**What is your study about, and why did you chose to study this?**
*They are looking for what you are doing*, *and for you to clearly articulate your research aims, objects and research question*.
My study is about how global ideas – that are diffused around the world – are adapted within a new context, namely modern welfare states. The **aim** of the study was to explore how contexts shape ideas, but also how ideas can shape contexts. More specifically, the **aim** of the study has been to understand new forms of collaborations operationalized as social enterprise and collaborative innovation project are adapted into the Nordic welfare model represented by the study context of Norway. And also to assess what tensions can arise when a new idea is adapted in a new context.
Therefore, I raised the **RQs**: how are global ideas adapted by modern welfare states? How might welfare state models affect the adaptation.
I set up three **research** **objectives** for the thesis:
1. To investigate how policymakers adapt new forms of collaboration by way of policymaking. To identify how SEs is perceived vis-à-vis the existing welfare system.
2. To assess how new forms of collaborations – operationalized as SEs – are adapted in the policy field of welfare provision and explore how SEs meet with institutional complexity.
3. To understand how new forms of collaborations are adapted in local public sector organizations, and to assess how tensions emerge and what their nature are.

**Exploratory**:
Formulate
problems & clarify concepts.
Started with litt. Search and prelim. Interviews.
Typically seek to create hypothesis and test. Also used when data collection process is challenging. You are allowed to change you assumption based on findings since you are exploring n unexplained phenom that could have man explanations

Open the door to further examination

**How did your RQs evolve during your research process?**
*They want you to critically reflect on how your research evolved. And impact of literature review.*
**Exploratory design**
**Initially**, actually, when applying for the Ph.D. position I wanted to study the translation of a Norwegian social enterprise initiative and how it was diffused and adapted in Barcelona, Spain. I actually went with the given SE to observe a workshop and interview the relevant actors from Norway and a PSO from Spain. However, when I came, I was not allowed to observe the meetings. And when we came back to Norway, the project was paused.
This was in there very beginning of my employment, so the focus naturally shifted. I then approached social enterprise more broadly and started actually to read the **extant literature on the field**. Here the publications made by the EMES network was very helpful in pinpointing me in a certain direction. I was quite occupied with the ecosystem for social enterprise, and after having conducted some of the preliminary interviews, this approach proved to be an interesting one, also because of the incipience of social enterprise in the Nordic countries, or at least in Norway. There are, of course, semianl Norwegian contributions on the research topic in Norway, however, my impression is that there lacks more empirical data in the Norwegian context.
**2nd article**, I was actually co-supervising two master’s students at the time that I was planning this article. And I discussed with them, my ideas for an article on organizational forms, and they conducted a slightly different approach which I found quite interesting. But finally, reading the work of **Pache and Santos** especially, I found it interesting to not replicate, but get inspired about their study on social enterprise and institutional complexity. So the first two articles evolved much due to the extant literature.
**3rd** article, naturally evolved/changed – primarily due to the empirical data. The objective of the study was to understand how a social enterprise was implemented by two PSOs, but instead – and due to the empiricism, the focus was **changed** to how the collaborative innovation project was implemented and the tensions that emerged.

**Case study** (SINGLE CASE STUDY W/EMBEDDED UNITS)
The reason for employing this design was because I was interested in exploring the adaptation processes of global ideas at different levels. The choice for employing this strategy was to explore the case (adaptation of new forms of collaboration) while considering not only the historical and institutional trajectories of the Nordic model, but also the influences at the different levels of analysis.
**Case selection**: Initially I wanted to investigate the translation of SE from three analyitcal levels. As I believed that it would give me the ability to explore in-depth the translation of SE in relation to the historical and institutional trajectories of the Nordic model. And I believed, had I been able to do so, the boundaries on the case would arguably been stricter, and I would have avoided the more abstract research problem of the thesis.
Difficulties relating to the 3rd article: When the 3rd article evolved as it did, I went in to panick-mode for a couple of months, trying to reformulate the study aim and objective so that it could fit in the overall Kappe with a logical red thread. After having discussed with supervisor and colleagues, I decided to climb up the ladder of abstraction so as to better incorporate the third article. However, a clear limitation resulting from this, and which I believe is a common pitfall in case studies, is the lack of a clear boundary on the case. So instead of only focusing on SE, the ideas that were opearationalized was now broader and entailed “new forms of collaboration”.

**CASE**:
In reflecting upon this issue, I find it difficult to pinpoint exactly the name of the strategy used to select the case. As mentioned, SE was 1 type of innovation strategy in the job announcement. But studying new forms of collab. Can be considered an example of new ideas. On the one hand, it was based on being an example of the adaptation of global ideas. On the other, however, the idea of being referrable to other situations.

**Selection of units/ “levels of anal.”.**I have been quite interested in exploring tensions. And one of my assumptions have been that tensions will emerge when new ideas meet new contexts. Also, in the extant literature tensions are pointed out. Although collaborations between two PSOs arent new, I found that these new buzzwords or terms that are positively promoted in rhetoric, are vague, they lack certain empirical knowledge, and the literature focuses on drivers and barriers implying some type of tension.

*POLICYMAKING (org. form)*: FIRST, my interpretation of the SE field in general, and SE research topic in Norway, is that it is rather **fragmented**. The **scholarly literature**, pointed me to interesting factors and discussions within the literature. *One* of them being **discussion regarding policymaking** in terms of a legal organizational form. In the research on **ecosystems**, which is key for the **institutionalization of SE**, political acknowledgement and legal forms is considered one pillar in their ecosystem.
Also, and as discussed in the **Nordic countries, social enterprise are considered ambiguous**, and especially in the Nordic context with the specificities of the welfare systems. Thus, legitimizing SEs through a distinct **organizational** **form** may be **key** in **the evolution of SE in the Norweigan context**. I therefore found the point of entry of policymaking in terms of organiational form an obvious and interesting one as it is suggested an important factor for the SE ecosystem.
**NOT a unnatural** focus: **ICSEM** study ecosystem + **NATO** (nodality *authority* treasury and organization)
However, the reason for studying why policymakers opt for (in)action over action when it comes to org.form is rooted in the extant literature and the discussion on how and why organizational forms can be favorable or unfavorable for the development of SE.
HOWEVER, studying policymaking for social enterprise, could have been more explicitly addressed in the Kappe as well as in the article, and it could have been reframed in light of the ecosystem. However, I chose not to do so because of the changes made in the third article.
*Why is org.form. of interest?* Both strengths and weaknesses of introducing policy. My assumption: in a social-democratic WF state, developing org.form. is of particular importance because of the state’s dominant role in providing and funding WF services. In the absence: might find it diffucult to be acknowledged as something different than private providers 🡪 can be co-opted into behaving like these orgs. Might make it difficult for municipalities to engage with them – diff. to understand.
*FIELD LEVEL* (**access to markets** – and here I mean – access to **procurement processes** or **engaging in projects with the public** sector) is also considered key in the SE ecosystem. It can also be viewed as public support. The reasonf ro selecting this unit of analysis has its bases in (1) the extant literature and (2) the preliminary intervies. FIRST, the overall idea was found when reading cross-national research reports on the ecosystem and more precisely, how SEs engage with the public sector. My assumption here was that since the public sector delivers universal services and due to the welfare profiteer debate, this might be difficult. SECONDLY, when conducting the preliminary interviews with actors in the field, it became apparent that this indeed was an issue. And in some if the interviews the duality of SE was problematized – how can they survive when PSOs pressure them to demonstrate the social mission. In the Norwegian literature, it is also stated that approx. 50% of SEs organize within the private an 50% in the voluntary sector, and that this selection is rather pragmatic. One interesting question in this regard is why does it make it pragmatic for the organizations? It was around that time that I found Pache and Santos’ (2013), article which inspired me to conduct a similar study.
*APPLIED LEVEL:* the choice of selecting the applied level approach to my analysis was so that could investigate an, *in situ* implementation of a new innovative IPR between two PSOs and a SE. However, once that did not evolve as planned, the focus became on how new forms of collaborations are implemented.

**Selection of methods**

**Selection of informants**

**How did you design your study (research and methodology) and why did you take this approach?**
*They want you to clarify what you are doing, why you did it and how*.
Thank you for allowing me to present the design of my study and why I took this approach.
JOB DESCRIPTION!
*I employed an EXPLORATORY CASE DESIGN because*FIRST: although the research field on adoption and adaption, or diffusion and translation of global ideas are not a new exercise, the SE research topic in Norway can be considered incipient.
SECOND: the field is – in my oppinion – quite fragmented, which made it difficult for be to completely grasp.
THIRD: I actually had little knowledge about SE, the approach allowed me to explore and get aquainted with the field.
COMBINED the exploratory design allowed be to work with rich data. And, as we will discuss probably later, the data collection was challenging in certain aspects, therefore the design allowed me to follow the emperical material.
*RESEARCH AIM, OBJECTIVES and RQs*
I then developed the research aim to explore how contexts shape ideas, but also how ideas can shape context, and more specifically how ideas are adapted in specific contexts. I have been quite inspired by Scandinavian institutionalism in developing the research aim. The Nordic welfare model, being – to me – an obvious choice, not only because it was pragmatical to choose the study context where you live, but especially because of the legacies of state and cooperation, but also because of the reform patterns in the Nordics. Also, much of the literature on PSI focus on drivers and barriers, therefore I expected some kind of tensions arising, and I wanted to explore these tensions in some way when selecting the levels of analysis.
*LEVELS OF ANALYSIS/LEVEL OF UNITS*
After choosing the explanatory case approach and the aim of the study. I moved on the units of analysis. And employing **complementary analytical approach** was much inspired by extant literature. How translations or adaptations happen at a micro, meso and macro level of analysis. Once that I established that, I worked on the research objectives and how they could fit this complementary level of approach. 🡪 levels of analysis = tool to structure the research objectives for the thesis.
*UNITS/ARTICLES/DEFINING THE LEVELS OF ANALYSIS*
Having established that I wanted to approach the adpatation of new ideas from three different levels, I started working on defining the units or selecting the units / the content of the articles.
1st: the first article – inspired much by the extant literature – such as EMES-studies, ICSEM- report, but also the debate on politically recognize SE through an organizational form.
2nd: The question regarding how SEs organize and what type of organizational form they choose, was motivated first by the research report from ROKKAN senteret on SEs in Norway by Eimhjellen and Loga (2016) and a research report by Kobro and colleagues (2017) discussing how SEs are pragmatic in choosing organizational forms. And, also since SEs seek to deliver welfare in a context with a strong and large state – I found the field level quite interesting. Finally, reading Pache and Santos (2013) inspired me to go furter and exploring how hybrid organizations experience institutional complexity.
3rd: Finally, I also wanted to include an *in situ* implementation of a collaboration between PSOs and SEs. How are municipalities or PSOs actually working with SEs.
WHEN DEVELOPING THESE LEVELS OF ANALYSIS, THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES THAT I WANTED TO INVESTIGATE BECAME MUCH CLEARER TO DEVELOP:
🡪 how policymakers adapt to new forms of collaboration by way of policymaking (ID how SE is perceived in rel to existing welf)
🡪 to assess how new forms of collab (SE) are adapted in the policy field of welfare provision (explore responses to inst compl)
🡪 to understand how new forms of collab are adapted in a local PSO, and assess tensions.
TENSIONS INTERESTING AND IMPORTANT AT ALL THREE LEVELS.
*RESEARCH QUESTIONS*:
While the research question for each article were developed in line with the development of the research objectives and the analytical levels (complementary approach), the overarching research problem was infact developed much later due to the change in focus of the third article. Initially the focus was on translation fo SE, but because of the change, I decided to climb up the ladder of abstraction to be able to incorporate the third article.
*METHODS*I chose semi-structured interviews, typical for exploratory studies. The reason for choosing this method is that it gathers information from key informants who can inform the topic under investigation. As the field of SE is in its incipience in Norway, I found this to be a good method. I also found the method to be quite effective as it (1) allowed me to collect qualitative and open-ended data, (2) allowed me to explore the informants’ beliefs, experiences and opinions regaring social enterprise and new form of collaboration. And finally (3) since I was expecting some kind of tension between the idea and the context, I wanted to ensure that the informants that I recruited could talk openly about these issues, rather than having pre-structured interview guides or survey questions.

**What were the main shortcomings and limitations for your design?**
*They want to see if you can critically assess what shortcomings or limitations are related to your work. Present weaknesses and strengths of the methods*.
I want to thank my opponent for this very important question as it allows me to critically reflect on my own research and its limitations. With respect to the main shortcomings and limitations to the study, I would like to say 4 things relating to the limitations in *design, choice of methods, sample selection* and *limitations concerning researcher bias*. The choice of studying the adaptation of new forms of collaboration through a case design has its clear weaknesses as cases can lack scientific rigour, and that it provides little bases for generalization to a wider population. Althouhg this is typical for case selection, I took certain methodical choices that are clear limitations in this regard.
**FIRST *DESIGN:*** FIRST, **placing boundaries** on my caselacks. The raised research problem is broad – and the reason for it being so broad and abstract – was a purposeful choice as I needed to fit the third article into my research deisgn. However, not having a more clear boundary on my case, meaning delimiting the case more clearer (definition&context / time & place / time & activity) is a limitation. SHOULD HAVE TIGHTENED. ALSO THE BROAD AND ABSTRACT RESEARCH PROBLEM THAT HAS A THEORETICAL AMBITION, AND THE LIMITED SCOPE OF THE EMPIRICISM.
**SECOND *CHOICE OF METHODS****: SECOND,* and very important: A hallmark of case studies is the use of multiple data which enhances the study’s scientific rigour and credibility. Combining multiple data sources strengthens the findings. My thesis relies solely on semi-structured interviews, which I find to be a serious limitation within the study, and which may also affect the rigour of my research, which I am quite aware of. It can also affect both the findings and the study’s credibility. And not to forget: it makes it difficult to generalize/transfer the results to a wider population. Certain attempts were made to include certain documents, such as political platforms, political policy expression regarding SE for documents analysis, however, here, I could absolutely have taken a step further to strengthen the findings with a mixed-method approach. The result is that I missed out on important data that could have substantiated my findings and strengthened the overall design of my thesis. I consider this one of the more critical limitations regarding this thesis. HOWEVER, WITH THAT SAID, I DON’T DISREGARD THE FINDINGS AND THE VALUES OF THEM.
**THIRD *SAMPLE SELECTION***: THIRD, *sample selection (SIZE & PROFILE)*. So my samples were selected purposfully based on a set of criteria that the informants had. However, each sample for the articles consists of very few informants, representing a quite a one-sided aspect of the problems under investigation. This limitation makes it difficult to generalize the data to a broader set of population. In fact, one might argue that the issue of not including more participants can affect the interpretation of the data.
INCLUDING CERTAIN PERSPECTIVES COULD HAVE ALTERED OR MODIFIED THE RESULTS, THEREFORE ITS HARD TO INFER BEYOND THESE CASES.
**ART1:** For instance, in the 1st (POLICYMAKING), the policymakers had to have an understanding of SE in order to be interviewd. I only focus on policymakers in terms of polticians. My argument is that they represent *one* group with the power to develop policies for SE. However, to understand this issue more in-depth, I could have recruited more actors to get a broader picture. E.g. bureaucrats (contacted ministries), but also, I could have recruited private support organizations and philanthropist getter their perspective on the development of an organizational form. I could have focused on politicians and street-level-bureaucrats at the local level in order to undetstand whether how they undetstood SE vis-à-vis the existing welfare stystem – which I think also is very interesting.
**ART2**: . For the 2nd (FIELD), the SEs had to receive support from public and private actors and had to have existed for at least 5 years. The reason being that they had to have experienced different institutional logics from private and public actors & the last criterion had to do with the fact that the SEs I contacted with a shorter lifespan, did not have time to talk. This was a pragmatic choice. In this article, 2 structural hybrids, 2 blended hybrids with (IDEAL LLC) and 1 blended hybrid (VOL.ORG) were recruited. This is a skewed representation of SEs in the field. Here, I could have strengthened the sample by including another blended hybrid organized as a LLC. Also, in lack of a mixed-method-approach I could instead have interviewed bord members and staff within the organizations to get a broader understanding of the problem under investigation. Therefore, it is hard to infer beyond these cases.
**ART3:** For the 3rd (APPLIED), focus on actors involved in the implementation.
In the article, 3 employees at the Refugee Integration Office were included in the sample as well as 4 employees at the Adult Education Center were included. One perspective that is completely missing from this study is the perspective of the users/target group, the women.
**FOURTH researcher bias**: FOURTH, reasearcher bias is also worth mentioning in this section as a limitation.
- *In the beginning* – difficult to understand SE. My political view had a specific perspective on SE. However to mitigate this, I was active in attending conferences, reading up on the extant literature, and by getting to know what was going on in the field through interviews.
- *Knowing of one of the informants*: One of the informants interviewed for article 2 I had knowledge of, therefore my interpretation of the information the informant provided me with, could have been affected. However, to mitiage this I added another employee from this specific SE in my sample.
- *Feeling sorry for*: In the third article, the collaboration climate became quite toxic for a specific group of collaborators. And knowing what they had gone through and their feelings about the discussions (or rather – lack of discussion), was tough. Im a human being, and it was hard to listen to. I discussed this with my co-author and research group.
HOWEVER THESE ARE THE FOUR THAT I BELIEVE ARE THE MOST **CRITICAL** TO MY RESEARCH.

**How did the findings relate to the existing literature?**
*They want to check if I can put my results in a context of what has been done before.*Thank you for letting me reflect on my findings. My impression is that yes, certain findings can align with the extant literature, while other parts do not.
FIRST \*ANTECEDENTS DE VRIES…\*
the findings relate well to what is expected in the adoption and adaptation of public sector innovation. There are established antecendets that can function as both drivers and barriers for the adaptiation of PSI. For example, the two reviews from the authors De Vries, Bekkers and Tummers from 2016 and 2018 have identified antecedents such as environmental, organizational, individual, and innovation process antecedents.
SECOND \*EMES+NORDICs: HULGÅRD, ENJORLAS ET AL. 2021\*
the findings on social enterprise being pressured to operate as regular private providers in the welfare systems, I believe relate to the Nordic discussion on SE – especially the last book from 2021 and the chapter written by Prof. Bernard Enjolras, Malin Gawell, Linda Andersen etc.
THIRD: \*PACHE & SANTOS\* - my findings on how hybrid organizations relate to the findings of P&S on the hybridization pattern on the Trojan Horse - although in a different welfare state context.
FOURTH: \*MAGNUSSEN 2016\* - another interesting finding that relates to the existing literature – but provides another perspective, is that on the enthusiastic leader. Magnussen published an article, where the enthusiastic leader acts as a driver for PSI projects, however my findings suggest that the picture is more nuanced than that.
FIFTH: \*MISE\* - and just to say, this study is not the first study not matching witht the MISE results. In the MACRO-INSTITUTIONAL SOCIAL ENTERPRISE FRAMEWORK, Norway, (a country that spends much on public welfare, that has high degree of voluntary involvement in civil society, and that is more individualistic rather than collectivistic in cultural orientation) is more likely to have a large SE sector. However, that is not what my data tell me. Here, Norway emerges as an oddity as the SE sector still is emerging.

**How did the findings relate to the research questions**?
*What were your key findings? They want to explore whether you were able to answer your research question and aim.*In my thesis I set out to answer *how global ideas are adapted and how might welfare state models affect the adaptation*. The research question is deliberatly framed in a broad manner so as to include all three articles.
In comparison with the broad research question and the empirical scope of the thesis, which I think we can agree is smaller than the theoretical ambition, I can however answer the research question as follows:
*The overall findings demonstrate that
FIRST: the* ***adaptation of global ideas in new contexts*** *is a* ***compelx process*** *and that the* ***outcom****e of the adaptation process is in* ***the hands of many and placed at different levels*** *within modern welfare states
SECOND:* ***antecedents****, or historical and institutional factors within modern welfare states* ***play parts in shaping how global ideas are adapted***. *Important roles are played by* ***previous******reforms****,* ***legacies****,* ***ideologies, institutions,*** *and* ***conflicting******logics*** *do in fact affect the process.*DUE TO THE ABSTRACTION IT MAKES IT DIFFICULT TO GET A DEFINITIVE ANSWER ON THE RQS.

**More specifically on the three analytical levels:
FIRST**: I find that the reason for why policymakers opt for policy INACTION (in terms of establishing an organizational form) is because they view social enterprise not as a phenomenon in its own right, but instead they tend to place social enterprise on equal footing as private actors in the welfare field. They are therefore likely co-opted into the existing system of welfare provision. EXPLANATION: can reflect path dependence and/or there is little need for SE in a highly institutional context.
**SECOND**: I find that social enterprise are highly dependent on the acceptance of institutional referents holding the public-sector logic, and who also function as gatekeepers to public grants. Social enterprises are therefore pressured to emphasize their docial mission which simetimes compromise their economic mission. Norwegian social enterprises select various strategies to secure compliance with internal and external logics. The data can also indicate that logic compoartmentalization may be a pragmatic solution for social enterprises as it can allow them to attend to their mission and adhere to external demands.
**THIRD**: I find that when developing and implementing new forms of collaboration across organizational boundaries, it is important for the innovation process to be openly discussed, and to agree on “what collaboration” means in a project (hierchical vs egalitarian). And, when tensions emerge, it is crucial to address and clarify *WHY* the innovation is being realized, *HOW*, to operationalize such innovations, for *WHOM* the innovation is targeting, and *WHOSE* project it is. Clear structures for collaborations are need to be implemented by the project leader(s).

**Were there any findings that surprised you?** *They want you to dig into unexpected results relating to your RQ.*Thank you for reflecting on surprising findings, I haven’t actually given that too much thought yet. However,
FIRST: I was not so surprosed that the LEGACY OF STATISM would affect the adaptation, but the clear presence of MARKET-THINKING OR REFORMS – surprising
SECOND: 1st article – a bit surprised that politial parties seems to take for granted quasi markets and public procurement system – at least on the left side of the political spectrum. + IN RHETORIC vs. ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE.
THIRD: 3rd article – that the SE were not the main producer of tension.

**What biases may exist in your research?**
*How did you manage/mitiage/account for them? What have you learned – Research is never perfect*.
- Bias in sample: as mentioned the one-sided profile of informants and sample size 🡪 might not show the entire picture
- Research bias:
(i) political view – MITIGATED: challenging my views, attending conferences, reading extant litt., enrolling in research network
(ii) knowing an informant – MITIGATED: added an extra informant
(iii) feeling sorry for informants – MITIGATED: comments and discussions with co-author and Research group.

**How can your findings be put into practice?**
*What does this mean for the world/literature?*
This is a good, and difficult question to answer. But of course, important for the contribution of the thesis.
OVERALL – an understanding of the importance of critically reflect upon context when introducing a new idea.
1st ART – can inform the field, but also practioners about political acknowledgement and about their opportunity structures in Norway and what may hinder the institutionalization of them.
2nd ART – although never ment in a normative way: can provide an undertanding for social enterprises of what tensions you can expect when organizing.
3rd ART – inform municipalities about how to organize collaborations – what tensions can emerge, how to assess and discuss.

**If you could redo your research from scratch, how would you alter your approach?**
*They are testing if you can critically assess your research and learn from it. What have you learned, and what would you have done differently to improve your results?*If I could redo my research from scratch, I would have approached the subject more narrowly. I would focus more narrowly on social enterprise. Because it is – in my opinion – so fragmented, I would have liked to study parts of the ecosystem more concretely and more structured – and better planned.
Would probably also conduct an exploratory design, but I would have sought to include more perspectives – meaning a more diverse sample and also uppin the sample size. It would be interesting to analyze perspectives from politicans, street-level-bureaucrats, support structures, philanthropists and SEs.

**Why social enterprise and why study social enterprise at a policy and organizational level**?
*WHY FOCUS ON LEGAL FORM (POLICY)?*

ARTICLE 1

**Why did you not use policymaking theories**?
🡪 Not studying policymaker *per se*. If we had, than evaluating the policy cycle, would of course be of relevance.
🡪 We focus on *why* the policymakers chose inaction over action. Not the process of getting there

**A theoretical research question would require a more elaborated theoretical section while the rationales for the empirical are not weel sustained**
Thank you for pointing this out. I imagine that the reader must be confused about this issue, so let me clarify.
So, we have actually gone back and forth with reviewers regarding the RQ. Our aim is to explore the justification for why policymakers opt for inaction. What are their reasons for inaction. However, our RQ that we have operated with are *how* policymakers understand SE, how they understand SE vis-à-vis the existing welfare system, and what if any policy they promote.

**Why the issue of legal status/why is it of interest and importance to have a policy (legal org) for SE?**
Thank you for this question. I have though much about it, and of course, discussed this issue thoroughly with my co-author. I am aware of strengths and weaknesses with introducing SE policy in terms of legal status in a nation context.
- Political acknowledgement and legal forms recognized at the national level is considred one of 6 pillars of the SE ecosystem, so I find it highly relevant to discuss.
-I find that previous research, in combination with the results for this study, suggests that in a social-democratic welfare state, devloping a poilicy may be particularly important for their opportunity structures, because of ste state’s dominant role in providing and funding welfare services.
-In the absence of any SE policy, they may find it difficult to be recognized as different from commercial and voluntary organizations, increasing isomorphic pressures and the risk of being co-opted into behaving like existing welfare providers.
-Without a policy: might be difficult for municipalities to understand and engage with them.
BUT WHY OF INTEREST? There are strengths and weakneses: might exclude certain SEs, might be more pragmatic for them to have another org.form. because of their activities.

**Why the choice of informants exclusively among Members of Parliament**?
Thank you for allowing me to clarify this, as I imagine that the reader must be confused about this issue. So let me clarify. It is true that most of the interviewed are MPs, however, this is not the case. When trying to recruite informants to the study, it became quite obvious that not many had an idea of what SE entails. The reason for focusing first on MPs is because at that time, some of the MPs were quite active in promoting SEs. And after having read the political platform for the Government – mentioning SE, but not specifying their role, I was interested in understanding how they understood SE.
After reflecting upon my sample profile, can see that it is quite one-sided. And as you commented in the report, I could have strengthened the profile and the findings by having included e.g. bureaucrats. However, and maybe even more interesting, I could also have included policymakers at the local level that have experience with working together with SEs, which I think is an interesting future article. But, since policymakers reprenset *one* group with the power to develop policy for SE, I found it highly relevant to include MPs and also to let them specify how they understand SEs. The reason for including local and regional informants is based on the fact that there lacks an understanding of SE.

ARTICLE 2

**What has been the added value of using the concept of hybridity for investigating tensions between institutional logics?**
Using the concept of hybridity when studying tensions between institutional logics, is not a new approach. Although many organizations that are not SE embody different logics, I find it relevant to add the concept of hybridity when studying tensions between institutional logics:
FIRST, it is widely acknoweldged that SEs do embody different logics or operate with a double or tripple bottom line. They are considered by nature arenas for contradiction and to me this is a logical and appropriate **entrence point**.
SECOND, it allowed me to elaborate on specific **hybridization patterns**.
THIRD, the way I read the litterature: there is a growing acknowledgement of increasing pluralistic institutional environements, and hybrids are **likely to do well is such environments**, thus using the concept of hybrity allows to **explore how**.
THIRD, allows for **comparison** – Pache & Santos + Mair and coleagues.

**Why did your analytical focus focus only on governance structure of SE and not other instruments such as statutes, board, stakeholders etc. that can contribute to addressing institutional complexity?**
Thank you for letting me reflect critically on my research approach and choice of data material. It is true that instruments such as statutes, board, stakeholders and more can contribute and highlight the institutional complexity. This can be considered a limitation with regards of this study.
However, I have been preoccupied with understanding the perceptions of the employers of the SEs. How they experience the institutional complexity. Of importance to me was to allow the informants address the issues themselves. In all the interviews, save the interviews with informants tied to the voluntary organizations, I got the impression that the de facto decision-making power lied on the social entrepreneur or founder. This was quite explicitly stated in the interviews. Although it is an interesting case for further exploration/research, and as I understand the literature on hybrids and social enterprise and mission drift for example, the data that I have did not point to internal logic tensions.

**The legal status is used as a proxy for the institutional logics that characterize the organization’s institutional environment (makret vs. voluntary). Yet given the sample of organizations constituting the basis of the empirical analysis, this equivalence is not warrented and would need to be better substantiated. It is difficult to concider the ideal LLCs operating on a market logic as they are non-profits. If these organizations compete, they are most likely to compete for public funding and the institutional environment is mainly shaped by the public institutions that purchases their services, not by the market.**
*Thank you for this comment. I can immagine that this can be quite confusing for the reader.*
Yes, it is true that they are most likely to compete for public funding or contracts for the public sector. As it is not a pure market-logic that, but rather a logic from the quasi-market, I did discuss with the peer reviewers to instead employ the term “public procurement logic”. I did play around with the idea as it could highlight the fact that they do not operate on pure market-logic terms, but I had to follow my data which showed that some of the SEs did in fact compete for contracts with private organizations (businesses, business conferences, orgnaizations and events). To mitigate this, I therefore employed the concept of logic-*dialects*. However, I do agree that although the SEs identify as commercial-like actors, the pressures that they are submitted to are not only competitive pressures. They are also submitted to public-procurement logics, but also political agendas (what type of service they should pursue), political deabtes (welfare profiteer debate – pressuring them to tone down the welfare profiteer debate).

**Given the composition of the sample, the institutional logics at play within these organizations would have needed to be better substantiated by further information about their activities, “clients”, owners, statutes, board composistion, governance arrangement, and internal policy documents.**
*Thank you for this critical question regarding the composition of my sample. This allows me to critically reflect on the study’s limitation regarding methods and sample*.
The selection of the SEs were based on two criteria: SEs had to receive support from public and private actors and had to have existed for at least 5 years. The reason being that they had to have experienced different institutional logics from private and public actors & the last criterion had to do with the fact that the SEs I contacted with a shorter lifespan, did not have time to talk. This was a pragmatic choice.
LIMITATION: In this article, 2 structural hybrids, 2 blended hybrids with (IDEAL LLC) and 1 blended hybrid (VOL.ORG) were recruited. This is a skewed representation of SEs in the field. Here, I could have strengthened the sample by including another blended hybrid organized as a LLC. Also, in lack of a mixed-method-approach I could instead have interviewed bord members and staff within the organizations to get a broader understanding of the problem under investigation.
However, I have been a bit cautious in implying what expectations they might have felt, however had I included this further information, it would have strengthened the findings and rigour of the study. Which of course would have strengthened the transferrability of the study.

ARTICLE 3

**Focusing on Callon’s four moments of translation enables a micro-analysis, but may come at cost of overseeing other factors (than interational) that the literature discusses as widely important to the innovation process and which should be noted. A revision of the article, should include a discussion of how the theoretical fraemwork used in the research is situated in a wider field of alternative theoretical frameworks.**
I agree that literature on *collaborative governance* could also have been employed to analyze our empirical data. And I am not of the impression that Callon’s four moment of translation (including *problematization, interessement, enrolement, and mobilization*). As we describe in our method section, our starting point was that the collaboration project was a collaboration between two equal partners (as highlighted in the applications for funding), but after careful examination of the collected data material, we find that the structure of the given collaboration was structured in a hiearchical way, where the Refugee Integration Office lead by the enthusiastic leader was in the driving seat. Here, Callon appears relevant when seeking to undertand *how, why* and *at what point* during the development and implementation the tensions arose.
The choice of employing this framework is not an exclusive, but rather a pragmatic choice that we found useful in the analysis of the data. Specifically, the four moments of translations were fruitful in highlighting our main findings. Although we might have overlooked contextual features, we had to follow our data material and focus on the interactional micro-analysis. However, the R&D project is still ongoing, and it could absolutely be an interesting topic for future research. I also want to add that although collaborative governance could have fit neatly in this study, what ties the three articles together is – amongst other – the focus on translation theory.

**CONCEPTS**

***COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE \*ANSELL & GASH, 2007\*****:* A governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-stakeholders in a collaective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliverative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs and assets.
🡪 different types of collab. Gov.: collab. between governments and external actors, collab. within gov. and collab. between gov and individual citizens
🡪 strategies: bargening.
🡪 benefis

***ONTOLOGY***: the nature of reality. WHAT IS REALITY? realism and relitivism.
Realist: one truth exist 🡪 leading them to certain ways to generate knowledge
Relativism: multiple realities 🡪 can only understand
CONSTRUCTIVIST: multiple realities

***EPISTEMOLOGY***: how you can examine the nature of reality. HOW CAN I KNOW REALITY? what we believe about how to generating knowledge. E.G: Knowledge can me measured / Reality needs to be interpreted / Should be solved by best tools to solve the problem
*Realist*: since they believe that one truth exist, to generate such knowledge, they use scientific method. Discover new knowledge from the outside, take measurements and draw conclusions
CONSTRUCTIVIST: epistemological stance – knowledge needs to be interpreted to discover the underlying meaning.

***METHODOLOGY***: The study of methods, decisions and choices that led me to my methods. Considers my RQ, resources time etc.

CREDIBILITY – INTERNAL VALIDITY

TRANSFERRABILITY – EXTERNAL VALIDITY

DEPENDABILITY – RELIABILITY

CONFIRMABILITY - OBJECTIVITY