CDU has to work closely together with the SPD and the Green Party since the party enjoys just a very tiny majority in the local government.

5   The local welfare discourse

Resulting from the context described above, two possible outcomes can be anticipated: the lack of clear majorities in the city council and the rather conservative environment could lead to a strong perseverance of traditions and existing structures, if compromises between the different local milieus cannot be found. If such compromises are possible, however, widely accepted decisions can be taken. The question resulting from these scenarios is: are there collaboration and agreement on social policy between different groups in Münster? If so, how are decisions taken?

In order to answer these questions, we have to go back in time about 20 years. At that time, many stakeholders in Münster feared a decline of the city, due to relocations of regional administration and companies and to competition by other cities. To counter these trends, a broad advocacy coalition transcending political cleavages formed around the common goal of strengthening Münster's competitiveness *vis-à-vis* other cities. This goal brought together stakeholders from the University with members of local public administration. In the process, they were joined by representatives of the local entrepreneurship, politicians and civil society. This cooperation between the University and the municipality was perhaps the most crucial novelty at that time, since both milieus had been rather separated – among other things because of the adherence of municipal actors to strictly divided responsibilities (*Zuständigkeiten)* – beforehand (cf. focus group III). The lack of collaboration between the two institutions was overcome mainly by the business sector and the especially from the Institute of Business and Administration approaching the public authorities in order to conjointly develop a policy for Münster's future. Through the application of marketing strategies, the challenges posed by the economic situation in Münster in the 1980s/90s – should be addressed. Public actors, especially local politicians, were reluctant in the beginning but finally integrated into the coalition. The growth of the alternative students' milieu and the growing awareness of the need for mobility and flexibility were able to break up the former passiveness of the municipality (cf. focus group III).

Following the common perception of the need to promote Münster as a location for business, an integrated city marketing institution was established as an owner-operated municipal enterprise (*Münster Marketing*). The difficulty in this process was the integration of a high diversity of stakeholders: each department has jealously monitored its sphere of competence and exerted its influence so as to be adequately represented in the new structures and processes (cf. focus group III). To achieve a balance of the diverging interests and positions, a long dialogic process (more than ten years) was needed. When the issue was laid out before the municipal politics,

first of all a proposal was filed to discuss it comprehensively instead of the usual procedure of debating it within the different departments. This approach – described as an "*administrative innovation*" (member of the Office for Urban Development, City and Traffic Planning in focus group III) – facilitated agreement along with the institutionalisation of regular planning meetings between different departments as well as other long-term network structures. Through this regular collaboration, a firm coalition of actors sharing major problem perceptions (e.g. fearing a decline in the labour market situation) and political goals (especially strengthening Münster as a business location and as an attractive living environment) was established.

As the most important factor, however, stakeholders underline that a change in perceptions and municipal "culture" was necessary. This contained a change in the self-perception of the city: from a rather conservative, provincial town to the "most liveable community" (as attested by the international LivCom-Award 2004). It also contained a change in the philosophy of administration, towards a more comprehensive image of the municipality (focus group III).

The city's marketing agency is currently integrated in most local decision processes. In their activities, a preference for lighthouse projects[3], prizes and public campaigns to stimulate investments in the city can be observed. This focus corresponds to the concept of a "festivilisation" of local policies as defined by Häußermann and Siebel (1993). The external perception of the city shall accordingly be maintained and further improved, including questions of urban development, architecture and a focus on the attractiveness of the city centre. The position of Münster in the competition of communities all over Germany serves as the crucial indicator of success for the advocacy coalition supporting this process.

The members of this coalition have – willingly as well as unconsciously – established a frame of competitiveness and investment that pervades a whole range of different topics at the local level. This discourse is also used in order to prevent the insistence on individual interests since the overarching aim of strengthening the locality can be advocated as lying in each and everybody's interests. A positive image of Münster is generally assumed to promote financial investments, support the local labour market and further improve the city's economic situation. The specific advantages of individual projects are thus secondary, since they are more likely to incite protest and individual dissent. Insofar, the arguments are used strategically to underline common goals and facilitate networking and cooperation (cf. focus group III).

Through the deep-seated incorporation of the marketing agency and its basic concepts in policy-making in Münster, the advocacy coalition is not only relevant for the business sector. Instead, the core frames of competitiveness and investment also have a strong impact on the local welfare discourse. Good economic performance and growth enhancement are forming the levelling pole against which policies are measured. In the social sector, this is complemented by a frame of prevention: instead of classic curing and caring policies, preventive instruments are preferred since they are perceived as being economically more efficient. Measures are directed towards ensuring that all persons and groups are able to participate as successfully as possible in the (labour) market. Thus, the frame of competitiveness is carried forward from the city level to the individual level of each citizen. One example of this approach is the setting-up of expansive child care facilities which is advocated as both an "investment" in the future of the children and as an encouragement for the labour market participation of their parents. At the same time, Münster shall be presented as a family-friendly city to outsiders and thereby attract investors and companies in addition to well-educated young people.

---

[3] Even though, apart from such lighthouse projects, the necessity for interim small successes or "quick wins" to ensure commitment and acceptance of the approach is also acknowledged (cf. focus group III).

One of the strengths of the coalition is its powerful cohesion which is assured through small trusted networks that work together on specific topics. At the same time, the cohesion of the networks hinders the integration of new actors who enter the field or who try to promote policies or projects without connecting them to the dominant frame. This leads to a situation in which most social policy measures are presented as stimulating either the competitiveness of the city directly – for example the renovation of run-down neighbourhoods in certain districts – or as strengthening the ability of certain groups in participating in the market – for instance education measures as "investments in human capital". The discourse thus seems to establish a context in which social entrepreneurs need to comply with the dominant frame in order to secure financial or advocatory support.

At the same time, the willingness of public actors to provide funding is decreasing. This is related to the self-perception of the municipality: stemming from the catholic tradition of the local welfare system, subsidiarity plays a vital role. This means that the most basic unit (e.g. the family or the community) should be responsible for supporting weaker members of the society. This founding principle is reinforced by the strong reliance on market mechanisms and the need to create incentives for investors in Münster (cf. interview with the head of *Münster Marketing).* Financial intervention by public actors is merely agreed upon as a measure of last resort, as shown for example in an urban rehabilitation programme in the neighbourhood *Osthuesheide* in Münster. Here, stakeholders only agreed on investing in renovation measures since the area was on the verge of serious deterioration. In addition, the topic (urban development) is strongly connected to the dominant frame. In instances where this is not the case, financial support is a lot harder or even impossible to achieve, as will be shown in more detail below.

6   Innovation in the discursive context: the case of MAMBA

In the following, one innovation of those studied within the WILCO project in Münster will be presented in more detail. The dynamics between the innovative ideas, the dominant discourse and actors' constellations will be analysed in order to establish the role of discourses for social innovation and social entrepreneurship.

MAMBA (*Münsters Aktionsprogramm für MigrantInnen und Bleibeberechtigte zur Arbeitsmarktintegration in Münster und im Münsterland*) is a local project for the labour market integration of migrants and persons with a right to stay. It follows the general perception – dominating in civil society as well as among public actors in Münster – that labour market participation is crucial for the social integration of migrants (cf. interview with the founder of the GGUA). Especially refugees are confronted with a rather restrictive legislation regarding residence and working permissions, hampering their integration into social and economic life. Without a residence permit obtaining a job is very difficult and many employers do not want to hire refugees because of bureaucratic hurdles and uncertain future perspectives. On the other hand, for some groups there is no chance to obtain a long-term residence permit without proof of employment and independence of social assistance. Consequently, refugees need special support and consultancy for labour market integration.

MAMBA was originally developed in 2008 by the local refugee relief organisation GGUA *(Gemeinnützige Gesellschaft zur Unterstützung Asylsuchender e.V.)*, which is considered as one of the most experienced organisations in this field in Germany. It is widely-known and well-reputed among the target group, lowering the thresholds for refugees to access the project (cf. interviews with MAMBA employees).

The project is established as an intersectoral network, linking partners from the non-profit, for-profit and public sector. The GGUA serves as the network hub. The partners contribute various competences: whereas the GGUA has good access to the target group, other institutions are experienced in counselling and qualification measures. It follows an empowering approach, including language courses and further training such as computer courses. The individual competences of the participants are perceived as the building stones for their potential contribution to the local labour market. Other partners assist with connections to local enterprises and knowledge about Münster's labour market. As the interviews indicate, employers are interested in MAMBA as they consider participants as highly motivated for most kinds of jobs and also for temporary work.

MAMBA receives multilevel funding from several institutions. The largest share is provided by the European Social Fund (ESF) whereas the city of Münster has contributed comparatively small sums twice on an *ad hoc* basis to ensure economic survival of the project. However, funding by the EU and the federal government is limited to the end of the year 2013. Thus, it seems as if the network will be terminated at the beginning of 2014. Nonetheless, MAMBA is seen as a big success by many local stakeholders. The success of the project in terms of the number of participants and the percentage placed in paid labour is also established in internal evaluations of the project as well as those of the federal programme (Mirbach et al. 2013; Mirbach/Schobert 2011).

In general, MAMBA is in line with Münster's discourse: strengthening the employability of refugees and migrants follows the main paradigmatic lines of Münster's welfare system outlined above, since it improves their individual competitiveness and saves expenses from the public purse in terms of social benefits (cf. interview with the founder of the GGUA and MAMBA project leader). However, it is not integrated into the core of the dominant frame: the labour market integration of refugees can hardly be used to promote Münster as an attractive location for business investments. Instead, the founder of the GGUA and the leader of MAMBA both point to the fact that external funding was necessary to implement the project, even though local political and administrative actors support the ideas underlying it. So far, no local actor has indicated a willingness to act as sponsor after the end of funding by the ESF (cf. interview with the founder of GGUA and MAMBA project leader). Thus, it seems that the availability of external funds opened up a window of opportunity for the project that would otherwise not have been realised.

The founder of the GGUA underlines the importance of public discourse for the support by local stakeholders and citizenship: while it is rather easy to gain support for projects to assist refugees (which implies a humanistic focus), the notion of "*Asylbetrüger*" (asylum fraud) leads to negative reactions. He emphasizes that the organisation is constantly attempting to strengthen the humanitarian notion and that support for their policies in Münster is generally high. However, he mentions that he meets resistance when he is trying to address concealed racism in the city (cf. interview with the founder of GGUA and MAMBA project leader). Apparently, the overwhelming majority of politicians and members of public administration do not include racism in their problem perceptions, which is why statements on this topic are excluded from public discourse. Evidently, the attempt to establish a counter-discourse for the field of migrant policy has so far not been successful.

Even though, influencing the local discourse is possible, albeit in incremental steps. Sometimes, it requires structural change. The spin-off of refugee policies from the regulatory agency (*Ordnungsamt*) into an autonomous office in Münster facilitated cooperation between the adminis-

Forschungsjournal Soziale Bewegungen – PLUS
Supplement zu Heft 2/2014
Erhältlich unter http://www.forschungsjournal.de/fjsb-plus

Forschungsjournal
Analysen zu Demokratie und Zivilgesellschaft
Soziale Bewegungen

tration and NGOs or advocacy groups. It led to a change of discourse: the view of the regulatory agency on refugees – which is similar to that of the police – was replaced by one more closely connected to social policies (cf. interview with the founder of GGUA and MAMBA project leader). This improved collaboration, which led to a series of projects and service contracts between the municipality and the GGUA. However, there is still a difference between the GGUA and other established providers of general social services in Münster, especially the Catholic organisation of Caritas. The founder of the GGUA stresses their privileged access to the public administration which leads to many municipally financed projects being awarded to established welfare organisations instead of smaller NGOs (cf. interview with the founder of GGUA). Therefore, the survival of the GGUA is dependent on other financial sources since a permanent funding will not be granted by the administration (cf. interview with the founder of the GGUA and MAMBA project leader).

Hence, the case of MAMBA shows the distinctive effect of the local discourse: the GGUA as the responsible institution of the project remains outside of the dominant coalition, being admitted as partner solely on a temporary basis depending on the respective topic addressed. In areas which are more easily connected to the dominant frames – such as the integration of migrants through labour market integration as a well-delineated field – integration is possible, if funding is provided by other institutions. In other areas – for example regarding the issue of racism – integration is less probable and the GGUA takes the role of the opposition to the dominating coalition.

7 Conclusions

7.1 Hegemony in Münster

The case study has shown that there is a broad consensus of different groups in Münster around the goal of promoting Münster's competitiveness. This has been established as the dominant frame for local discourses and has led to hegemony of this aim and its attached rules of discourse. The high diversity of different stakeholders supporting this objective and their influence in different institutional settings has consolidated the hegemony of the frame. Through structural changes, the dominant local actors have become involved in most local decision-making processes and in these environments act as the "intellectuals" reproducing the hegemony.

For members of this coalition promoting new ideas is rather easy. They can rely on a broad network of supporters, adapt their argumentation to the logics of the discourse and form coalitions to achieve wide-spread endorsement. Other groups outside the main coalition can be co-opted by the hegemony. One example is MAMBA: a few of the aims of the GGUA have been integrated into the hegemony by the promoters of the dominant frame. This is strictly limited to the narrow thematic field of the project: the need for migrants to be able to earn their own living, which is widely acknowledged in Münster. Other aims the GGUA are rejected if they do not fit the dominant frame. Ideas are blocked by the boundaries of compromise formed by the core aims and values of the coalition (in this case: Münster's competitiveness compared to other cities). One example for this is the issue of racism, which remains a topic that is pushed aside by local political and administrative actors which might stem from the fact that such a discourse runs counter to the general aim of promoting the city as a modern, pluralist and open-minded location. This gives rise to an ambivalent position of the GGUA in Münster: while it is on the one hand partially integrated into the hegemony – to pursue its aim of improving the living situation for migrants in Münster – it is one the other hand an opponent, pointing to flaws in local migrant and refugee policy.

The possibility to exert influence through the distribution of resources can be seen as an instrument of power of the municipality. Those interests that cannot be co-opted might in some cases still be forced to comply with the dominant rules of discourse in order to obtain funding. While such leverage is apparently not used so far in Münster, it shows that the GGUA is at the border between a co-opted group (aligned through the moral-cultural dominance of the hegemony) and a ruled subaltern group (domineered through coercion by financial means) (Opratko 2012: 35-39).

7.2   Discourses and social innovation

The innovations studied in Münster show that social innovators and entrepreneurs need to be sensitive to the dominant goals, problem perceptions and frames of the local discourse in which they act. Even though Münster displayed a particularly unified hegemony and a very broad coalition, discourse analysis in other cities within WILCO has also confirmed the power of words for social innovation implementation. At times there might also be two opposing discourses struggling for hegemony in a setting. This gives innovators more leeway to choose coalition partners, while a well-established hegemony as shown in the Münster case study will narrow these options considerably.

The strength of the hegemony not only depends on the intensity of collaboration and networks, but also on the resources commanded by them. This is also true for the potential strength of an entrepreneur: public administrative actors have more resources at their immediate disposal than non-profit actors who mainly have to rely on external support (e.g. in terms of funding). The cases studied in this paper suggest that the more dependent an actor is on external support – be it in terms of funding, of access to target groups, of public support etc. – the more important the alignment with the dominant discourse becomes. Thus, as illustrated in section 2 of this paper, discourses and therefore discursive hegemony are not some pre-determined, definite fact, but are instead socially constructed through the interplay of different actors in the medium and long term.

Consequently, not only do social innovators and entrepreneurs need to be sensitive to the dominant frames, but they can also attempt to influence them in the long run. Nevertheless, this requires a "historic bloc", including potent promoters and partners to install an alternative frame. For the context of Münster, however, the chances for this are low, since the existing hegemony is supported by a wide range of actors from local politics and public administration, local entrepreneurship as well as civil society. Those actors are institutionally well-placed to maintain the hegemony as long as there are no other, more pressing problems which contradict the dominant frame.

Most changes in discourse will thus only be achieved in small steps and often over long time periods. This can be seen by the evolution of the GGUA's role from an "enemy" to a potential partner for some well-delineated policy subfields. However, this collaboration is fragile: further lobbying work directed against municipal actions and decisions can threaten support, which is usually granted only on a short-term basis – compared to the routine funding of well-established charities and other organisations in social policy (cf. interview with the founder of GGUA and MAMBA project leader).

The lesson to be learned for social innovators and entrepreneurs is therefore to be sensitive to the dominant local discourses, their underlying values, goals and rules. In order to ensure short-

term support, aligning the proposed undertaking to these frames might be helpful or, in the case of a strong and closed hegemony, even necessary. In the long run, however, proponents of a specific topic or project can try to influence the local discourses according to their own interests if they can form support networks. Knowledge about the institutional embeddedness of the discourse coalition(s) and potential allies will again prove most helpful in this attempt.

References

- Austin, James/Stevenson, Howard/Wei-Skillern, Jane (2006): Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), pp. 1-22.
- Bundesagentur für Arbeit (2013): Arbeitsmarktreport. Agentur für Arbeit Ahlen-Münster. Januar 2013.
- Defourny, Jacques (2001): Introduction. From third sector to social enterprise. Borzaga, Carlo/Defourny, Jacques (eds.): *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*. London: Routledge. pp. 1-28.
- Faltin, Günter (2011): Social Entrepreneurship – Zwischen Entrepreneurship und Ethik.
- Jähnke, Petra/Christmann, Gabriela B./Balgar, Karsten (eds.): *Social Entrepreneurship. Perspektiven für die Raumentwicklung*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, pp. 75-85.
- Foucault, Michel (1997). *Die Ordnung des Diskurses. Mit einem Essay von Ralf Konersmann*. Frankfurt am Main, Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Häußermann, Hartmut/Siebel, Walter (1993): Die Politik der Festivalisierung und die Festivalisierung der Politik.
- Information und Technik Nordrhein-Westfalen (2012): Geschäftsbereich Statistik, Statistisches Jahrbuch Nordrhein-Westfalen.
- Katz, Hagai (2006). Gramsci, Hegemony, and Global Civil Society Networks. *Voluntas*, 17(4), pp. 333-348.
- Klein, Juan-Luis/Fontan, Jean-Marc/Tremblay, Diane-Gabrielle (2009): Social Entrepreneurs, Local Initiatives and Social Economy: Foundations for a Socially Innovative Strategy to Fight against Poverty and Exclusion. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, 32(1), pp. 23-42.
- Mair, Johanna/Martí, Ignasi (2006): Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), pp. 36-44.
- Majone, Giandomenico (1989): *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process*. New Haven/London, Yale University Press.
- Martin, Roger L./Osberg, Sally (2007): Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 5(2), pp. 28-39.
- Mirbach, Thomas/Schobert, Berthold (2011): Evaluation des ESF-Bundesprogramms zur arbeitsmarktlichen Unterstützung für Bleibeberechtigte und Flüchtlinge mit Zugang zum Arbeitsmarkt. Abschlußbericht. Hamburg, Köln, Kerpen.
- Mirbach, Thomas/Triebl, Katrin/Farrokzhad, Schahrzad (2013): Programmevaluation „ESF-Bundesprogramm zur arbeitsmarktlichen Unterstützung für Bleibeberechtigte und Flüchtlinge mit Zugang zum Arbeitsmarkt". 2. Förderrunde – Zwischenbilanz. Hamburg.
- Opratko, Benjamin (2012): *Hegemonie. Politische Theorie nach Antonio Gramsci*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- Phills, James A. Jr./Deiglmeier, Kriss/Miller, Dale T. (2008): Rediscovering Social Innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Jahrgang 6, Heft 4, S. 34-43
- Rein, Martin/Schön, Donald (1991). Frame-reflective policy discourse.

- Wagner, Peter/Weiss, Carol/Wittrock, Björn/Wollmann, Hellmut (eds.): *Social Sciences and Modern States. National Experiences and Theoretical Crossroads*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press. pp. 262-289.
- Sabatier, Paul A./Jenkins-Smith, Hank C. (1993) : *Policy Change and Learning. An Advocacy Coalition Approach* (Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy). Boulder: Westview Press.
- Scherrer, Christoph (2007): Hegemonie: empirisch fassbar? <mark>xxxx</mark>
- Merkens, Andreas/Rego Diaz, Victor (eds.): *Mit Gramsci arbeiten. Text zur politisch-praktischen Aneignung Antonio Gramscis*. Hamburg: Argument, pp. 71-84.
- Siebel, Walter (ed.), *Festivalisierung der Stadtpolitik : Stadtentwicklung durch große Projekte*, Opladen: Westdt. Verl., 7 – 31.
- Stadt Münster 2012: *Bericht zur Kindertagesbetreuung in Münster*. Zum Kindergartenjahr 2012/2013. Amt für Kinder, Jugendliche und Familien, V/0124/2012.
- Youth Office Münster (2012): *Yearbook of the Youth Office 2011*.

Interviews:
- Focus group III.
- GGUA: founder of the GGUA.
- GGUA/MAMBA: founder of the GGUA and MAMBA project leader.
- Münster Marketing: head of Münster Marketing.