



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

Social Entrepreneurship and Refugees in Europe **Overcoming Crisis: Innovating Opportunities and Collaboration**

verfasst von / submitted by

Lara Ellinor Trikha

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2017 / Vienna, 2017

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

A 066 589

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Internationale Entwicklung UG2002

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Ao. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Margarete Maria Grandner

“If someone says we are just romantics, inveterate idealists,

thinking the impossible, that the masses of people cannot be turned into almost perfect human beings, we have to answer a thousand and one times: Yes, it can be done; we are right. The people as a whole can advance. Improving ourselves as a whole, as we do as individuals daily.

We have to work every day, work in the inner sense of improving ourselves, of gaining knowledge, and understanding about the world around us, of inquiring, and finding out, and knowing why things are the way they are and always considering humanity's great problems as our own.

I have to tell you honestly that we have to make a bigger, greater effort repeatedly, to move ahead, to meet the goals we ourselves set of being the best, of aspiring to be the best, because it hurts us to be anything less”

(Guevara, Deutschmann 2003: 167).

Acknowledgements

My sincere gratitude to my advisor Ao. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Margarete Maria Grandner, for her patience and guidance.

To my Co-advisor Professor Alejandro Cugat, Mara Daniel, Rachel Finn-Romero, Katrina Hoven, Matthias Frank, and Help2day: thank you for your emotional and intellectual support and inspiration.

To everyone who is moving beyond fear, moving beyond borders and working towards collaborative, innovative change; thank you for your courage, resilience, and determination for creating positive social change.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
Introduction.....	1
Overview.....	2
Section One: Theoretical Framework	
Social Entrepreneurship Introduction and Definition.....	5
United States.....	9
Europe.....	12
Global Context.....	14
Research Gap.....	15
Social Entrepreneurship Relevance	17
Cosmopolitanism.....	21
Othering.....	23
Social Connection Model.....	25
Section Two: A Humanitarian Crisis: Inefficiencies and Contradictions within EU Refugee Policy	
Introduction Section 2.....	31
Setting the Scene: EU Refugee Policy.....	31
EU Refugee Policy Brief Overview.....	33
Humanitarian Crisis in the Mediterranean.....	39
Section Three: Overcoming Crisis: Innovating Opportunities and Collaboration	
Introduction Section Three.....	48
Demographic Shifts-Opportunities for an Aging Population.....	48
Manifestations of Solidarity.....	51
Examples: Social Entrepreneurs Working with Refugees	
Examples Austria.....	53
Examples Germany.....	54
Further Examples.....	56
My Experience.....	57
Difficulties and Obstacles for Social Entrepreneurs.....	59
Social Impact Measurement.....	61
Discussion.....	64
Conclusion.....	67
Abstract English.....	69
Abstract German.....	70
References.....	71

Introduction

Over the last few decades, people have been looking towards finding innovative solutions for societal problems that create new opportunities to the world's most pressing challenges. Within the field of development studies, we learn, among other things, about international organizations, neoliberalism, and exploitation, failed development projects that run out of funding, complex problematic power relations between the north and the south, social exclusion, demographic challenges, environmental degradation and human rights abuses. The world is currently faced with several overwhelming challenges, many being the result of the exploitive sides of capitalism. Furthermore, "the trend in many countries of adopting the liberal ideology of diminishing government involvement in the economy and society has made it increasingly more difficult for welfare states to answer social needs and claims, on the one hand, and has broadened their reliance on the activities of the third-sector nonprofit organizations (NPOs), on the other" (Sharir, Lerner 2006: 16).

An important and influential topic that is central to development studies, policy making, and everyday life, is refugees and the increasing fear of others as countries change, borders transform and new definitions of citizenship and social responsibility emerge. Although some mechanisms which attempt to provide solutions are in place, like the Sustainable Development Goals and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in order to stay optimistic about the possibility of overcoming global challenges, I have discovered social entrepreneurship as a viable solution to tackling the challenges I have learned about during my studies.

This thesis argues that social entrepreneurship has the potential to offer sustainable solutions which help shift perspectives away from viewing refugees as a problem, and instead, provide measurable opportunities and innovation to create economic and social strategies to deal with the shifting

demographics in Europe. Social entrepreneurs challenge the destructive consequences of failed policies and capitalism for personal profit and exploitation, and move towards creating a shift in consciousness, which strives to make social value become more important than profit. Using a literature and policy analysis I explore the following research questions:

- What is social entrepreneurship?
- Can social entrepreneurship provide sustainable solutions for the shifting demographics and humanitarian challenges in Europe that have arisen due to the inefficiencies and contradictions within EU refugee policy?
- What are the difficulties and the comparative advantages (and disadvantages) of social entrepreneurs in comparison to other actors such as the government and entrepreneurs who are only profit oriented?

Overview

The first section is the theoretical section, which defines social entrepreneurship and social enterprises, and examines the differences between schools of thought in the United States and Europe. I also introduce arguments about why social entrepreneurship is important and what the difficulties confronted by social entrepreneurs are. The second part of the theoretical section very briefly explores theories of othering and cosmopolitanism, the social connection model and notions of collective responsibility, for social change. These frameworks are included, in order to provide a lens that is important to bear in mind when discussing challenges that include intercultural collaborations and also provide an additional foundation to show why social entrepreneurship is needed.

In the second section, I examine EU refugee policy as an example to highlight how top-down solutions have not been adequate in dealing with refugees seeking asylum in Europe. I argue that this humanitarian crisis will need to be approached from several different angles, including with social entrepreneurial innovation and a shift in discourse. Policy makers and civilians should shift away from seeing refugees as only an expensive and culturally challenging problem and reframe the discussion and policy towards recognizing the potential resources and economic opportunities that refugees bring, in order to provide long-term sustainable solutions for both refugees and Europeans. Here I explore the shifting demographics and humanitarian challenges that have arisen in Europe due to the inefficiencies and contradictions within EU refugee policy.

The final section describes projects and potential solutions that social entrepreneurs in Europe have contrived. I identify several projects both for refugees and in collaboration with refugees. Furthermore, I discuss some personal experiences that I have had within the social business world. I provide my anecdotal experiences of working with Help2day and attempting to launch Unter Einem Dach, two initiatives in Vienna navigating the social business world. This section shows how ‘crisis’ and ‘problems’ can potentially be turned into opportunities, and discusses the comparative advantages (and disadvantages) of social entrepreneurs in comparison to other actors such as the government and entrepreneurs who are only profit oriented.

Social entrepreneurship has the potential to be one solution for refugees in Europe, and help with the current and upcoming economic and social consequences of the demographic shifts and ramifications of an aging population. However, further research and evidence is needed to measure its effectiveness and success. For example, through my research, I have discovered that the bridge between academia and practitioners needs to be

strengthened in order to ensure that best practices are developed and shared efficiently. Furthermore, more awareness of the concept is needed in order for social enterprises to flourish.

This will allow for new forms of social responsibility, democratic economies and conscious forms of living together to emerge. Social entrepreneurship is the future, yet we cannot topple the entire global economic system. Therefore, through establishing creative solutions to problem solving that are not within the current norms and influencing a shift in values, it can become possible to move away from the exploitive tendencies of the market and instead, transform it into a force for good. This thesis does not claim that social entrepreneurship will solve everything, however it can be used as a practical way to deal with the current shifting demographics in Europe concerning refugees. Furthermore, it can help shift in the narrative concerning refugees. The discourse should include refugees as part of the solution, not the problem, and use this situation as an opportunity for innovation.

Section One: Theoretical Framework

Social Entrepreneurship Introduction and Definition

What is Social Entrepreneurship?

Social entrepreneurship is entrepreneurship with a mission to create positive social or environmental change. Zahra et al. in *Globalization of Social Entrepreneurship Opportunities* (2008), reviewed over twenty definitions of social entrepreneurship and unified them into the following single definition: “social entrepreneurship encompasses the activities and processes undertaken to discover, define and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner” (Zahra et al 2008: 118). Social entrepreneurship can also shortly be described as a “construct that bridges business and benevolence by applying entrepreneurship in the social sphere” (Roberts, Woods 2005: 46). Furthermore, “where traditional entrepreneurship involves the identification, evaluation, and exploration of opportunities in order to gain personal or shareholder wealth, social entrepreneurs recognize, evaluate and exploit opportunities that result in social value” (Austin, Stevenson, Wei-Skillern 2006: 2).

The European Commission lists the following characteristics of social enterprises: there is an economic and entrepreneurial nature of initiatives and a continuous activity of producing and/or selling goods and services. A social enterprise has a social, health and/or environment oriented purpose and then re-invests profits back into the business and its purpose and it is organizationally independent of the public sector (Larsen 2012). Furthermore, social dimensions of the initiatives exist, which are launched by a group of citizens. Finally, and most importantly, there is “an explicit aim to benefit the community” (European Commission 2012).

Social entrepreneurship is the bridge that has been missing in western corporate capitalism. Leadbeater, in *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*

(1997), explores how social entrepreneurs come to be, and how social welfare and entrepreneurship can be brought together. He argues that: “there is a growing political and intellectual consensus that we need to start looking beyond the confines of the traditional welfare state and the voluntary sector for solutions to our social ills (Leadbeater 1997: 76). Furthermore, increasingly more people (especially young people), are feeling passionately about the environment, human rights, social justice, and other social causes. Many people are no longer interested in only making money or buying products they need. It is becoming popular to want a job that creates a positive influence in the world, and consumers are more frequently buying products that are environmentally sustainable and produced accordingly to human rights standards (Leadbeater 1997: 80).

Furthermore, Dees states that it can help those who want to create change, with the opportunity to do so. Together with institutions, networks, and communities, social entrepreneurs create solutions that are efficient, sustainable, transparent, and have measurable impact (Dees 1998a: 3). The concept of social entrepreneurship is not new, but the label is.

The new name is important in that it implies a blurring of sector boundaries. In addition to innovative not-for-profit ventures, social entrepreneurship can include social purpose business ventures, such as for-profit community development banks, and hybrid organizations mixing not-for-profit and for-profit elements, such as homeless shelters that start businesses to train and employ their residents. The new language helps to broaden the playing field. Social entrepreneurs look for the most effective methods of serving their social missions (Dees 1998a: 2).

Those who gain the most as a result of a social entrepreneur’s efforts are typically those most disadvantaged by the current status quo. However, social entrepreneurship is more holistic than only helping the most disadvantaged. It is not only the principal target group that is affected but also the entire community around them. For example, social entrepreneurship can be used to tackle global development inequalities and problems, through creating sustainable businesses that create social change, reaching across race, class and gender to find solutions to help those who

are at a disadvantage. Social entrepreneurship is therefore also closely related to human rights and development, since through social enterprises innovative solutions to global challenges can potentially be found.

What social entrepreneurs do is they see a societal problem (whether it be poverty, health, refugees) and find not only a solution but then also create a sustainable business model for social impact. In Martin and Osberg's book, *Getting Beyond Better* (2015), they use the term 'equilibrium' rather than status quo or current system of power.

The social entrepreneur faces a steep challenge in building a model to drive equilibrium change. A social entrepreneur cannot act as a government does and simply mandate change. But neither can a social entrepreneur focus like a for-profit business solely on the customer segment that has the greatest ability to pay. Social Entrepreneurs seek to change the equilibrium of a marginalized or disenfranchised segment of society (Martin, Osberg 2015: 131).

For example, social entrepreneurs in Austria work to include marginalised groups in mainstream society through startups like Career Moves and Exit. Career Moves "connects people with disabilities with potential employers" (Hagelmuller 2013). The organization Exit "helps victims of human trafficking by giving not only legal and psychological advice but also helping these victims to set up a new life in Austria, and not fall back into prostitution" (Hagelmuller 2013). Another example of a social entrepreneur with a systems-changing solution is: Muhammad Yunus who created the Grameen Bank which spearheaded microfinance globally (Dees 1998a: 3).

Muhammad Yunus is a very popular example of a social entrepreneur. He noticed that impoverished people living in Bangladesh had very limited options to qualify for loans through the formal banking system.

They could borrow only by accepting exorbitant interest rates from local moneylenders. More commonly, they simply succumbed to begging on the streets. Here was a stable equilibrium of the most unfortunate sort, one that perpetuated and even exacerbated Bangladesh's endemic poverty and the misery arising from it (Martin, Osberg 2007).

Therefore, Yunus used \$27 of his own money to lend to 42 women from the village of Jobra, and the entire loan was repaid (Martin, Osberg 2007).

Yunus discovered that even with very small amounts of money:

women invested in their own capacity for generating income. For example, with a sewing machine, women could tailor garments, earning enough to pay back the loan, buy food, educate their children, and lift themselves up from poverty. Grameen Bank sustained itself by charging interest on its loans and then recycling the capital to help other women (Martin, Osberg 2007).

Yunus created a global network of other organizations that were inspired to replicate this idea around the world, which established microcredit as a worldwide industry (Martin, Osberg 2007). He saw a problem, and created a solution using a sustainable business model.

These examples show how these types of ideas do not just change the lives of the beneficiaries but can create a shift in the status quo or equilibrium. “The social entrepreneur is a visionary individual who is able to identify and exploit opportunities, to leverage the resources necessary to the achievement of his/her social mission and to find innovative solutions to social problems of his/her community that are not adequately met by the local system” (Bacq, Janssen 2011: 382). Furthermore, Martin and Osberg argue that “social entrepreneurs attack systems and equilibrium in society that are stuck and that desperately need to change” (Martin, Osberg 2015: 27). Further examples of social entrepreneurs will be discussed later in this thesis, in more detail to look at how solutions for refugees are being found through social entrepreneurship.

There are many different ways of defining social entrepreneurship and in order to create a comprehensive understanding of the concept, one must acknowledge the various schools of thought surrounding social businesses, which have created slightly varying definitions. These schools of thought became popular primarily in Europe and in the United States, although interest is growing all around the world. “It was not until 2004-2005, when the worldwide University Network of Social Entrepreneurship began discussions that European and American definitions of the concept of Social

Enterprise were compared” (Defourny, Nyssens 2010: 33). Today, more networks, researchers and practitioners around the world are contributing to advancing these schools of thought, as each country has specific needs and unique economic and political structures.

It is exceptionally difficult to find one unifying definition for social entrepreneurship. Bacq and Janssen, in their article: *The Multiple Faces of Social Entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria* (2011), give a comprehensive overview on the various definitions. They show that there are three main schools of thought of social entrepreneurship. Two schools have emerged in the US: The Social Innovation School and the Social Enterprise School and in Europe, social enterprises are conceptualized as being primarily a part of the third sector.

The Social Innovation School stresses the importance of the social entrepreneur as an individual and focuses on his/her characteristics. The Social Enterprise School claims that this kind of organizations will survive by conducting profit-generating activities in order to finance social value creation. The European tradition approaches social entrepreneurship by creating specific legal frameworks for ‘social enterprises’ (Bacq, Janssen 2011: 380).

I will give a brief introductory overview of the American and European definitions in order to show the variations in interpretation and an understanding of how these definitions came to be. Although it is important to note that definitions of social entrepreneurship vary across the globe beyond America and Europe, which causes even more confusion about the term.

United States

Social entrepreneurship as a term in the United States began gaining traction in the 1980s, where according to Dees (2007), it was created by individuals like Ed Skloot from New Ventures and Bill Drayton from Ashoka. The Social Innovation School, is associated with Bill Drayton and Ashoka, which is an organisation that aims to support social entrepreneurs as the engines of social change to act as role models for citizens. Ashoka supports

social innovation through investing in the most promising entrepreneurs. Ashoka also provides a network for collaboration to bring ideas and projects together, and “Ashoka creates needed infrastructure, such as access to social financing, bridges to business and academic sectors, and frameworks for partnerships that deliver social and financial value” (Ashoka 2015). Today, Ashoka exists in 70 countries, with 3,000 Ashoka fellows whom they are supporting and providing the tools required within a global network of change in order to deliver sustainable social solutions (Ashoka 2015). The Social Innovation School has a strong focus on heroic individuals.

The American Social Enterprise school of thought, on the other hand, highlights generating income while pursuing a social mission. This was led and motivated by New Ventures, which was the most prominent consulting firm in the United States in the 1980s, and “provided services to nonprofits interested in exploring business ventures” (Defourny, Nyssens 2010: 38). In this school of thought the heroic individual also plays an important role, however the business modelling, income generating aspect of social missions is the central focus for the social enterprise school of thought.

These two schools of social entrepreneurship partially arose as a result of the propaganda in the United States which teaches to value individual success and believe in the American Dream. The American version of capitalism is government-detached and individual financial success, short-term financial profit and media coverage reinstate these values (Bacq, Janssen 2011: 389). Media channels are thus dominated by corporate interests and ideologies through which much of the American public has learned to resent social services and the poor, regarding those in low-income families as lazy, and blaming those in a lower economic class rather than those above in the economic structure. This mentality instills a fear of “the other” which further disconnects Americans from each other and thus reinforces individuality rather than cultivating a sense of citizenship and community. Therefore, unemployment benefits are very low and family allowance does not exist (Bacq, Janssen 2011: 389).

In *Media Magic; Making Class Invisible* (1995), Mantsios explains how the mass media shapes the notions of social possibilities and national identity. This mass media is controlled by a handful of mega corporations who are determined to create a country of consumers rather than a country of connected citizens. For example, although the United States have enough wealth to eliminate poverty, it is the most stratified country in the developed world. The rigid class distinctions influence daily American life. Mantsios states: “we as a nation, retain illusions about living in an egalitarian society. These illusions exist because the media hides gross inequities from public view. In those instances when inequities are revealed, we are provided with messages that obscure the nature of class realities and blame the victims of class-dominated society for their own plight” (Mantios 1995: 386). The media in the United States will blame the victim, rather than acknowledge that poverty is systematic. One can see parallels in the media in Europe, as refugees are increasingly targeted in a very negative light.

This means that in the US, social issues like education, poverty, inequality etc. often do not directly concern the government, and are more of a moral and charity issue (Bacq, Janssen 2011: 389). Therefore, “in the US, social entrepreneurship could be considered as a substitute for the Welfare State – a social state that guards for social protection and free negotiation between social partners” (Bacq, Janssen 2011: 389). This means that most social entrepreneurial initiatives are privately organized and exist at a local level, rather than having a more global presence. For example, the rapidly growing tech industry in a region like the Bay Area in California, has increased inequality within the local population. therefore, many social entrepreneurs are helping vulnerable groups to overcome these gaps and private impact investors are crucial actors in the ecosystem of social entrepreneurship in California.

In the United States people rely on foundations and charity for social services, so social entrepreneurs heavily rely on these foundations (The Schwab Foundation, The Skoll Foundation and The Omidyar Network for example). Furthermore, they also rely on consulting firms like New

Ventures to help generate income, as supported through the Social Enterprise School.

Europe

On the other side of the Atlantic, “the European tradition considers the poor man as a victim rather than a culprit, which explains its very organized social security, viewed as a fair consequence of the economic progress” (Bacq, Janssen 2011: 389). The European Rhineland model, emphasises the importance of collective success, and long-term vision, founded on “shared values of equality and collective interest, money is only a means to reach the goal of creating value” (Bacq, Janssen 2011: 390). In Europe, third sector organizations (such as cooperatives, non-profits and mutual societies), already played a significant role after WW2 in providing social services.

During the 1970s, the concept of social exclusion became relevant, when several social problems like unemployment increased. This was partially a result of the failure of the

modern welfare states to effectively address the concerns of exclusion and state’s incapacity to protect excluded individuals and communities or to re-integrate them. While state-driven agenda and market forces play a role in generating such catastrophic scenarios, the burden on the third sector to ameliorate the social setting has grown and various innovative strategies have been explored. To fill the gaps in welfare provision, a new breed of organisations, social enterprises, came into existence (Kummitha 2016: 61).

Social exclusion and work integration programs are important today with refugees as well. This will be addressed later in this paper.

Furthermore, in the 1990s the work integration social enterprises (WISEs) were specific social enterprises which gained popularity throughout Europe. “The main objective of work integration social enterprises is to help low qualified unemployed people who are at risk of permanent exclusion from the labor market” (Defourny, Nyssens 2010: 37). Many of these programs were created without a legal framework, which led to more laws eventually being passed, through pressure from citizens and entrepreneurs, in order to

promote and help support social enterprises succeed in several countries (Defourny, Nyssens 2010: 37). As a result, today there is more policy and public sector support for social enterprises in Europe than in the United States and “the European tradition approaches social entrepreneurship by creating specific legal frameworks for ‘social enterprises’ (Bacq, Janssen 2011: 389). However, there are still many legal and bureaucratic barriers for social enterprises in Europe that can be improved.

Ioan and Wolf discuss social entrepreneurship and the role of the welfare state in Germany and explain: “that private actors involved in social service provision can be viewed with suspicion and therefore, the reactions that social enterprises generate are diverse, while they are received with excitement by some, others warn not to release the state from its responsibilities and commercialize welfare” (Ioan, Wolf 2015). Furthermore:

while the state and social welfare organizations tend to deliver services that are aligned with and responsive to national policies (such as legal consulting services or providing emergency accommodation), social entrepreneurial initiatives develop their services based on challenges they see surfacing locally and often act on the spot; they provide opportunities for local exchange and integration, complement organized mass accommodation with private housing, open opportunities for income generation (beyond or before) the informal labor market, provide easily accessible language courses and offer psychological support (Ioan, Wolf 2015).

For example, in Austria, the state helps provide emergency accommodation and legal services for refugees, and social entrepreneurs and charity organizations help provide services for integration, local exchange, and possible work opportunities.

This thesis will dive into the current situation in Europe in regards to refugees, as an example which shows how various actors from all backgrounds and sectors can work together and coexist while solving social problems. Furthermore, I will be using the term ‘social entrepreneurship’ while taking into account the background from the various schools of thought and broad definitions. However, since this thesis is focused

primarily on Europe, the European definition(s) and connection with the third sector is important to keep in mind.

Global Context

The main schools of thought available within academia regarding this topic are from the US and Europe. There are however scholars in developing nations who are researching and measuring the impact of social entrepreneurship in their countries as well, such as the Indian researcher Krishna Rama Reddy Kummitha and the article *Social Entrepreneurship As A Tool To Remedy Social Exclusion: A Win-Win Scenario?* (2016). This is an area where a great deal of research will be needed in order for projects in countries beyond Europe and the US to avoid dependency and create their own models for change. Each country has specific needs and legal systems, so one rigid definition and model cannot be applied universally.

In the paper entitled: *Extra EU Countries Dossier on New Generation Social Enterprises Summary of 5 Stakeholder-Interviews in 5 non-European Countries* (2017), Bauernfeind presents a report which summarizes five interviews about social entrepreneurship in San Francisco, Singapore, Tel Aviv, Sao Paulo and Melbourne. Through interviews, the various countries were compared, and the role of the government, funding, and definitions were explored (Bauernfeind 2017: 133). These interviews were done in order to provide a global perspective, which moves beyond the European context. It is becoming increasingly more evident that social entrepreneurship is a global phenomenon and it is therefore necessary to receive a holistic picture by selecting perspectives from other continents.

The representatives in the study from San Francisco and Israel argue that the reason for the rise of social enterprises is a bottom-up process, which comes from individuals and the civil society that critically scrutinise mainstream politics and the economic system (Bauernfeind 2017: 142). On the other hand, the representative from Singapore believes that the reason for this development is primarily due to the top-down activities of the

government, combined with the success of the tech industry (Bauernfeind 2017: 143).

In Singapore the state invests a lot in social entrepreneurship and the government is working on training its citizens to become self-reliant, risk takers with entrepreneurial thinking (Bauernfeind 2017: 136). Tan, who works with a state-affiliated organisation in Singapore, states:

the main goal is to enable and empower society to be self-sustainable. The question is: how can we move away from giving people social assistance rather than: how could we give them social assistance. We are removing this mentality via education and training to be self- sustainable. Social enterprises are training society to change this mindset” (Bauernfeind 2017: 136).

The paper shows how important the role of the government is within shaping the discourse around social entrepreneurship and also stresses the variations within perspectives as well as the commonalities (difficulties in funding, lack of public awareness regarding the term etc.) which are globally present as social entrepreneurship grows. When one examines the various economic and political backgrounds of countries, it is understandable that such fluctuating definitions of social entrepreneurship exist. However it is also evident that more research, shared best practices and public awareness needs to be increased (Bauernfeind 2017: 161).

Research Gap

An article recently published in the Stanford Innovation Review: *The Research Gap in Social Entrepreneurship* (2016), addresses a very important discovery within the field of social entrepreneurship. Over 500 academic articles were identified and compiled into a literature list, which was compared with a social entrepreneurship syllabus provided by the Skoll Foundation, which recommends literature for courses on social entrepreneurship (Hand, Lewis 2016). This resulted in the discovery that “academics and practitioners of social entrepreneurship seem to be operating in different spheres” (Hand, Lewis 2016). The data showed that “the practitioners and business school professors that teach social

entrepreneurship today, reference hardly any of the academic scholarship on social entrepreneurship” (Hand, Lewis 2016). This shows that there is a research gap within the field of social entrepreneurship which further complicates finding consistent information, definitions, and best practices for this discipline.

Academic scholarship on social entrepreneurship is an area which will need to be improved over the years in order for more efficient social change and innovation to develop. “Academics may seem slow and plodding to the practitioner, but only because they want to get it right. Practitioners may seem over-eager and unreflective to the academic, but only because there is a fierce urgency in the injustices they work against” (Hand, Lewis 2016). Addressing this research gap, within both the academic and practical field, will allow for more precise data in the future and more effective projects. Furthermore, finding common definitions could help with more accurate social impact measurement and more public support and awareness about social entrepreneurship as a legitimate model for change.

Organizations and research projects are also currently being funded by the European Commission, and various institutions of higher learning have programs and research underway to increase scholarship, data, and accurate measurement in this field: programs like SEFORIS for example.

SEFORIS stands for Social Entrepreneurship as a Force for more Inclusive and Innovative Societies. It is a multi-disciplinary research programme, funded by the European Commission, that investigates the potential of social enterprise in the EU and beyond to enhance the inclusiveness of societies through greater stakeholder engagement, promotion of civic capitalism and changes to social service provision. Seforis combines insights from policy makers and social enterprise practitioners with cutting-edge academic research to build robust and novel evidence on social entrepreneurship (SEFORIS 2016).

Social entrepreneurship projects arise when there is a social need that is not being sufficiently handled by the existing structures. It varies from country to country, in terms of how successful social entrepreneurship is. At times it is supported by the state and other times the state is not involved at all and

social entrepreneurship is supported by foundations instead. Social entrepreneurs find ‘niches’ that other organizations (e.g. governments) do not. Often their projects arise out of a need from society, and they act as a bridge between the public and private sectors.

While social enterprises were originally seen primarily as a way of meeting social needs for local communities that had been let down by both the market and the state, they are now seen as playing a greater role in a competitive market both within the private sector and within the markets for public services. It is the latter set of activities that is of particular interest here as social enterprises and other parts of the third sector increasingly become a delivery agent for the state” (Hunter 2009: 30).

For example housing and education are being provided by social entrepreneurs in Germany and Austria, and grants to further support these activities are made available by the governments of these countries.

Social Entrepreneurship Relevance

As theorists strive to define and measure social entrepreneurship and social impact, organizations like the Impact Hub, Ashoka, The European Commission and the Skoll Foundation, as well as many others are recognizing the value of social enterprises and supporting social entrepreneurs in both manifesting their ideas on a practical level and supporting them through their networks. There is also the SOCAP conference, which shows, that there is growing support for social entrepreneurship (Bauernfeind 2017: 145). SOCAP is a network of entrepreneurs, and social impact leaders, based in California, who believe in an inclusive and socially responsible economy to address the world’s toughest challenges (Bauernfeind 2017: 145). Their mission is to create a platform where investors willing to put money into enterprises focused foremost on social return can meet the world’s most innovative entrepreneurs. SOCAP has supported more than 1,000 entrepreneurs through scholarships, mentoring and training, and has attracted over 10,000 participants to its annual conferences. “Finding meaning in your work is always a major theme, as well as measuring social impact. It attracts

different kinds of people, all age groups, all sectors, all backgrounds from 80 different countries in the world” (Bauernfeind 2017: 145).

Even though social entrepreneurship is a relatively new term as defined in Europe and the United States, throughout the last ten years it has become increasingly widespread on an international level with international organizations, prestigious universities, public agencies, private corporations, governments and entrepreneurial firms paying close attention and allocating resources to social entrepreneurship (Dees 2007: 27). Because of this increased recognition, social entrepreneurship has become more widespread (Jiao 2011: 142).

To elaborate the global context, The Thomas Reuters Foundation, Deutsche Bank and the Global Social Entrepreneurship Network conducted the world’s first expert study with an online survey in 45 of the world’s biggest economies to find out which countries are creating the best environment for social entrepreneurs (Zweynert 2016). The USA, Canada, UK, Singapore and Israel came out as having the best environments (Lombardi, Wulforst 2016). In each of the 45 countries, 20 experts were contacted and the researchers focused on social entrepreneurship. Academics, social entrepreneurs, investors, policy-makers and support network staff provided data (Thomson Reuters Foundation 2016). The poll found that “almost 60 percent of social enterprise experts said there was a lack of public awareness about social entrepreneurs” (Zweynert 2016).

In the countries that were rated the best, certain governmental support structures have been set up to assist social entrepreneurship. For example, in the United States, “President Barack Obama set up the White House’s Office of Social Innovation and Social Innovation Fund, while in Britain the government pioneered innovative social finance tools, such as social impact bonds and social investment tax relief” (Zweynert 2016). A key finding of major importance from the poll is the challenge for social entrepreneurs “in accessing financial support, whether grants, debt or equity investment. Only 10 countries surveyed in the poll agree that it is easy for social entrepreneurs

to access grant funding, and only four agreed the same applies to investment” (Norbury 2016). This poll contributes to showing that social entrepreneurship is indeed expanding around the world, however knowledge of the term is still significantly low.

Zahra et al in *The Globalization of Social Entrepreneurship Opportunities* (2008) argue that global wealth disparity, the corporate social responsibility movement, technological advances/shared responsibility and market/institutional and state failures are four factors of the globalized world, which have influenced the increased awareness about the social problems that are present. Through globalization there has been increased awareness of the unequal wealth circulation and social problems persistent in the world economy. Furthermore, due to the fact that information is very easily accessible through the internet, individuals have been provided with knowledge that can be applied to venture social opportunities. “More exposure to social problems in the developing world has encouraged the founding of many social ventures” (Zahra et al 2008: 121).

Zahra et al argue that increased intercommunication between the developing world and the developed world allows for greater innovation and more effective solutions, through more intercultural collaboration and better data. This has therefore also created opportunities for attempted improvements in these countries, through the Millenium Development and Sustainable Development Goals (Zahra et al 2008: 118). International organizations, neoliberalism, and exploitation, complex problematic power relations between the north and the south, social exclusion, environmental degradation and human rights abuses. The world is currently faced with several overwhelming challenges, many being the result of the exploitive sides of capitalism which further increase inequality.

As economic inequality grew, so did the concern and attention regarding the role of large multinational corporations. More specifically, the role of powerful corporations within the distribution of the world’s financial and environmental resources. As a result of this increased attention, both social

activists as well as stakeholders have coerced multinational corporations into considering their social responsibility. Today, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) can be understood as a company's responsibility to those who are oppressed by the corporation as well as those whose rights are affected by corporate actions (Zahra et al 2008: 120).

Although some companies have increased their CSR efforts they are not able to keep up with the amplifying expectations to be involved with and aware of social problems. Furthermore, these corporations have a lot of money and are therefore faced with raising expectations for corporate action and accountability towards social problems by society (Zahra et al 2008: 120). In Europe, large companies, banks, and other public-interest entities with more than 500 employees are encouraged to disclose in their management reports relevant and useful information on their policies, main risks and outcomes relating to “environmental matters, social and employee aspects, respect for human rights, anti-corruption and bribery issues, and diversity in their board of directors” (EU Commission 2014b). These reports are intended to help companies meet standards of CSR. The increased popularity of CSR also contributes to the increased popularity and globalization of social entrepreneurship.

In: *A conceptual model for social entrepreneurship directed toward social impact on society* (2011), Jiao discusses how an alliance is needed between corporate organizations and nonprofit organizations. Furthermore, in order to make steps towards solving social problems, cooperation between different sections of society needs to take place. In regards to CSR, Jiao argues that “social entrepreneurship will be further encouraged by these steps taken by all branches of society. Therefore the disappearing boundaries between sectors will lead to innovative ways to effectively tackle social problems” (Jiao 2011: 132). Social entrepreneurs recognize these issues and take the opportunity to create change.

Cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism is interesting to include in this thesis as it also discusses disappearing boundaries as well as the dichotomies of inside/outside, us/them, nation/international (stable concepts for nation states), which are no longer sufficient or able to be sustained. A cosmopolitan is a citizen of the world who lives in and across borders. Cosmopolitanism is all about adapting to being open to distant others and raising the moral imperative to interact positively with those others in the name of common humanity. Global activism, for example, can be framed by civic cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism encourages universal assumptions that refute the characters of “time and space while also being susceptible to the particular hegemonic order of the day and the balances of power in any given context. It is, therefore, always both conformist and contesting, universal and particular. However, it is through contestation that cosmopolitanism can truly flourish” (Chouliaraki, Blaagaard 2015: 26). Cosmopolitanism is a notion that can be adapted to many universalist ideas like freedom, human rights and democracy. However:

those ideas are always susceptible to the hegemonic order of the day and as such are always context-bound, related to power and particular to time and space. In other words, they will always exhibit conformist traits. However, to be truly cosmopolitan (if one can distill an essence of cosmopolitanism), to build solidarities that are far reaching and egalitarian, then contestation must take precedence (Chouliaraki, Blaagaard 2015: 36).

The cosmopolitanization of society is a globalization from within as people are increasingly more mobile between different cultures (through marriages, diasporic kinship networks etc.) on one hand, and through the internet on the other. Furthermore, there is also easy access to global images of disaster and suffering, creating more interconnection and awareness.

Beck, in *Cosmopolitan Vision* (2006) also discusses the importance of cosmopolitan openness to otherness. He argues that “Europe needs to unite forms of life which have grown out of language, skin colour, nationality or religion with awareness that, in a radically insecure world, all are equal and

everyone is different” (Beck 2006: 17). Humans identify most strongly with individuals who have close proximity to them, and want to help them when needed. People have the tendency to be less influenced by the “suffering that occurs farther away from them, cosmopolitanism theory describes the shared belief that certain basic needs (e.g., feeding children) are universal” (Zahra et al 2008: 126). This discourse is “reinforced by behavioral decision theorists who proffer that search for opportunities tends to be local. However, the theory of cosmopolitanism asserts that friendship toward humanity frequently overrides local, and even nationalistic, tendencies by stressing the universal human vulnerability to suffering” (Beck 2006: 29).

Zahra et al take the conversation back to theories of cosmopolitanism and the urgency to act out of a sense of empathy and basic universal human needs. Although they discuss cosmopolitanism, they also include elements from pro social theory, which highlights the importance of altruism in order to help others. “Prosocial behavior is driven by empathy, which is triggered by an event such as the increased awareness of the prevalence and urgency of a given social opportunity” (Zahra et al 2008: 126). This means that people are more likely to respond rapidly to a situation when the injustice and suffering is perceived to be severe (Zahra et al 2008: 126). Interestingly, in regards to the topic of othering, this also reduces the imaginative value of both “psychic distance and liabilities of foreignness, which have been used to explain the reluctance of new ventures and established companies to move into markets that are culturally distant from their own home markets” (O’Grady, Lane 1996: 321).

This sense of urgency can be felt, as policy makers, entrepreneurs, activists, and people from all sectors are grappling with the humanitarian crisis that Europe is currently faced with in regards to refugees, and the economic and cultural challenges that lie ahead, as demographic shifts call for new innovative ways to integrate and educate refugees, so that they can be a positive opportunity for Europe, rather than a burden.

There are contradictions and inefficiencies within European Refugee Policy which have led to a humanitarian crisis in the Mediterranean and throughout Europe. This will be elaborated in Section 2. The social opportunities for innovation that social entrepreneurs recognize exist because of the needs in society. Currently, refugee humanitarian assistance and policy have proven to be short term solutions which have not been efficient. These solutions do not guarantee integration both economically and socially.

The long term effectiveness of social entrepreneurship is still being measured and researched as time goes on. Therefore, I cannot argue that it can guarantee solutions. However, it is currently helping to clean up the mess and deal with the consequences of past decisions that Europe is currently faced with. Dealing with change and creating solutions so that Europe can attempt to reach the standards of human rights and equality that it strives to represent. Furthermore, social entrepreneurship can assist in shifting the refugee discourse (both in the media and within policy making) away from seeing refugees as a problem and work towards creating opportunities for economic growth, intercultural collaborations, building bridges, breaking stereotypes and moving away from fear of the other.

Othering

All over Europe right wing xenophobia and anti-immigration parties are gaining rapidly growing support. “The increasing use of racism and xenophobia and anti-immigration discourse affects not only the right wing parties but also the mainstream political parties” (Faedda 2014: 116). A ‘politics of fear’ is being highlighted by the media, in Europe and the United States, as people adjust to shifting demographic landscapes. In order to lay a foundation for the lens which I feel is needed to be aware of when discussing any topic within Development Studies, and particularly when discussing refugees and intercultural collaboration, I will discuss some brief theoretical background of othering. I will briefly define the concept of ‘othering.’

Othering is a phenomenon of power relations resulting in one group describing itself united in a 'we' which then implies that the various groups are fundamentally different 'others' (Rismyhr 2012). These distinctions are too often the foundation of discrimination and power differences within sexuality, gender and race. When one 'others' another group, their perceived weaknesses are highlighted to make oneself look superior. This creates a hierarchy, which serves to keep the hegemonic power structure in place (Rismyhr 2012). In development discourse, these hierarchies are examined and evaluated through attempts to analyze necessary steps to improve the wellbeing of humanity. Human Rights, social innovation, equality and environmental sustainability provide a new platform, which calls for a shift away from binary, patriarchal patterns of domination and subordination. As new voices are being heard, and new tools of communication have been established, there is no longer room for dualism. Othering must be acknowledged, examined and diagnosed.

Othering is present across many spectrums including race, class, gender, geography and culture. This results in some individuals, communities, and even nations to be devalued and members of the paramount class or country to be privileged. Within the context of refugee policy making, it is crucial to expose otherness and its impact on society as a first step towards developing effective solutions.

It is important to be aware of the presence of othering in refugee discourse, development practices and social entrepreneurial ventures. Theorists who discuss othering highlight how stereotypes, assumptions and binary thought patterns create more separation and subordination, rather than the collective action and inclusive dialogue needed to allow everyone's voice to be heard and to create an effective dialogue for contemporary policies that embody human rights norms. In order to create a cohesive intersectional discourse, binary concepts that create structures of hegemony and reinforce patterns of colonization, need to be removed and/or restructured to pave the way towards a new discourse, challenging the current structure of power.

This also means that the voice of the other needs to be placed in the forefront, not as a victim, but as a complex subject which is affected by global processes and has the ability to create effective global change. Although some may argue that changing the consciousness and hegemony, which exists within the population, is a long, hard and difficult process, it is only when each of us recognizes the true impact of otherness that collectively we can begin to move toward developing meaningful, sustainable solutions.

Social entrepreneurs, have a global perspective and sense of cosmopolitanism, which enables a stronger ability to understand other cultures as well as a desire to make home/earth/wherever you are, a better place. As societies rely more and more on social entrepreneurs—whether independent or corporate—to mend holes in the social fabric left unaddressed, governments, NGOs, and researchers need to examine the intimate links between the characteristics of these entrepreneurs and the social ventures they build (Zahra et al 2008: 129). Social ventures are quickly becoming the vanguards of social transformation, enhancing the quality of life and enriching human existence around the globe (Zahra et al 2008: 129). For example, The Impact Hub is a global network of changemakers. It is both an online and a physical platform, which provides social entrepreneurs a borderless space to connect, collaborate, exchange ideas, and have access to support on several levels including financially. The first Impact Hub was opened in London in 2005, and today there are 82 Impact Hubs all over the world, in 48 countries, with over 11,000 members on 5 continents (Impact Hub Vienna 2016). The Impact Hub is a place where individuals from all different backgrounds and sectors can come together and collaborate on social change.

Social Connection Model and Collective Responsibility

A further case for social entrepreneurship: although there is a persistent ideology of human rights and cooperation in the dream of democracy, the current system is deeply stratified and full of contradictions within theory

and practice. This creates a sense of apathy and hopelessness, set up through structural barriers which are designed to keep a hierarchical structure of power, limit opportunities for advancement and suppress democratic and economic representation for subordinate groups. Oppression in terms of gender, race and class is interconnected in a system which manipulates public opinion through the media, separates rather than unifies and gives voice to those with money. The intersectionality of oppression should be acknowledged to reconstruct the notions of democracy and human rights through transforming the dominant ideology to include a collective responsibility for social change which acknowledges human interconnection and values every voice. Furthermore, the strong influence of the media and the social stratification sets barriers preventing members of subordinate groups from advancing, and discrimination against race, class and gender are a direct result of the dominant group's efforts to stay in power. This undermines democracy and calls for a restructuring of the capitalist and welfare systems.

Western culture does not place a strong emphasis on the need for collective action partially due to the mentality of individualism. Those who feel they do not have a responsibility to engage in social justice issues often feel overwhelmed with the magnitude of problems in the world and feel that they are too much to deal with. Society has taught us through media and a faulty system of values to disregard the pain we see in the world and assume that others (i.e. social activists, Mother Theresa's politicians and other authoritative figures) will take care of. It seems overwhelming to wrap our minds around the extremity of the current global crisis; in terms of climate change, poverty, economic collapse and pollution. There is a passive mentality that is persistent in so many people, which persuades us that we do not have the capability to solve these massive problems and should therefore not even attempt to create change. Our way of thinking and passive mentality is strongly a result of being 'enslaved' in a sense, by powerful global institutions which have an incomprehensible amount of

control over global justice and the distribution of resources wealth and especially the media, which shapes our patterns of thought.

International, corporate, financial institutions and other military, economic and social institutions as well as great power governments, constitute the global institutional power. This global order, is a significant cause, though not the only cause, of severe global poverties and enormous inequalities in standards of living around the world. There is a very small set of ruling institutions and groups of people in power who determine the living standards of the world's population and create a global order in which some people are "unfairly disadvantaged and others are unfairly advantaged" (Young 2012: 141).

To grasp a better understanding of structural injustice, we must examine the "rules and practices of business, communications, media and the leisure and consumption tastes of ordinary people" so that new solutions can be found (Young 2012: 142). The consumerism, individualism and materialism, in the United States and Europe in particular, places an emphasis on competition and selfishness, rather than on collaboration and interconnection. Singer in *Famine, Affluence, and Morality* (1972), addresses the responsibility to live with only the necessary material goods and donate to those in need as much as possible. He highlights this responsibility as 'moral obligation' which, if we chose *not* to act would make us immoral human beings. Singer makes an excellent point, when he observes how there is a problem with the fact that "the charitable man may be praised, but the man who is not charitable is not condemned" (Singer 1972).

As human beings become more educated,

we gain more responsibility and can no longer sit back and watch what we know to be wrong, especially in terms of global poverty, refugees, war and preventable deaths. The decisions and actions of human beings are capable of preventing suffering (Singer 1972).

Furthermore, Singer makes this point very clear by stating: “if it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it” (Singer 1972). The words “comparable moral importance” are crucial to look at within our own lives. How have our perceptions of morality been made? What is our definition of happiness, specifically in terms of what we need and what we want (or think that we want), how has media shaped these definitions, and trying to control our actions for personal gain? The answers to these questions; the values of affluent societies directly contribute to the suffering of others if not addressed in a globally conscious manner.

Citizens all over the world (especially educated citizens in the world’s most wasteful, and most affluent countries) must assume responsibility for their preferences and tastes to some extent; yet also make sure that a just political and social structure is being maintained. The social connection model which is introduced by Young in the book *Responsibility for Justice* (2012) addresses this need very adequately. Here too, we are dealing with political responsibility, an idea that does not ignite ideas of personal liability or guilt. ‘Blame language’ which is associated with liability, can be inappropriate when concerned with issues of structural injustice

because it divides people between powerful wrongdoers and those who are innocent, whether as victims or bystanders. This often simplifies the causes of injustice, and renders most people passive or comparatively unable to help remedy the problem” (Young 2012: 116).

This includes the tendency to only blame corporations and/or policy makers for global injustice rather than also personally reflecting on how to live in a just manner and working within the institutions and reform the system from within. “The social connection model finds that all who contribute by their actions to structural processes with some unjust outcomes share responsibility for the injustice. This responsibility is not primarily backward looking, as the attribution of guilt or fault is, but rather primarily forward looking” (Young 2012: 96). Young agrees with Singer in terms of a universal moral obligation for global justice. “Individuals have a

responsibility for structural injustice because they contribute by their actions due to the processes that produce unjust outcomes. Our responsibility derives from belonging together with others in a system of interdependent processes of cooperation and competition through which we seek benefits” (Young 2012: 105). Young states:

the notion of responsibility for the future, a responsibility each person has alone and also has together with others: ‘I must answer for myself or before myself by answering for us and before us. I/we must answer for the present *we* for and before the *we* of the future, while presently addressing myself to you, and inviting you to join up with this ‘us’ of which you are already not yet a member (Young 2012: 119).

Young furthermore discusses solidarity and the importance of connecting people from all different backgrounds and sectors stating: “people in solidarity for the sake of justice are determined to improve social relations, but they are also tentative and humble” (Young 2012: 120). The type of solidarity that Young strives to inspire is “a relationship among many people who recognize and take up shared responsibility in relation to the social institutions and practices they enact and support, to make them just. This solidarity is an ideal, a promise and an engagement” (Young 2012: 121). This type of solidarity can be seen within both top down and bottom up approaches present in the the world today.

Young and Singer aim for us to engage in a daily practice of shared responsibility and conscious consumer choices. It is important to remember the words that Nelson Mandela made famous “our greatest fear is not that we are inadequate, but that we are powerful beyond measure” (Williamson 1992: 23). Through shared responsibility and collective action, we can stop turning our backs on the pain in the world and open our eyes to the change we wish to see.

Section one, has introduced the concept of social entrepreneurship and shared global responsibility, and has provided a foundation on which a discussion of refugees in Europe can build on. Social entrepreneurs notice a problem and seek to fix it through filling gaps where government is not able

to fulfil its duties and finding ways to support those most disadvantaged. The plight of refugees around the world, and most urgently, currently the refugees in Europe, can be understood as a global call to action, as policymakers grapple towards finding solutions, while refugees and Europeans face immense changes which policies and a discourse that must be re-framed towards highlighting the opportunities, rather than the problems that accompany the shifting European landscape with newcomers and an aging population.

Section Two: A Humanitarian Crisis: Inefficiencies and Contradictions within EU Refugee Policy

Introduction: Section Two

This section examines the inefficiencies and contradictions within EU Refugee policy, using a literature review analysis of EU refugee policy and highlighting events in the Mediterranean.

The first part of this section examines EU refugee policy. Through a brief review of EU refugee policy, highlighting events in the Mediterranean and how these have sparked international attention which has framed refugees as an enormous problem, I show that the policies that European leaders have attempted to deal with the influx of refugees crossing the Mediterranean, and the lack of equal distribution of refugees throughout the EU has not been enough. I argue that the refugee discourse in Europe must be reframed and solutions will need to come from the private, civil and NGO sectors as well, calling social entrepreneurs to action, and cultivate more sustainable, long-term solutions.

There are increased fears throughout Europe which include concerns regarding economic stability, safety, and cultural clashes. These are highlighted in the media and perpetuated through increased hate crimes throughout Europe. This can be connected to the problematic discourse perpetuated by politicians of viewing refugees as only a problem, rather than reframing the issue and using this situation as an opportunity to invest in growth and social innovation.

Setting the Scene: EU Refugee Policy

The modern refugee regime was created in the aftermath of the Second World War. Through an international convention signed by 147 governments, the 1951 United Nations Convention on the Status of Refugees, states committed to reciprocally admit people onto their territory who flee conflict and persecution (Betts 2016). “Its basic aim is to ensure that when a state fails, or worse, turns against its own people, people have somewhere to go, to live in safety and dignity until they can go home. It was

created precisely for situations like the situation we see in Syria today” (Betts 2016). This is also based on Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights from 1948, “which recognizes the right of persons to seek Asylum from persecution in other countries” (United Nations 1948).

today, that system is failing. In theory, refugees have a right to seek asylum. In practice, our immigration policies block the path to safety. In theory, refugees have a right to a pathway to integration, or return to the country they’ve come from. But in practice, they get stuck in almost indefinite limbo. In theory, refugees are a shared global responsibility. In practice, geography means that countries proximate the conflict take the overwhelming majority of the world’s refugees. The system isn’t broken because the rules are wrong. It’s that we’re not applying them adequately to a changing world, and that’s what we need to reconsider (Betts 2016).

Although European leaders have tried to deal with the influx of refugees crossing and attempting to cross the Mediterranean, anti-foreigner rhetoric and xenophobia, are on the rise. Additionally, restrictive policies such as fence-building and pushbacks are also present in several EU countries. Such practices place refugees at risk, pushing them into the hands of smugglers or simply redirecting their movement. Furthermore, each pillar of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS), has been inadequately addressed: “guaranteed access to protection for those in need, respect for international and EU protection standards, coordinated responses in a spirit of solidarity, and the orderly and fair distribution of responsibilities among the Member States” (Maiani 2016: 9).

The role of the media in the perpetuation of racism and fear, as well as shaming and pushing for action, has also been a crucial player in the formation of what is being called the refugee crisis. For example, last September, a picture of a young drowned boy created international attention and has become a symbol for the crisis. However, Betts argues that there are contradictions within the discourse. “We mourn the tragic death of two-year-old Alan Kurdi, and yet, since then, more than 200 children have subsequently drowned in the Mediterranean” (Betts 2016). Furthermore, the language used within the media, through words like ‘swarms of refugees’

and ‘influx’ etc. have further perpetuated a lot of distress, and led to the ‘crisis’ which policy makers have been attempting to deal with.

EU Refugee Policy: Brief Overview

The legal definition of a refugee, as defined in the 1951 Refugee Convention, under Article 1(A)2, applies to any individual:

owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (OHCHR 1954).

Due to that definition, refugees can also be defined by the following three characteristics: first, they are outside their country of origin or residence, secondly, they are unable to be within the protection of their home country due to a legitimate fear of being persecuted; and finally, the persecution feared is based on at least one of five grounds: race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion.

A note on word choice: In this paper, I use the word refugee. It is problematic within my paper, that I use this general term, because within this context, it is important to validate the differences between refugees fleeing involuntarily (forced to leave and escape violence), and migrants. Within migrant and refugee policy there are important distinctions. However, “all people on the move have human rights that should be respected regardless of whether a migrant, refugee or asylum seeker” (The Elders 2016: 6). Unfortunately, “many migrants not eligible for refugee status are also vulnerable and require special protection. These might include groups as diverse as victims of trafficking, unaccompanied children, people with disabilities, and people fleeing famine or the effects of climate change” (The Elders 2016: 7). We need to move away from this clumping together of groups of people, which increases fear of

the other and this is important to bear in mind, when later in this paper, I discuss projects and business working with refugees and I do not distinguish between what status they have. I say refugee and mean refugees, migrants and asylum seekers and various newcomers. All of whom, are here and need protection, integration, and respect.

Free movement has been an important value of European integration since the Treaty of Rome in 1957. In the late 1980s, “During the enlargement negotiations, strict border controls became a conditionality principle for the Central European countries that were joining the EU” (Triandafyllidou 2014: 9). Since the first agreements were made in Schengen, Luxembourg, the name stuck and it has transformed into a convention which entered into force in 1995 and led to a series of rules and measure to ensure visa policies, the right to asylum and security measures (Frontex EU 2015). Increased cooperation in regards to managing borders more effectively in relation to security, asylum and migration happened as time went on and Ad hoc centers for various projects were created, including Air Borders Center in Rome, Italy, Eastern Sea Borders Centre in Greece and several more (Frontex EU 2015). Then, Council Regulation 2007/2004 of the European Council (Frontex EU 2015) created The European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union (FRONTEX), on October 26th, 2004. Furthermore, EUROSUR, a monitoring, and surveillance and information exchange system were also created, in which data protection and nonrefoulement are also included.

The principle of nonrefoulement is also very important within the discussion of EU refugee law and Human Rights. The definition of nonrefoulement can be found under Article 33 of the 1951 Refugee Convention and it declares that a refugee cannot be sent back to a country where he or she would be at risk of persecution: “no contracting state shall expel or return (‘refouler’) a refugee in any manner whatsoever to the frontiers of territories where his life or freedom would be threatened” (UNESCO 2016). The principle of

nonrefoulement is part of customary international law and this means that it is legally binding for all states and has been added into other international human rights treaties like the 1984 Convention against Torture, for example. International refugee law strives to protect individuals who are seeking asylum from persecution, however, issues with refoulement arise since this law only protects those who have already been legally recognized as refugees (UNESCO 2016).

Frontex is in charge of EU border management to help border authorities from various EU countries to work together, in coordination with the EU Fundamental Rights Charter (Frontex EU 2015). Frontex has various areas in which it works: joint operations (includes sea) training, risk analysis, research, providing a rapid response capability (ready in case of crisis/emergency), and assisting member states in joint operations. The latter is for when member states make the decision to return foreign nationals staying illegally, who have failed to leave voluntarily. Frontex assists member states in coordinating their efforts to maximize efficiency and cost effectiveness while ensuring the respect for the fundamental rights and human dignity of returnees is maintained at every stage (Frontex EU 2015). A final activity that Frontex also engages in, is the information systems and the information-sharing environment. Frontex is central to the current refugee policy, as well as the Dublin System.

The European Dublin System is the cornerstone of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS). It was designed to quickly process asylum requests and avoid so-called ‘asylum shopping’ (which is when refugees choose which country to go to according to preferences, likelihood of being accepted etc.). The current Dublin regime declares that it is that the responsibility of the Member State which played the greatest part in the applicant’s entry to the EU, for processing an asylum claim.

In most cases this means it is the Member State of first entry. It can also be a Member State which has issued a visa or residence permit to a non-EU national, who then decides to stay and apply for asylum when this authorisation expires. Family unity and the protection of unaccompanied minors are the main reasons to derogate from these

rules. In practice, this means the responsibility for the vast majority of asylum claims is placed on a small number of Member States – a situation which would stretch the capacity of any Member State (Fratzke 2015: 2).

The Dublin Convention was created in tandem with the 1990 Schengen Convention. “The Dublin Convention was initially signed by Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom. Austria and Sweden joined in 1997, and Finland in 1998” (Fratzke 2015: 3). Dublin II came in 2003. This also set into action the EURODAC regulation, “which established a database for recording fingerprint data of asylum applicants to aid the implementation of the Dublin System” (Fratzke 2015: 3). Dublin III came into action in 2014, after revisions in 2013, when the European Council and Parliament attempted to make improvements, such as determining member state responsibility. Dublin’s two key criticisms are as follows: “first it pushes responsibility for examining claims to Europe’s external borders and states that may be ill-equipped to handle this additional burden. Second, it causes delays that put the individuals and families subject to its provisions at risk for hardship and even rights violations” (Fratzke 2015: 7). The Dublin system is “currently based on the Dublin III Regulation (hereafter “DRII”) 7 and governs responsibility-allocation among 32 States – the 28 EU Member States plus the four EFTA [European Free Trade Association] ,associate’ States” (Maiani 2016: 11).

In a study commissioned by the European Parliament’s Policy Department for Citizens’ Rights and Constitutional Affairs: The Reform of the Dublin III Regulation, Dublin is examined as well as the Commission’s “Dublin IV” Proposal. The report argues that “by retaining the Dublin philosophy and betting on more coercion, Dublin IV is unlikely to achieve its objectives while raising human rights concerns. Until now, the relocation schemes established in September 2015 have also failed to produce appreciable results” (Maiani 2016: 6). Furthermore, discussion its inefficiency explains:

while it may be assumed that a Dublin procedure is run for every application filed with a Member State, only a small percentage of the

tens of thousands of procedures gives rise to a transfer request ($\approx 12\%$). While most requests are accepted ($\approx 70-80\%$), only a minority of agreed transfers are eventually carried out ($\approx 30-40\%$). All in all, Dublin transfers are made for approximately 3-4% of all applications lodged in the Dublin area (Maiani 2016: 15).

The Dublin system is ineffective and inefficient, inflicts hardship on protection seekers and damages the efficiency of the CEAS. The Report The Reform of the Dublin III Regulation also confirms that “interferences with fundamental rights – nonrefoulement, family life, liberty and integrity, due process, and the rights of the child – are commonplace” (Maiani 2016: 12).

EU cooperation resulted in three conceptual elements of an EU-wide asylum policy: the notion of ‘manifestly unfounded’ asylum claims; the idea of ‘safe third countries’ transited by asylum applicants en route to their destinations, in which, it is assumed a genuine refugee would have claimed asylum; and the idea that there are countries in which no serious risk of persecution exists (Triandafyllidou 2014: 8). Critiques enlisting the cooperation of third countries would require more development aid and even some “policy transfer concerning human rights standards. However, conditionality arrangements are often unrealistic because they pose too many requirements to countries of origin and transit than these last cannot fulfill” (Triandafyllidou 2014: 10).

For example, looking at Italy, in *We are not Racists, but We Do Not Want Immigrants, How Italy Uses Immigration Law to Marginalize Immigrants and Create a (New) National Identity* (2014), Faedda analyzes Italian immigration policy, law and political discourse from results found through interviews with Italian immigration attorneys and legal practitioners. In Italy, the common discourse is one in which immigration is criminalized and therefore everything foreign is synonymous with being a criminal. “Excessive bureaucracy, a confused corpus of law and harsh security-oriented policies leave immigrants unprotected and vulnerable, especially in prison and detention centers” (Faedda 2014: 115). One lawyer from the study stated: “our immigration law is incoherent: it does not reflect the real needs of immigrants. It is often xenophobic and characterized by an

irrational fear. The legislation should consult with experts who deal with immigration at the ground roots level” (Faedda 2014: 119).

Faedda shows in her work that Italy is using its political and legal systems as a primary tool of racialization and associated subordination. Italy seems to have found renewed unity through the rejection of immigrants and ignoring the many other social and economic problems that existed prior to the flows of immigration, “such as the (Italian) mafia, unemployment, and widespread corruption. The deep divisions among Italians are seemingly erased in order to (re) create a homogenous community that is united against the other” (Faedda 2014: 124).

Human Rights obligations demand that Italy has to protect the dignity and rights of everyone. Children, as the most vulnerable group, are crucial to protect. A recent report by the UNHCR states: “in 2015, 8% all refugees and migrants arriving in Italy were unaccompanied and separated children. This included 9% of those arriving from Eritrea, and 10% of Somalis: the two top countries of origin” (UNHCR 2015: 12). Their situation warrants particular concern, requiring specific reception arrangements and care. Most unaccompanied and separated children leave the reception centers, which raises concerns over their wellbeing, protection, assimilation, and education. Italian national legislation offers a wide range of guarantees to unaccompanied children, but there are shortcomings in its implementation. Legislative reforms and stronger governance at the central level is needed (UNHCR 2015: 12). In this example, children bear the brunt of the lacking implementation of rights and proper procedures.

Eurosur the European Border Surveillance System, is an intensive surveillance network coordinated by Frontex, along with the EU’s eastern and southern borders. It has been developed since 2008 and since December 2013 it has been fully operational in the 19 southern and eastern Schengen states (Webber 2014: 5). “The Eurosur Regulation was adopted on 22 October 2013 and operations formally began on 2 December 2013” (Heller, Jones 2014: 10). Eurosur was upgraded when it was strongly criticized since

it did not prevent over 1,500 the deaths of people crossing the Mediterranean between March and June 2011. “Most notorious were the deaths from hunger and thirst of about 63 of 72 migrants whose boat drifted between Libya and Italy, sending distress signals every 4 hours for 10 days, ignored by an airplane, military helicopters, two fishing vessels and a large military vessel” (Webber 2014: 5).

Since the 1980s two main methods were created to deal with migration: regionalization and management. “Regionalization refers to the coordinated efforts of nations to manage migration at a regional level through shared policing and interception efforts, synchronizing travel and visa requirements, and pushing the boundary enforcement of and for wealthy countries onto other states” (Loyd, Mountz 2014: 25). Regionalization and management methods over the last few decades have led to islands playing an important role from which one can observe tensions surrounding enforcement, sovereignty, and migration.

Humanitarian Crisis in the Mediterranean

In 2014 over 218,000 refugees and migrants crossed the Mediterranean Sea, many fleeing violence, conflict and persecution in Syria, Eritrea, Iraq, and elsewhere (UNHCR 2015). A UNHCR report on December 29th, 2015 gave statistics that over one million refugees had arrived. “1,000,573 people had reached Europe across the Mediterranean, mainly to Greece and Italy, in 2015. Of these, 3,735 were missing, believed drowned” (Holland 2015). In Italy, almost 170,000 people arrived by sea since the beginning of 2015 (European Commission 2016b).

There are not as many migrants that enter Europe by sea as other places, however, those entering by sea have an exponentially stronger impact on public opinion and the media, as news of the deaths in the Mediterranean has become tragically common. Therefore the sea border is the ideal stage for political actors to externalize their policies. Refugees and migrants that arrived by sea in 2013 reached 60,000, in 2014 there were 219,000 and in only half the year of 2015 already 137,000 arrived in June 2015 (UNHCR

2015, 4). The lack of legal ways to cross the Mediterranean forces many asylum seekers to turn to smugglers. In 2014 IOM's Missing Migrants Project counted more than 5,000 fatalities of migrants in transit (IOM 2015).

From January to May 2015, there were 91,860 arrivals and 1, 828 deaths (IOM 2016). As of March 2016, the updated numbers from the International Organization of Migrants states that there were 204,311 documented arrivals by sea and 2,443 deaths from January to May 2016 (IOM 2016).

As of 8 August 2016, some 262,935 people had crossed the Mediterranean Sea to Europe. During the reporting period, the trend in sea arrivals through the Eastern Mediterranean slightly increased, with 1,920 people arriving to Greece, contributing to a total of 160,297 arrivals by the end of July 2016. As of 8 August, 99,545 persons had arrived by sea to Italy in 2016, compared to 93,540 at the end of July 2015 (UNHCR 2016b:1).

On October 10th 2016 there have been 3,611 deaths in the Mediterranean of 4,836 refugee deaths worldwide (IOM 2016). The Mediterranean Sea routes between North Africa and Europe, are the world's most deadliest transit route (IOM 2015). The main route across the Mediterranean is the central route. Task force Mediterranean was created to prevent more lives from being lost. It focuses on the states of origin and transit to stop migrants from even embarking in the first place. This is all within the framework of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility and the European Neighborhood Policy (Webber 2014: 4).

As time continues to pass and migrants are still dying while trying to reach Europe, the EU policy makers' discourse regarding the so called 'migration crisis' has changed from being a *humanitarian* crisis to a *migration management crisis*. The focus is increasingly on the so-called "mixed flows" of migrants and refugees reaching Europe and on potential terrorists allegedly embedded among boat people" (Garelli, Tazzioli 2016: 3). In the article: *The EU hotspot approach at Lampedusa*, written by Garelli and Tazzioli (2016), the newest approaches to 'migration management' are discussed. For example, the EU Relocation program and the Hotspot approach.

This relocation program is a two year plan that the EU and member states agreed on in 2015. This plan aims to:

relocate 160,000 asylum-seekers mainly from Greece and Italy to other European countries. Yet, the number of pledges continues to be woefully inadequate and implementation unnecessarily slow and challenging. So far, 4,776 asylum-seekers have been relocated from Greece and Italy, only 3% of the original target. UNHCR is calling on States to increase pledges, including for unaccompanied and separated children, speed up the registration and transfers of candidates, and for more nationalities fleeing war and persecution to have access to the scheme (UNHCR 2016b).

Spindler, an EU diplomat states: “Unless countries can escape their domestic political agendas, this scheme, which is already wholly inadequate, will continue to fail” (Henley 2016).

The ‘hotspot approach’ supports member-states with tasks along the border (like fingerprinting and identification processes) where there are many migrants (Garelli, Tazzioli 2016). The EU Border Agency (Frontex), the EU Police Cooperation Agency (Europol), the EU Juridical Cooperation Agency (Eurojust), and the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) send employees to the hotspots of Italy and Greece to strengthen these frontline states’ border functions. “Since October 2015 four such hotspots have opened—Lampedusa, Pozzallo, and Trapani in Italy, and Lesbos in Greece” (Garelli, Tazzioli 2016). These locations have become experimental grounds for this new system.

In October 2013, on a refugee ship off the coast of Lampedusa, 360 people died as a result of a shipwreck. This sparked political action and the Italian government responded by launching an operation called Mare Nostrum.

This program used Italian navy ships between Libya and Sicily to intercept refugee boats. The operation consisted of a total of 32 Italian naval vessels, averaging five ships on station at any one time. They intercepted a total of 420 boats carrying a total of 150,810 refugees. The operation lasted from October 2013 through November 2014, and cost approximately eight million euros per month. That cost was largely borne by the Italian government. An additional 50,000 refugees were rescued by commercial ships in the Mediterranean (Micallef 2015).

Mare Nostrum was stopped in October 2014 because it was too expensive for Italy to operate on its own (10 million a month). Mare Nostrum was replaced by Operation Triton, which is funded and run by the EU Border agency Frontex. Triton consists of 7 ships, 4 planes, and a helicopter. It costs 3 million dollars a month with a mission to protect the EU's borders (Ghosh 2015). Unfortunately, this operation is not as effective as Mare Nostrum and its focus is on intercepting ships and preventing them from entering Europe. There are "50 times more deaths in this period in the year, as opposed to last year this time this year" (Ghosh 2015). The need is so great that NGOs like Doctors without Borders have enacted rescue operations to fill the gaps in aid.

For example, Nitsche wrote an article for "Global Voices" entitled: Private Initiatives Take the Helm in Solving Europe's Shipwreck Crisis. Here she comments on how Triton was not able to solve the crisis and while politicians delay, citizens take action. SeaWatch and MedWatch are two initiatives that are discussed in the article. SeaWatch was established by several families from Germany and run by volunteers. "The project is financed by private donations, aimed to use its own boat to oversee the maritime area between the Maltese and Libyan coasts, to provide first aid to boats in distress and to respond to their experiences at sea to the public" (Nitsche, Roskams 2015). Watch the Med is a similar program with a larger network. "Watch the Mediterranean Sea is an online mapping platform to monitor the deaths and violations of migrants' rights at the maritime borders of the EU" (Watch the Med 2016).

Refugees should not have to risk their lives in order to come to Europe. There should be legal routes so that they do not have to go on small boats from smugglers. If they do seek asylum, they should not be treated like criminals and the deaths of refugees should not be legitimized or tolerated in the name of protecting borders. The protection of human life needs to be the highest priority. The European Union has been built on the fundamental human rights ideals stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

which it is obligated to acknowledge. This demands a new level of global engagement from civilians and politicians alike.

In mid-April 2015, European leaders held emergency meetings, after a record number of deaths, which resulted in increased funding of the Frontex-led operations in the Mediterranean (bringing it to the levels of Mare Nostrum), and significantly increase their scope and coverage. This included the deployment of naval vessels from several EU States. Many private and non-governmental initiatives, including operations by Migrant Offshore Aid Station (MOAS) and Médecins Sans Frontières, also supplemented these efforts. Results could be seen immediately. In May 2015, the number of refugees and migrants drowned or missing at sea fell to 68, a quarter of the figure only one year earlier. The downward trend continued in June, which as of 29 June saw 12 deaths, compared to 305 in 2014. This decline in deaths at sea is an important achievement and a sign that with the right policy, backed by an effective operational response, it is possible to save lives at sea (UNHCR 2015).

The tragedies that have occurred in the Mediterranean have been a direct result of failed policies, which means that through the implementation of better policies, solutions are possible with enough political will and collective action.

All too often, countries facing a mass influx of refugees and migrants are left to respond on their own. Financial and logistical support to countries affected by large movements of refugees and migrants has been insufficient. This results in an unfair and disproportionate responsibility being placed on certain countries by accident of geography. Those countries become overwhelmed and less able to meet the needs of those arriving, thus increasing suffering and fuelling the narrative that migration as a whole is chaotic and to be feared (The Elders 2016: 8).

The events in the Mediterranean represent a call for global action. EU policy measures and their failures, which led to the deaths in the Mediterranean, can be seen as the old system crumbling and a plea for global action. There are limits to what the state can do and provide, as we can see, through the inefficiencies of the relocation programs, the hotspots, FRONTEX and

Dublin. The long bureaucratic wait times and the inability to work, are all barriers that can easily be overcome. I want to highlight that refugee policy has been so focused on the crisis management and control, and looking at dealing with how many are coming in etc. and there needs to be more focus on what happens once they are here.

Humanitarian aid gives immediate relief and aids emergency situations and policy measures attempt to control and protect, but what about long term sustainable solutions? NGOs donate needed supplies and clothes or provide housing, but this is also limited and creates a dependency. “Policy-makers should not consider the social economy as a cost but as an investment that can make societies both more inclusive and profitable” (EFESIIS 2015: 4). Zahre et al list “five criteria to be used to delineate viable global social opportunities for entrepreneurs: prevalence, relevance, urgency, accessibility and radicalness” (Zahra et al 2008: 125). All of these can be applied to the refugee situation and understanding the social entrepreneurs’ motivation and decision to act.

This section examined EU refugee policy. As political, demographic, social, economic and environmental shifts occur and have occurred throughout history humans have migrated in search of survival and better lives. The tragedies in the Mediterranean succeeded in inspiring an international sympathetic response, however, the “disorder engendered by the lack of a common response system stoked fears, cynically and irresponsibly fuelled by populist politicians, provoking a rise in anti-migrant sentiment. A dramatic consequence of this sentiment was the United Kingdom’s decision in a popular referendum in June 2016 to leave the European Union” (The Elders 2016: 8).

The attitude toward immigration is hostile (Faedda 2014: 115). The European Union has attempted to deal with these pressing and concerning issues by producing several declarations and resolutions on the matter of racism and anti-discrimination, like the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) in order to “take firm and sustained action

at the European level to combat the phenomena of racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and intolerance” (Faedda 2014: 117). Immigration is viewed as a constant emergency; it is a problem that no country in Europe has been able to solve, even though immigration is an integral part of European (and global) history (Faedda 2014: 115).

IOM Director General Ambassador William Lacy Swing described the delicate point in time that Europe is in. “We face unprecedented challenges dealing with the current migration and refugee emergency,” he states. “We have to work closely together to deal with what I would not call a migrant crisis but a systemic crisis in dealing with this emergency” (IOM 2015). There is constant media coverage about organized crime attacks and incidents of sexual assault and decreased safety; we cannot read or watch the news without hearing about the refugee crisis. However, we need to stop calling this the refugee crisis. It is a humanitarian crisis and a human rights crisis. In the year 2015, there were increased hate crimes all around Europe, and the fear rhetoric used to describe the deaths, the chaos, and the crisis, is still dominating the media. This issue must be reframed to highlight the economic and cultural contributions that refugees bring with them.

For example, EU level responses have to date been focused far more on burden-sharing than on how to resolve these integration challenges (Islam, Merritt 2016: 2). The Friends of Europe paper also argues “the European public must be encouraged to understand that newcomers also bring fresh demand and so spur growth, and that would give a strong push by EU leaders’ reference in a European Council to the expected shrinkage of Europe’s labour force in the years ahead” (Islam, Merritt 2016: 4). A new and positive discourse needs to be started by civil society in terms of integration. For example, one first step to overcoming the difficulties of integrating newcomers into the labor markets is also for the government to “lift the ban in some countries on asylum seekers’ ability to find employment” (Islam, Merritt 2016: 7). There are many barriers that obstruct immigrants use of widely available financial services.

Authorities could help immigrant entrepreneurs through access to credit [...] there are ‘proof of residency’ requirements along with language and cultural differences that make it hard for newcomers to open a Bank Account, obtain a credit or debit card....These are easily remedied handicaps that needlessly delay the integration process” (Islam, Merritt 2016: 8).

Betts is the Director of the Humanitarian Innovation Project at the University of Oxford. In a TedTalk from February 2016, Betts gave a speech, based on his research discussing contradictions within refugee policy and the reality reflected in practice and asks the same questions that I am addressing in this thesis: why is the current system not working and what can we do to fix it. Betts argues that we need to create more choices and opportunities for refugees. He discusses how “politicians frame the issue as a zero-sum issue, that if we benefit refugees, we’re imposing costs on citizens. We tend to have a collective assumption that refugees are an inevitable cost or burden to society. But they don’t have to. They can contribute” (Betts 2016). They can contribute in a way that will benefit everyone, including the host countries.

Betts suggests four ways to reframe the refugee issue using the opportunities provided through globalization, mobility, and markets, after results from research in Uganda, Jordan, Kenya, South Africa and the United States. These four suggestions are: enabling environments, economic zones, preferences matching between states and refugees and humanitarian visas. For example with “enabling environments” Betts and his team of researchers mean providing opportunities for refugees within refugee camps. In Uganda, the team measured how beneficial entrepreneurship was for both the refugees and the locals, and how with the right support set up, this can flourish. Betts concludes that:

we really need a new vision, a vision that enlarges the choices of refugees but recognizes that they don’t have to be a burden. There’s nothing inevitable about refugees being a cost. Yes, they are a humanitarian responsibility, but they’re human beings with skills, talents, aspirations, with the ability to make contributions—if we let them” (Betts 2016).

These skills and talents can be applied as social entrepreneurs and many innovative projects are currently underway to work towards creating solutions and opportunities, not only for refugees but for Europe as a whole. “In the next decades, a growing number of people will be on the move. The challenge for Europe is to see this not as a threat, but as an opportunity. That is, to imagine how migration can become a driver of innovation towards a younger, dynamic, cosmopolitan and, at the end of the day, a more resilient Europe” (Manzini 2016: 1).

Section Three: Overcoming Crisis: Innovating Opportunities and Collaboration

Can Social Entrepreneurship provide sustainable solutions for the shifting demographics and humanitarian challenges in Europe? What can Social Entrepreneurs and refugees do to improve the situation? What has been done, what is being done and my experience.

Introduction Section Three

The first section introduced social entrepreneurship. The second section presented a humanitarian crisis that Europe is faced with which shows that current top-down solutions have not been enough and that the discourse surrounding refugees is one that highlights fear.

Migration is and has always been a fact. People do move, forcibly or voluntarily, temporarily or permanently. Refugees are neither saints nor criminals. And yes: we do have problems concerning violence against women, security issues, nationalist mobilizations, politicized religion, segregation - that's why we need to talk about those topics fearlessly and find out solutions (Social Innovation Community 2016).

In this section, I search for solutions, while also highlighting challenges that social entrepreneurs face that need to be addressed. I examine some organizations throughout Europe that attempt to create solutions to see if social enterprises can also find solutions in ensuring social inclusion and employing refugees.

Demographic Shifts Opportunities for an Aging Population

Europe is currently confronted with very low birth rates and an aging population, it therefore also needs immigrants to maintain the welfare system. Consequently, this means that the 2030 migration policies should be re-framed, “with a view to a more economically sustainable, humane and carefully managed migration strategy” (Manzini 2016: 18). The increased aging population will have major repercussions on the labor force and social protection systems in Europe “will struggle to manage the consequences of old-age dependency: between 1965 and 2005 the average retirement age

increased by only six months, whereas life expectancy went up by nine years” (Manzini 2016: 18).

A report by the International Monetary Fund entitled: *The Refugee Surge in Europe* (2016), also states the economic and social importance of quickly integrating refugees into the labor market, to make use of the economic benefits of the refugee dynamic. “The refugees’ successful labor market integration could also help alleviate the fiscal effects of population aging, although the effect is likely to be small and will not be a panacea for demographic problems. At the same time, rapid integration policies, including education, housing and ALMPs, entail some upfront fiscal costs” (Aiyar et al 2016: 33). Furthermore,

Flexibility in product markets can also help integrate refugees. Easing barriers to starting a new business—for example through simpler regulatory and administrative procedures for new firms, ensuring equal market and job access, access to finance, and start-up support—could help newcomers and natives alike become entrepreneurs by tapping a growing number of business opportunities. Flexibility also helps native workers adjust to immigration surges, by moving to more highly skilled jobs that are complementary to those taken up by the immigrants (Aiyar et al 2016: 34).

One of the priorities as stated in a very recent UNHCR Report UNHCR (2016), states: “empower community-based initiatives aimed at finding immediate and long-term solutions for asylum seekers and refugees” (UNHCR 2016a: 1). Huysentruyt et al surveyed 1,030 social enterprises in 2014 and found that these enterprises “generated more than €6.06 billion in revenue, served 871 million beneficiaries, employed just over half a million people, and helped many more—roughly 5.5 million people—to find a job, making labor markets more equal and ensuring social inclusion of people with disabilities or migrant backgrounds” (Huysentruyt et al 2016). By giving refugees agency and purpose, vocational training and other programs to increase motivation and integration.

Another interesting example is a recent study done by a team funded by the Saïd Business School, University of Oxford, 2016: “An Analysis of Gaps

and Opportunities in Germany's Refugee Integration System" by Refugee Connect (The Global Challenge 2016). Refugee Connect's research focuses on identifying the gaps in this system and potential opportunities for improvement. In one of their project proposals: Refugee Integration in Germany: Process, Challenges, Solutions, Gaps, and Prospects, they argue that "integration programs are overwhelmed and inefficient" since the refugees are usually living on the outskirts of German society (because housing is overflowing) (Ismail, Ng, Singh 2016a). Furthermore, resources for refugees (NGOs and for-profit) are available but they are often not aware that these exist (Ismail, Ng, Singh 2016b: 2).

The study recognized "an alarming lack of the use of innovative technology in addressing them" (Ismail, Ng, Singh 2016c: 11). A member of German parliament mentioned, "that the country has over half a million unfilled jobs and a number of cities are close to turning into ghost towns due to the decrease in population over the years" (Ismail, Ng, Singh 2016c: 3). This means that refugees bring not only rejuvenation but usher new possibilities for Germany's future and economy. The "average age of a German resident is 46 -compared to the average age of its refugees at 24" (Ismail, Ng, Singh 2016c: 7.). Andrea Nahles, the federal labour minister of Germany states: "we have a more than a million vacancies, with a need for qualified personnel, more than half of these (immigrants) who come to us are younger than 25-so that could really work out" (Islam, Merritt 2016: 8). Therefore, refugees urgently need to be integrated to become assets rather than burden society. They suggest that this can be achieved through effective information and distribution, cross-sector collaboration and grassroots mobilization (The Global Challenge 2016). They conclude that the refugee problem is in fact not a problem, instead, it brings immense opportunity. Furthermore, the study recognized "an alarming lack of the use of innovative technology in addressing them" (Ismail, Ng, Singh 2016c: 26). The study concludes that the refugee 'problem' is, in fact, a catalyst for opportunity (Ismail, Ng, Singh 2016c: 26).

Manifestations of Solidarity

Throughout the last few years, there have been numerous examples of how people have taken the opportunity to help refugees and create change. Here I will highlight a few examples of collaboration and empathy.

In September 2015, a group of volunteers came together and created Train of Hope, which assisted, organized, and welcomed refugees arriving at the Train Stations in Vienna and 1000s of Austrians were eager to help (Train of Hope 2015). There are also several projects and organizations throughout Europe that aid refugees by giving them bikes and offering workshops to teach them how to repair bikes as well. This serves to give them mobility, potential trade training while allowing them to network with their new communities.

Another example is the organization KAMA that helps refugees and works towards moving beyond othering. One of the founders of the KAMA project was a volunteer at an association called Ute Bock. During her time there, she noticed that asylees in Austria who were waiting for their asylum applications to be processed are concerned not only faced with the problem of securing basic living conditions (food and accommodation), but also with the lack of everyday activities and structured daily activities. Due to the fact that asylum seekers in Austria have small chances of employment, they are condemned to idleness, and do not actively participate in social events (Van Kouwen 2016). They are socially marginalized and invisible. Therefore, KAMA enables these individuals to present themselves to the public in a different light through offering classes and workshops related to their various skills and talents which they bring from their home countries (Van Kouwen 2016). This is the first step out of isolation in a foreign country and new friendships are formed. Their potential new country is not being perceived only in a negative way (due to long waiting for the asylum

application processing to be realized), but it's positive aspects begin to be recognized (Van Kouwen 2016).

A corporate example can be found in Austria: the Deloitte Future Fund. This fund collects activities and resources for specific social issues in order to „encourage the societal integration of refugees” (Impact Hub Vienna 2016). This is through their Corporate Social Responsibility program. Furthermore, the program found! supports innovative and sustainable initiatives that create employment opportunities for refugees (Impact Hub Vienna 2016). These initiatives are supported for six months to successfully launch them (Impact Hub Vienna 2016). The Impact Hub Vienna also believes that: “Creating new prospects for the future is essential for the successful integration of refugees. Thus, enabling integration into the Austrian labor market is of special importance. Only by having jobs, people are able to secure a livelihood for themselves and become integrated and productive parts of society” (Impact Hub Vienna 2016).

From civilian groups and volunteers, NGOs to private sector businesses, people have come together to help refugees. This shows that people are willing to take responsibility to create change, yet finding and organizing volunteers can be difficult to sustain for a larger framework and the government cannot rely on NGOs and civic society to take over what they are not managing. Furthermore, some people would want to help but cannot afford to financially, since volunteering takes time away from paid work. Social entrepreneurship has the potential to provide this solution since there a profit is made, which goes back to helping social causes, yet the entrepreneurs can also still make a living themselves. Furthermore, just to remind the reader of previous definitions in section one:

while the state and social welfare organizations tend to deliver services that are aligned with and responsive to national policies (such as legal consulting services or providing emergency accommodation), social entrepreneurial initiatives develop their services based on challenges they see surfacing locally and often act on the spot; they provide opportunities for local exchange and integration, complement organized mass accommodation with private housing, open opportunities for income generation (beyond

or before) the informal labor market, provide easily accessible language courses and offer psychological support (Ioan, Wolf 2015).

In this paper I propose and explore social entrepreneurship as one important piece to a shifting world, a way to use the existing system, challenge the status quo and find innovative solutions where old systems can no longer provide.

Examples Austria

Several projects that work with refugees in Vienna have appeared over the last years, including Cafe Connection, Topfreisen and Flüchtlinge Willkommen Österreich. The migratory flow caused by the Syrian crisis has increased in 2015 significantly. Civil society came together to welcome and assist the people who fled.

The MissingLink is a project connected with Social Innovation Europe, which is a “Horizon 2020 Programme funded project, and run by a consortium of 12 leading organizations across Europe” (Social Innovation Europe 2016). In an interview with the Social Innovation Project, when asked how successful the project has been, Kreuzer, one of the founders of the project, states:

In terms of impact, we have had countless articles featured in the regional media about our debates. These debates have seen thousands of people in those eight years. Next year, we are planning to qualify and incorporate young refugees directly into the workshops for pupils by a new module in ZusammenReden: „Train the Trainer.“ It will not only be the Caritas team who will teach about migration and asylum, but also newly arrived refugees (Social Innovation Community 2015).

The founders of MissingLink realized that simply supporting refugees would not be enough, so they created various projects for everyone in town in order to shine a more positive light on migration and improve the general public’s perception of the issue (Social Innovation Community 2016).

Topfreisen is a catering company that employs refugees while also giving them an opportunity to share their culture with Austrians through food

(Topfreisen 2016). The Connection is a café that employs refugee youth to give them work experience and also offers several workshops to help them adjust to life in Austria. These workshops include CV resume building workshops, and advice about how to communicate with European women (The Connection 2016). These are two examples of Social Enterprises that address both the economic integration of refugees through employment, as well as working on establishing cultural integration and exchange. This also helps overcome the fear of the other through creating spaces for dialogue and interaction.

RefugeesWork.at is another great Austrian social business. This is a new online platform, with a sustainable business model, that connects refugees and employers (RefugeesWork.at 2016). Companies pay to post their job, internship, apprenticeships, and educational opportunities. There are opportunities available for both asylum seekers who have approval to work and those who are still waiting for documentation (RefugeesWork.at 2016). This organization provides an excellent example of a business, which does not only help the target group (refugees) but also provides increased value for the community, individual companies, and nation at large.

Magdas Hotel, fits under the definition of a social business without a doubt. It is a hotel that employs refugees, offering them a chance for economic integration (Caritas 2015: 11). Magdas Hotel is supported by Caritas. There are over 24 languages spoken at the hotel and the entire business runs while also creating positive social change. Magdas also uses recycling and upcycling (Caritas 2015: 11).

Examples Germany

Refugees Welcome offers the chance for refugees to live in shared flats and other apartments rather than mass accommodation. Through an online platform, individuals are able to sign up and offer their apartments or rooms

to refugees. After registration, they are connected with a refugee via a refugee organization (Refugees Welcome 2016). Refugees Welcome began in Germany, however it is rapidly spreading internationally. It is currently in 20 different countries and so far there have been 867 refugees matched to shared flats (Refugees Welcome 2016). The founders of Refugees Welcome created a business that strives to increase integration, as well as provide housing solutions. “Emergency Housing is itself a problem, but the much greater challenge is the longer term of building affordable homes in a strategy that avoids the “ghettoisation of migrants, while also ensuring that they are re-settled in areas with good employment prospects” (Islam, Merritt 2016: 8).

Further examples in Germany include multitudes of offers in German lessons, especially on Kiron, which is the biggest educational institution for refugees worldwide, offering University courses (Kiron 2016). Another school is the ReDI, a coding school of digital integration in Berlin for Asylum seekers in Germany. “Currently, there are 43,000 open jobs in IT in Germany“ (Thorpe 2016). IT is a globally transferable skill, so the school trains the attending refugees for success, even if they end up having to leave again.

Completing the trip from Syria to Germany proves they are “resourceful in body, mind and soul“ she [the founder of ReDI] says of the struggle. Once they arrive, they often wait 12 to 16 months to get permanent papers allowing them to work. She sees an opportunity to use that time for productive training so that they not only learn some skills but connect with people as well (Thorpe 2016).

ReDI is a nonprofit school that raises money any way it can, however perhaps it will eventually develop into a social enterprise.

For example, the App Bureaucrazy, was designed and developed by two young Syrian refugees, Ghaith Zamrik and Munzer Khattab, and four other refugees, through the assistance of ReDI. This app strives to help newcomers arriving in Germany, as well as locals, navigate and simplify the complexities of German bureaucracy (Oltermann 2016). The founder of

ReDI, Anne Kjær Riechert hopes that initiatives like Bureaucrazy will help Germans recognise that refugees also bring talent to the country (Oltermann 2016). She states that:

If we want to help the people stuck in refugee camps around the world or getting trafficked, we need to empower and collaborate with people like Munzer and Ghaith. They know first hand what the situation is like, and hence can be part of building the real solutions (Oltermann 2016).

Further Examples

In the article *“How Business can help create sustainable solutions to Europe’s refugee crisis”* (2015), Bason suggests that the Danish government should collaborate with refugees to co-produce sustainable solutions. He argues that there is a very large business potential here for reasons such as having large global opportunities for growth, the personal resources that refugees have (IT, builders, engineers), and it would make sense to invest in durable solutions. Bason speaks from a design and business perspective and imagines re-creating refugee camps into good places to live. He states:

this is a potential untapped resource that can be activated as a contribution to the transformation of refugee camps into places where people would want to live. Not only does this offer a chance to improve conditions; it also offers a chance to empower the refugees to believe in themselves and their abilities – letting them shape their own future. Preserving and developing the refugees’ skills would preserve and renew the potential they bring with them (Bason 2015).

This approach would need to be done in collaboration with other projects, in order to ensure social integration as well. The presence of social exclusion fuels the practice of social entrepreneurship through the use of different innovative methods. “Social entrepreneurs and their enterprises not only provide basic facilities to address social problems but also generate employment provisions among deprived stakeholders or target groups,

which are expected to pull them out of poverty and alleviate social exclusion” (Kummitha 2016: 67).

The Refugee Youth Project is in the United States. It provides quality afterschool and mentoring programs for refugees between the ages of 4 and 21 (Refugee Youth Project 2015). In 2007, RYP started its community arts program through a partnership with the Maryland Institute College of Art and the Walters Art Museum (Refugee Youth Project 2015). In 2012, RYP created ArtWorks, a social entrepreneurship initiative that provides students with an integrated curricula of arts skill-building within the framework of marketing, budgeting, promoting, and selling produced goods (Refugee Youth Project 2015). The Refugee Youth Project currently serves newcomers from over 17 different countries (Refugee Youth Project 2015).

My Experience

In January 2015, I was part of a group of individuals who wanted to start an organization to help refugees. The idea was to create a space where refugees could live, and also have a co-working space (to also collaborate with entrepreneurs living in Vienna), café and community. We were four individuals with various backgrounds including one refugee from Pakistan. We won an award at the Impact Hub Vienna, called Social Impact Start, through which we received coaching, financial advisors, mentors, help with creating a business plan, a network of other entrepreneurs and experts, as well as an office space for meetings. It was a time when many people wanted to help refugees. We did some market research and saw that there were already very similar projects that we could collaborate with. We spent a lot of time creating a business plan, connecting with partners and doing a few small pilot projects which included a bike workshop for refugees and a cooperation with a film project with interviews. How were we going to make money from our idea? We would need a house, a very large house, or an internet platform (which was dismissed by other team members), or

sponsors, crowdfunding or membership fees for the co-working space. We were unable to come up with a financial model that would have worked for us, and since we all had to also make some money and not only work pro-bono, we went our separate ways.

Simultaneously, I have been able to be a part of a group of people who have co-founded an App called Help2day, which helps organizations organize and coordinate their volunteers as well as volunteers looking for places to help, and donations more effectively (Help2day 2016).

There are government and charity initiatives that strive to organize volunteers and donations, however, often these programs are not communicated well and there is confusion about how much is needed, there is only information posted on FB, and/ or people bring too many donations etc. Help2day aims to make this more efficient. It is not in competition with the government programs or the charity organizations but works in partnership with them.

Help2day has been more successful, partially because of the possibility of potentially earning income someday, since here a for-profit model is possible, through organizations paying for the App, paying for upgrades, investors, crowdfunding and cooperations with CSR programs can be applied. As a social enterprise, we want to connect others who want to help and create a sustainable business model that will generate income, so that we will not have to rely purely on donations and grants. We can also provide volunteer opportunities for refugees and provide support for organizations that work with refugees. Help2day reaches across sectors as we collaborate with NGOs, are a registered for-profit business ourselves, and also have the ability to not only help refugees but also helps create more community, inspire integration and potentially help to fight xenophobia. Several of the organizations listed above, that work with refugees, can for example, also use Help2day as a tool for more efficiency.

There are many difficulties that arise with being a social entrepreneur. Lack of funding while starting out, long discussions about what kind of business

model would work best to stay on track with the social mission, and questions like how can we work with existing NGOs, and government programs, in order to support them rather than compete with them? It is also really important to know what is the problem in society that is being addressed? This is important for investors and grant applications. When several different target groups are addressed, there are both advantages and disadvantages.

Difficulties and Obstacles for Social Entrepreneurs

In this thesis, I also address the following question: What are the difficulties confronted by social entrepreneurs? A major difficulty that social entrepreneurs consistently confront is lack of funds, which is directly correlated to the lack of knowledge about the term. This is also confirmed by a study conducted by the Enabling the Flourishing and Evolution of Social Entrepreneurship for Innovative and Inclusive Societies (EFESEIIS) Project. In *Extra EU Countries Dossier on New Generation Social Enterprises Summary of 5 Stakeholder-Interviews in 5 non-European Countries* (2017), the study which I already mentioned in Section 1, Bauernfeind points out constraints gathered from his research. He defines three variations of disabling factors. First, there are structural factors, that “are based on laws and government’s or investors’ activities (Bauernfeind 2017: 148). Further constraints come from society and their lack of understanding about social entrepreneurship, and finally, internal team conflicts may appear (Bauernfeind 2017: 148).

Regarding the structural factors, “some people see social enterprises as a threat for people on social welfare and fear the privatization that comes with social enterprises. They fear that social enterprises undermine the Welfare State and the obligations of the state to its most vulnerable groups” (Bauernfeind 2017: 148). Furthermore, others who were interviewed in the study referred to the point, that parts of society are skeptical of social

enterprises because they are making business with vulnerable groups (Bauernfeind 2017: 149).

Tan, who was interviewed from Singapore, believes that the main challenge for social enterprises is in finding the right balance between business orientation and social good. He states:

the main disabling factor is finding the right balance between business orientation and social good. When you start with a social mission, this mission is the reason why you exist. But many enterprises forget how to earn money. How can I run my business in a self sustainable way? How do I create Impact, how do I change the lives of people? That is very important, but there must be a healthy balance to economic thinking. If they don't have a good business model they will have a hard time succeeding" (Bauernfeind 2017: 149).

Another important factor for success are the personality traits and connections of the entrepreneurs as well as contacts to umbrella organizations, investors, and government grants (Bauernfeind 2017: 16).

The argument to improve legislation for social entrepreneurs is reconfirmed by a Policy Brief from EFESIIS entitled: *How Can Policy Makers Improve Their Country's Support to Social Enterprises?* (2015). Their research suggests that a further legal reform that would help enable a good environment for social enterprises would be reforming existing bankruptcy legislation.

Social entrepreneurship is a very risky activity, where success is often the outcome of failures. However, in several countries (particularly Austria) potential social entrepreneurs refrain from developing their entrepreneurial ideas to avoid incurring the legal consequences of potential bankruptcy. A legal system that allows people to recover rapidly from an entrepreneurial failure, such as in the United States, would facilitate the development of social entrepreneurship (EFESIIS 2015: 2).

EFESIIS also recently created country reports to further research and highlight some difficulties surrounding social entrepreneurship. For example, in the report about Austria the researches found that the dominant mentality in Austria is still that everything charitable is to be funded by the

state and therefore there are a lot of social services available, including from the church, like Caritas and classic NGOs and charitable organisations (Benadus, Schetling, Sapienza 2015:18). “However, Caritas is partly a social enterprise because, it has very concrete social goals, and is not only financed through donations but also operates as a very strong business (Benadus, Schetling, Sapienza 2015:18).

Furthermore, Austrians have not been able to fully embrace the concept of a social enterprise to generate an additional income. “There almost seems to be a rivalry about legitimization on the delivery of social welfare” (Benadus, Schetling, Sapienza 2015:32). However, social entrepreneurs “are not agents of privatisation or extended arms of a far-reaching welfare system, and should not replace public actors for ideological purposes” (Persson et al 2016: 26).

Government spending has its limits and has to face tough decisions about how to spend tax money so social entrepreneurs fill this gap. The private, public, and voluntary sectors are emerging as can also be seen through CSR. This is allowing for social entrepreneurship to emerge as well. This is a strong feature of social enterprises, they strive to make what is already available more efficient and sustainable. On the other hand, NGOs that rely on donations, are often lacking resources, especially if they are smaller organisations. Social entrepreneurial methods strive to improve the sustainability of these NGOs’ efforts.

Social Impact Measurement

The fluctuating definition of social entrepreneurship and the varying roles that government plays in their development and success, is a crucial topic to recognize within the research of social entrepreneurship. Here, a very important question to include is: what kind of social impact is actually occurring? This is valuable for validating and legitimizing the benefits, which a certified social enterprise has to show investors and policymakers that these ventures are indeed noteworthy. Several different measurement

tools and approaches have been created, it is hard for social entrepreneurs and their ecosystem to select and to use methods that work well for them. Every enterprise has different challenges and not every venture can be measured with the same standardized instrument. The impact measurement has to be adjusted to each company, which includes a very broad spectrum.

In social entrepreneurship people from various social and political and cultural backgrounds often collaborate on projects and finding ways to reach across borders and boundaries and learn how to create something great together. Even when a project “fails” much is learned through the collaboration and can be understood as a stepping-stone. “All successful entrepreneurs begin with understanding the world” (Martin, Osberg 2015: 136). This means that there needs to be an understanding of what projects have worked, what has not and what needs to be done. Here social impact measurement also plays an important role. These evaluation methods are very under-developed.

At the macroeconomic level, assessing the added value generated by these schemes using traditional economic tools is problematic. At the microeconomic level, evaluation is hampered by the lack of financial measures, such as return on equity, which are widely used in the private sector. Measures of operational efficiency developed in the public sector are likely to miss the value of the benefits created by small innovative organisations (Leadbeater 1997: 81).

Furthermore, the funding requirements for reports, evaluations and monitoring effect how a project is planned (Persson et al 2016: 19). This can create

an unintended side-effect that can have a detrimental effect on innovative ambitions of social entrepreneurs. If the more traditional way of structuring the activities would work, there would be no need for new approaches, and if new approaches are needed we should not require them to design their activities in a traditional manner (Persson et al 2016: 19).

How do you measure social impact? Sometimes this is discussed as ‘social value’ which “refers to wider non-financial impacts of programmes, organisations and interventions, including the wellbeing of individuals and communities, social capital and the environment. These are typically

described as ‘soft’ outcomes, mainly because they are difficult to quantify and measure” (Leighton, Wood 2010: 22). Quantifiable values need to be ascribed for organisations to measure effectiveness and help influence policy makers, donors etc of their validity. Various frameworks to measure social value have been created, the most popular being SROI (Social Return on Investment). Social Return on Investment is:

a framework to help understand the value of social change from the perspective of those changed. It tells a compelling story of change, which is a mix of narrative, qualitative and financial measures. It provides for a financial proxy value of this change, which can be understood alongside traditional financial costs. It is transparent and consistent and aims to create a more tangible currency in social value that everyone can understand. It can also help focus attention on particular activities and how well they are working to achieve social change (Leighton, Wood 2010: 29).

There is a lot of work to be done here to help these methods become most efficient and also create a standardized method. “Socially entrepreneurial organisations are like social test beds. They offer rare opportunities to conduct practical research and develop social policies. We need to find ways of leveraging the lessons learned in these organisations by transferring their best practice to the public sector” (Leadbeater 1997: 85).

A key finding in an OECD report from 2015: *Policy Brief on Social Impact Measurement for Social Enterprises* states that: “social impact measurement is not currently widespread, even though it is gaining traction. One reason is that social enterprises have limited human and financial resources to conduct and use this mechanism” (OECD 2015: 3). Another factor is that, although this field is growing quickly there is “no common language to date on social impact measurement addressing this complex issue” (OECD 2015: 5). The OECD suggests that “the European Commission could also play a leading role in facilitating the environment for social impact measurement, for example by providing specific grants” (OECD 2015: 13). Measuring social impact will help increase both public awareness, as well as investors and stakeholders’ knowledge about the relevance of social enterprises (OECD 2015: 17).

The research for this thesis has been challenging, due to fluid definitions of the term, fluctuating events within refugee policy and refugee statistics and lack of measurement of effectiveness of the organisations working with refugees that have only recently been founded. However, when one examines the success of work integration programs such as the work integration social enterprises (WISEs), from the 1990s, and the projected economic forecasts of aging demographics, as well as success stories that have happened before, one can begin to piece together an argument that shows that social entrepreneurship can indeed be one solution to the shifting demographics in Europe and the current challenges that these countries face.

Discussion

A longer discussion about neo-liberalism and social entrepreneurship could be included in this thesis. Could these neoliberal tendencies perpetuate the same problems that failed neoliberal policies created in the first place? However, social entrepreneurship, wants to help empower communities and organisations to not rely on donations or outside help but also have sustainable business models which will help empower the business owners to not only generate profit but also create positive change through the services and goods provided from the bottom up, rather than the top down trickle down approaches to neoliberalism. This means that a multidisciplinary approach to the study of social entrepreneurship is needed, in order to provide perspectives from International Development, Political Science, Sociology etc. and more research from a global context, including voices from the global south, should be included within the discourse of social entrepreneurship.

For example, a compelling discussion about neoliberalism within social entrepreneurship is presented in an article by Sharma (2016) called: *A Neo-liberal takeover of Social Entrepreneurship?* Sharma, is a social worker from India and provides a critical perspective about the western neoliberal

tendencies surrounding the discourse of the term. She cites an article by Martin Jacques from the 1980s which

warned against the rise of neoliberalism—as defined by trickle-down and laissez-faire economics with minimal state intervention—in the West. The article returns to the topic of neoliberalism, but this time predicts its impending demise. Jacques writes that neoliberal policies have led to slowing economic growth, falling real incomes for most people (as high as 90 percent of the population in the United States), and an increase in inequality (Sharma 2016).

She argues that the beneficiary should be the focus, rather than the enterprise and that the impact should be the main focus, rather than profit-making. Furthermore, she is worried about the scaling (expansion) of enterprise-oriented social entrepreneurship.

A commercial enterprise at scale needs layers for efficient management, controls, standardization, and constant growth—factors that may not allow for the most humane, responsive, and efficient solutions for those in need. By contrast, a social entrepreneur trying to solve a problem for a community with which he identifies will more likely create a solution that is innately self-reliant, rather than profit-focused (Sharma 2016).

Sharma believes that “social entrepreneurship does seem to work, however, in an “outsourcing” capacity, where it partners with a government or donor to implement programs and perform outreach” (Sharma 2016). Sharma’s article is important to mention, since there are not many voices from countries beyond Europe and the United States, within the mainstream discourse of social entrepreneurship yet. This is another reason Interdisciplinary programs like Development Studies, should include social entrepreneurship within their curricula, in order to move towards creating an inclusive dialogue beyond borders.

It is very important to note the neoliberal tendencies as to not make the mistakes of the past and create better solutions. Furthermore, I do not think that social entrepreneurship is seeking to replace the welfare state, just assist it, however, more research is needed, for better impact measurement, which in turn will lead to more funding from the government etc.

I think that one of the reasons some people might view social entrepreneurship as being too market-based and with neoliberal tendencies is because, being a new term and field of study, it has been primarily taught in business schools. However, as a result of this research, I believe that it is crucial that social sciences and humanities begin doing more research within this field in order to create a more interdisciplinary perspective. Particularly in Development Studies, social entrepreneurship should be thoroughly examined in order to create a globally conscious, multicultural, discourse around it. Taking into account the various issues that could come up (including privilege, white feminism, postmodernism, in order to move away from accidentally perpetuating inequality). I would be interested in social entrepreneurship examined through all of these lenses. Social entrepreneurs must really understand how the world works and the deeply ingrained structural inequalities and dependencies.

I want to mention that I only used the word refugee crisis once. The aim of this paper is also to help shift the discourse away from viewing refugees as a crisis, but moving forward and see this as an opportunity for Europe for innovation, for more labor-force and for new businesses. Refugees are the ideal entrepreneurs because they are willing to take risks and go to extreme lengths to make dreams a reality. Furthermore, many social enterprises work towards creating more social cohesion and multicultural understanding and integration. The rising xenophobia in Europe can potentially also be combated with these initiatives.

Furthermore, social entrepreneurship is not the only solution. It is filling the gaps where policy is not managing. Policymakers still need to come to an agreement. Policymakers should not rely on citizens to do all the work but neither should citizens expect the policy makers to come up with all the solutions. Democracy is a work in progress, as are Human Rights standards and the arch towards justice. Everyone needs to pitch in, we have a moral obligation to do so and work towards creating a global citizenship that moves beyond the fear of the other.

Conclusion

Social entrepreneurship has the potential to be one solution for refugees in Europe, and help with the current and upcoming economic and social consequences of demographic shifts. However, further research and evidence is needed to measure its effectiveness and success. For example, through my research, I have discovered that the bridge between academia and practitioners needs to be strengthened in order to ensure that best practices are created and that lessons are learned from each other. This thesis is not claiming that social entrepreneurship will solve everything, but it can be used as a practical way to deal with the current shifting demographics in Europe concerning refugees.

A transformation in the narrative concerning refugees is needed. The discourse should include refugees as part of the solution, not the problem, and use this situation as an opportunity for innovation. This also means that the conditions need to be created that encourage risk-taking, particularly in many European countries.

The lack of a common language and that social entrepreneurship is such a new term, as well as the shifting and frustrating landscape of European Policy regarding refugees, has made this a challenging area of research. I do still believe that social entrepreneurship is a key to creating solutions for Europe in the upcoming years. However, investments in research, social impact measurement, and better access to grants, resources, networks and good media attention for social entrepreneurs and social enterprises will be crucial in order for this to develop successfully. The social and economic inclusion of refugees in Europe, will help the economy and work towards dealing with the demographic shifts of an aging population. Refugees are not the problem, they are part of the solution. As we overcome fear and listen to one another's stories, create platforms for change, think outside the box and embody a sense of global citizenship, more solutions will be able to manifest.

And how do we get there? Changing the learning paradigm to change mindset: needs empathy. For example, policymakers should invest further resources in developing public awareness and education, about the potential residing in social enterprises, particularly among younger people (EFESEIIS 2015:4). Furthermore, long-term work requires stamina and social entrepreneurship takes courage and risks. In Social Entrepreneurship right now it is important to build coalitions and use new actors to change the equilibrium. “To get the kind of shift in consciousness that will influence policymakers to get their act together and society to embrace the policy change, there needs to be new stories told, in order to change the discourse” (Osberg 2015) Stories of successful social entrepreneurs, news which highlight projects with refugees that support both Europeans and refugees deal with the shifting demographics and stories through which the voices of the other are heard; these are the types of stories that need to be told to combat the fear perpetuated through the media.

The tragedies that occurred over the last years, as thousands of deaths, resulted through refugees trying to reach Europe, illustrate issues that resulted in fear-based policy making. The long-term effectiveness of social entrepreneurship is still being measured and researched as time goes on. Therefore, I cannot argue that it can guarantee solutions. However, it is currently helping to clean up the mess and deal with the consequences of the effects from past policy makers’ decisions that Europe is currently faced with. Furthermore, social entrepreneurship can assist in shifting the refugee discourse (both in the media and within policy making) away from seeing refugees as a problem and work towards creating opportunities for economic growth, intercultural collaborations, building bridges, breaking stereotypes and moving away from fear of the other.

Abstract

Although social entrepreneurship and social enterprises have slightly varying definitions between US and European schools of thought, the concept is rapidly gaining popularity as a solution to solving global challenges. EU refugee policy is used as an example to show how top-down solutions have not been adequate in dealing with refugees seeking asylum in Europe. I argue that this humanitarian crisis will need to be approached from several different angles, including with social entrepreneurial innovation in order to provide long-term sustainable solutions for both refugees and Europeans. Through establishing creative solutions to problems that are not within the current norms and influencing a shift in values, it can become possible to move away from the exploitive tendencies of the market and instead, transform it into a force for good. Social entrepreneurship has the potential to be one solution for refugees in Europe, and help with the current and upcoming economic and social consequences of demographic shifts and overcoming fear of the other.

However, further research and evidence is needed to measure the effectiveness and success of social entrepreneurship. This thesis is not claiming that social entrepreneurship will solve everything, but it can be used as a practical way to deal with the current shifting demographics in Europe concerning refugees. A shift in the narrative concerning refugees is needed. The discourse should include refugees as part of the solution, not the problem, and use this situation as an opportunity for innovation.

Abstract

Auch wenn es kleine Unterschiede in der Definition von Sozialunternehmen im US und europäischen Diskurs gibt, ist es auffallend, dass soziale Unternehmen als Lösungsansatz für globale Herausforderungen immer populärer werden. Die EU-Flüchtlingspolitik ist ein gutes Beispiel, um zu zeigen, wie top-down-Lösungen im Umgang mit Flüchtlingen, die Asyl in Europa suchen, nicht angemessen sind. Um langfristige Lösungen für Flüchtlinge und Europäer zu schaffen, muss diese humanitäre Krise mit vielen verschiedenen Methoden bewältigt werden; eine davon ist die sozial unternehmerische Innovation. Durch die Etablierung von kreativen Lösungsansätzen, die sich nicht in den aktuellen Normen bewegen und eine Wertverschiebung beeinflussen, kann es möglich werden, sich von Ausbeutungs- Tendenzen des Marktes zu entfernen und sie stattdessen als Kraft für das Gute zu nutzen.

Soziales Unternehmertum hat das Potenzial, eine Lösung für Flüchtlinge in Europa zu sein und Ängste vor “den Fremden” in der europäischen Bevölkerung zu lindern. Außerdem besteht die Chance, dass durch eine gelungene Integration wirtschaftliche und soziale Folgen der demografischen Veränderungen in Europa weniger stark schlagend werden. Für die Wirksamkeit und den Erfolg der Sozialunternehmer sind jedoch weitere Forschungen und Nachweise erforderlich. Diese Arbeit behauptet nicht, dass Soziale Unternehmen alle Probleme lösen werden, aber Sozialunternehmertum kann als praktischer Weg genutzt werden, um mit der derzeitigen Zuwanderung umzugehen. Eine Veränderung des Diskurses über Flüchtlinge ist erforderlich. Der Diskurs sollte Flüchtlinge als Teil der Lösung sehen und diese Situation als eine Chance für Innovation nutzen.

References

- Aiyar, S., Barkbu, B., Batini, N., Berger, H., Detragiache, E., Dizioli, A., Spilimbergo, A. (2016).** The Refugee Surge in Europe. International Monetary Fund, pp 1-55.
- Anderson L. M., Collins Hill. P. (2001).** Race, Class and Gender an Anthology. Wadsworth, pp. 1-592.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., Wei-Skillern, J. (2006).** Social and commercial entrepreneurship; Same, Different or both? Entrepreneurship: Theory and practice, vol. 30, issue 1, pp. 1-22.
- Bacq, S., Janssen, F. (2011).** The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, pp. 373-403.
- Barendsen, L., Gardner, H. (2004).** Is the social entrepreneur a new type of leader? Leader to Leader, pp. 43-50.
- Bauernfeind, A. (2017).** Extra EU Countries Dossier on New Generation Social Enterprises. Summary of 5 Stakeholder-Interviews in 5 non-European Countries. EFSEIIS New Generation of Social Entrepreneurs Exploratory Case Study Series, pp. 132-170.
- Beck, U. (2006).** Cosmopolitan Vision. Polity, pp. 1-216.
- Benadus, M., Schetling K., Sapienza R. (2015).** Social Enterprise, Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship in Austria: A National Report. EFSEIIS, pp. 1-62.
- Betts, A., Bloom, L., Kaplan, J., Omata, N. (2014).** Refugee Economies: Rethinking Popular Assumptions. Humanitarian Innovation Project. Oxford University, pp. 1-46.
- Betts, A., Bloom, L., Weaver, N. (2015).** Refugee Innovation. Humanitarian Innovation Project. Oxford University, pp. 1-52.
- Bloom, D. E.o Canning, D., & Fink, G. (2010).** Implications of population ageing for economic growth. Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 26(4), 583-612.
- Bornstein, D. (2004)** How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Print, pp. 1-36.

- Brian, T., Laczko, F. (2014):** Fatal Journeys: Tracking the Lives Lost During Migration. International Organization for Migration. pp. 1-222.
- Cannon, L. (2002)** Defining Sustainability. M. Edwards & A. Fowler (Eds), The Earthscan Reader on NGO Management, pp. 5-363
- Caritas (2015).** Annual Report 2015, pp. 1-35.
- Caruso, D. (2014).** Lost at Sea. German Law Journal, pp. 14-39.
- Chell, E., Nicolopoulou, K., Karatas-Özkan, M. (2010).** Social entrepreneurship and enterprise: International and innovation perspectives. Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, vol. 22, issue 6, pp. 485-493.
- Chouliaraki, L., Blaagaard, B. (Eds.). (2015).** Cosmopolitanism and the New News Media. Routledge, pp. 1-144.
- Corner, P. D., Ho, M. (2010).** How Opportunities Develop in Social Entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice. Baylor University, pp. 635-659.
- Dees, J. G. (1998a).** The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship. Stanford University, pp 1-6.
- Dees, J. G. (1998b).** Enterprising nonprofits. Harvard Business Review, vol. 76, issue 1, pp. 54-67.
- Dees, J. G. (2007).** Taking social entrepreneurship seriously. Transactional Social Science and Modern Society, vol. 44, issue 3, pp. 24-31.
- Defourny J., Nyssens M. (2010).** Conceptions of Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences. Journal of Social Entrepreneurship Vol. 1 No.1, 32-53.
- Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J., Mair, J. (2014)** ‘The Governance of Social Enterprises: Mission Drift and Accountability Challenges in Hybrid Organisations.’ Research in Organizational Behavior, pp. 81–100.
- Edwards, A. (2005).** Human Rights, Refugees, and The Right ‘To Enjoy’ Asylum Int J Refugee Law (2005) 17 (2): 293-330.
- EFESIIS (2015).** How Can Policy Makers Improve Their Country’s Support to Social Enterprises? European Policy Brief, pp. 1-5.
- European Commission (2015):** European Commission stands by Italy on coping with migratory pressure on Lampedusa. Press Release, Brussels. pp. 1-3.

- European Union** (2015). Global Trends to 2030: Can the EU meet the challenges ahead? European Strategy and Policy Analysis System (ESPAS), pp. 1-85.
- Faedda, B.** (2014). “We are not racist, but we do not want immigrants.” How Italy uses immigration law to marginalize immigrants and create a (new) national identity. *Migrant Marginality: A Transnational Perspective*, pp. 114-127.
- Fratzke, S.** (2015): Not Adding Up: the Fading Promise of Europe’s Dublin System, Migration Policy Institute Europe, pp 1-37.
- Garelli, G., Tazzioli, M.** (2016). The EU Hotspot Approach at Lampedusa. *Open Democracy*, pp 1-6.
- Guevara, E., Deutschmann, D.** (2003). Che Guevara reader: writings on politics & revolution. Ocean Press, pp 1-420
- Heller, C., Jones, C.** (2014). EuroSur: Saving lives or re-enforcing deadly Borders? *Statewatch Journal. Reflections on the State and Civil Liberties in Europe*. Vol. 23 pp 9-12.
- Hunter, P.** (2009). Social Enterprise for Public Service: How does the third sector deliver? Smith Institute. pp. 1-100.
- Islam, S., Merritt, G.,** (2016). Win-win solutions to Europe’s refugee crisis. *Friends of Europe*, pp 1-11.
- Ismail N., Ng, K., Singh A** (2016a). An Analysis of Gaps and Opportunities in Germany’s Refugee Integration System. *Refugee Connect*. Saïd Business School, University of Oxford.
- Ismail N., Ng, K., Singh A** (2016b). Refugee Integration in German; Process, Challenges, Solutions, Gaps and Prospects. *Skill Center, 2016 Global Challenge*, pp 1-3.
- Ismail N., Ng, K., Singh A** (2016c). A Closer look at Refugee Integration in Germany. *Skill Center, 2016 Global Challenge*, 1-26.
- Jiao, H.** (2011). A conceptual model for social entrepreneurship directed Toward social impact on society. *Social Enterprise Journal*, vol. 7, issue 2, pp. 130-149.
- Katsiaficas, C.** (2014). Search and Rescue Operations in the Mediterranean: The Role of Frontex Plus. *Bridging Europe EU Migration Policy Working Paper*, pp. 1-14.
- Kummitha, R. K. R.** (2016). Social Entrepreneurship as a Tool to Remedy Social Exclusion A Win–Win Scenario? *South Asia Research*, 36(1), pp. 61-79.
- Larsen M. M.** (2012): Social Entrepreneurship a single case study of a social entrepreneur in the Dutch not-for profit Sector. *Aarhus School of Business and Social Sciences*, pp 1-68.

- Leadbeater, C.** (1997). The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur. Demos, Creative Commons, pp.1-94.
- Leighton, D., Wood, C.** (2010). Measuring Social Value The Gap Between Policy and Practice. Demos. Creative Commons, pp. 1-102.
- Loyd, J. M., Mountz, A.** (2014a). Constructing the Mediterranean region: obscuring violence in the bordering of Europe's migration "crises." ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies, 13(2), pp. 1-24.
- Loyd, J. M. Mountz, A.** (2014b). Managing migration, scaling sovereignty on islands. Island Studies Journal, 9(1), pp. 23-42.
- Maiani, F.** (2016). The Reform of the Dublin III Regulation. Directorate General For Internal Policies. Policy Department C: Citizens Rights and Constitutional Affairs. Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs. European Parliament, pp. 1-76.
- Martin, R. L. Osberg, S.** (2015). Getting Beyond Better: How Social Entrepreneurship Works. Harvard Business Review Press, pp. 1-272.
- Mantios, G.** (1995). Media Magic, Making Class Invisible. Rothenberg, P.S., ed. Race, Class and Gender in the US. 3d ed, pp. 732.
- Nicholls, (Ed.)** (2006b) Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-504.
- O'Grady, S., Lane, H. W.** (1996). The psychic distance paradox. Journal of international business studies, pp. 309-333.
- OHCHR** (1954). Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Status of Refugees and Stateless Persons, pp 1-12.
- Palmer, J. P.** (2011). Healing the Heart of Democracy; the Courage to Create a Politics Worthy of the Human Spirit. Jossey-Bass, pp. 256.
- Pearce, J.** (2003). Social Enterprise in Anytown. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, pp. 1-144.
- Persson T, Hafen N., Rakar F.** (2016). Welfare, Education and Social entrepreneurship. EFSEIIS, pp 1-32.
- Puggioni, R.** (2015). Border Politics, right to life and acts of dissensus: voices from the Lampedusa borderland. In: Third World Quarterly. Vol. 36, No. 6, pp. 1145–1159.
- Roberts, D., Woods, C.** (2005). Changing the world on a shoestring: The concept of social entrepreneurship. University of Auckland Business Review vol. 7, issue 1, pp. 45-51.

- Rumford, C.** (2006). Theorizing borders. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 9(2), pp. 155-169.
- Shelley, L.** (2014). Human Smuggling and Trafficking into Europe a Comparative Perspective. Transatlantic Council on Migration. Migration Policy Institute, pp. 224-231.
- Sharir, Moshe, Lerner, Miri,** (2006). Gauging the Success of Social Ventures Initiated by Individual Social Entrepreneurs. *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 41, Issue 1, pp. 6-20.
- Stephan U., Patterson M., Ciara K.,, Mair, J.** (2016). Organizations Driving Positive Social Change: A Review and an Integrative Framework of Change Processes *Journal of Management* 42, pp.1250-1281.
- The Elders** (2016). In Challenge Lies Opportunity. How the World Must Respond to Refugees and Mass Migration. The Elders Foundation, pp. 1-20.
- Triandafyllidou, A.** (2014). Multi-levelling and externalizing migration and asylum: lessons from the southern European islands. *Island Studies Journal*,9(1), pp. 7-22.
- UNHCR** (2016). Europe's Refugee Emergency Response Update # 29. pp. 1-9.
- UNODC** (2011). International Framework for Action To Implement the Smuggling of Migrants Protocol. Publishing and Library Section, Vienna, pp. 1-176.
- Webber, F.** (2014). The cradle or the grave? EU migration policy and Exclusion and denial. *Statewatch Journal. Reflections on the State and Civil Liberties in Europe*. Vol. 23, pp. 3-6.
- Westall, A., Chalkley, D.** (2007). *Social Enterprise Futures*. The Smith Institute, pp. 1-83.
- Williamson, M.** (1992). *A Return to Love*. HarperCollins, pp. 1-336.
- Young, M. I.** (2012): *Responsibility for Justice*. Oxford University Press, pp. 1-224.
- Zahra, S. A., Rawhouser, H. N., Bhawe, N., Neubaum, D. O., & Hayton, J. C.** (2008). Globalization of social entrepreneurship opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 2(2), pp. 117-131.

Internet Sources

- Aliyyah A., Benton, M.** (2016). Humanitarian Innovation: Lasting Solutions to Big Challenges. SIE's Beyond Crisis: Innovative Approaches to the Integration Migrants. URL: <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/socialinnovationeurope/en/magazine/beyond-crisis-migrant-integration/collection/humanitarian-innovation-lasting-solutions-big> [Accessed 17.09.16].
- Ambrosi E.** (2015). Analysis: Migration: The enemy within. IOM. Blog. URL: <https://weblog.iom.int/analysis%E2%80%A6migration-enemy-within> [Accessed 27.08.16].
- Amnesty International** (2015). 8 ways to solve refugee crisis. URL: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/campaigns/2015/10/eight-solutions-world-refugee-crisis/> [Accessed 19.06.2016].
- Ashoka** (2015). Homepage. URL: <https://www.ashoka.org/>. [Accessed 10.02.16].
- Bajekal, N.** (2014). Italy to End Naval Operation That Rescued Thousands of Migrants. TIME Magazine. URL: <http://time.com/3543082/italy-navy-mare-nostrum-migrants/> [Accessed 19.04.15].
- Barry, D.** (2015). Italian coastguard rescues thousands of migrants and refugees in Mediterranean. URL: <http://www.independent.com.mt/articles/2015-04-14/local-news/Europe-needs-to-up-fight-against-human-trafficker-Europe-has-deaths-on-its-hands-again-Metsola-6736133797> [Accessed 09.03.16].
- Bason, C.** (2015). How Business can help create sustainable solutions to Europe's Refugee Crisis. Beyond Crisis Migrant Integration. Social Innovation Europe. URL: <http://www.designforeurope.eu/news-opinion/how-business-can-help-create-sustainable-solutions-europe-s-refugee-crisis>. [Accessed 10.16.15].
- Basulto, D.** (2015). The Tech Sector's Best Innovations for Solving the Syrian Refugee Crisis. The Washington Post. URL: https://regasus.de/online/datastore?epk=74D5roYc&file=image_8_en. [Accessed 01.09.16].
- BBC News** (2014). Operation Triton: Europe's Mediterranean Border Control. URL: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa30039044>. [Accessed 18.04.15].
- BBC News** (2016). Migrant Crisis. Migration to Europe Explained in 7 Charts. URL: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-34131911> [Accessed 26.09.16].

Betts, A. (2016). *Betts, Alexander: Our Refugee System is Failing, Here is How We Can Fix it.* [Video File]. URL: https://www.ted.com/talks/alexander_betts_our_refugee_system_is_failing_here_s_how_we_can_fix_it?language=en. [Accessed June 2016].

De Vries, Garelli, Tazzioli (2016). Mediterranean migration crisis: transit points, enduring struggles. Open Democracy Free Thinking for the World. URL: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/can-europe-make-it/leonie-ansems-de-vries-glenda-garelli-and-martina-tazzioli/mediterranean-migration-crisis-transit-po> [Accessed 10.10.16].

Drayton, B. (2015) Skoll Foundation, The Power of Mindset Change. [Video File]. URL: <https://www.bing.com/videos/search?q=drayton+2015+youtub e+aksha+skoll+foundation&&view=detail&mid=B0323E4D6A0C72AFFD80B0323E4D6A0C72AFFD80&rvsmid=E2C607B4CE88C20FFEE9E2C607B4CE88C20FFEE9&fsscr=0&FORM=VDFSrv>. [Accessed 17.12.16].

European Commission (2012). Enterprise and Industry. URL: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/social-economy/social-enterprises/index_en.htm [Accessed 26.09.16].

European Commission (2014a). Global Approach to Migration and Mobility. URL: <http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/international-a> [Accessed 10.10.15].

European Commission (2014b). Improving corporate governance: Europe's largest companies will have to be more transparent about how they operate. URL: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STATEMENT-14-124_en.htm [Accessed 09.05.16].

European Commission (2016a). Refugee Crisis in Europe. Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection. URL: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/refugee-crisis_en [Accessed 03.09.16].

European Commission (2016b). Managing the Refugee Crisis Italy Progress Report. URL: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/background-information/docs/managing_the_refugee_crisis_-_italy_state_of_play_report_20160210_en.pdf [Accessed 04.10.16].

European Union, OECD (2015). Policy Brief on Social Impact Measurement for Social Enterprises. Policies for Social Entrepreneurship. European Commission. URL: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=14353&langId=en> [Accessed 02.09.16].

- Frontex EU** (2015). About Frontex. URL:
/Origin.<http://frontex.europa.eu/about-frontex/origin/>
[Accessed 25.09.15].
- Ghosh, S.** (2015). Has Europe's Migration Policy Capsized? Aljazeera.
URL:<http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/insidestory/2015/04/europes-migration-policy-capsized-150417191746037.html>
[Accessed 18.04.15]
- Hand, M., Lewis, J.**(2016). The Research Gap in Social Entrepreneurship. Stanford Social Innovation Review. URL:
http://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_research_gap_in_social_entrepreneurship [Accessed 29.09.16].
- Hagelmuller, M.** (2013). Young and Dynamic: Social Entrepreneurship in Austria. The Guardian.URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/social-enterprise-network/2013/may/22/social-enterprise-austria> [Accessed 22.09.16].
- Henley, J.**(2016). EU refugee relocation scheme is inadequate and will continue to fail. The Guardian.
URL:<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/mar/04/eu-refugee-relocation-scheme-inadequate-will-continue-to-fail> [Accessed 22.10.16].
- Help2day** (2016). URL: <https://help2day.squarespace.com/>. [Accessed 22.12.16].
- Holland, H.** (2015). Over One Million Sea Arrivals Reach Europe in 2015. UNHCR. URL: <http://www.unhcr.org/5683d0b56.html>
[Accessed 10.05.16].
- Huysentruyt, M.**(2015) Taking the Impact of Social Enterprises to Scale. SEFORIS. URL:
<http://www.seforis.eu/news/2015/6/16/taking-the-impact-of-social-enterprises-to-scale> [Accessed 28.09.16].
- Huysentruyt, M., Mair J., Stephen U.** (2016). Market-Oriented and Mission-Focused: Social Enterprises around the globe. Stanford Social Innovation Review. URL:
https://ssir.org/articles/entry/market_oriented_and_mission_focused_social_enterprises_around_the_globe [Accessed 24.10.16].
- Impact Hub** (2015): <http://www.impacthub.net/> [Accessed 4.04.15].
- Impact Hub Vienna** (2016). Found! URL:
http://vienna.impacthub.net/program/found/?utm_source=facebook&utm_medium=CPC&utm_campaign=found_carousel
[Accessed 03.09.16].

- Ioan, A., Wolf, M.** (2015): Facing Unexpected Challenges-Social Entrepreneurs and the refugee crisis in Germany. SEFORIS. URL: <http://www.seforis.eu/news/2016/6/22/facing-unexpected-challenges-social-entrepreneurs-and-the-refugee-crisis-in-germany> [Accessed 10.10.16].
- IOM** (2015). Missing Migrants Project. URL: <http://missingmigrants.iom.int/>. [Accessed 10.10.16].
- IOM** (2016). Missing Migrants Project. URL:<http://missingmigrants.iom.int/>.
https://issuu.com/iomdrd/docs/mediterranean_update_7_october_2016 [Accessed 10.10.16].
- Jilani, H.** (2016). Refugees: A Global Challenge and a Global Opportunity. The Huffington Post. URL: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/hina-jilani/refugees-a-global-challen_b_12065286.html [Accessed 25.10.16].
- Kanini, R.** (2014). How to Measure Social Impact: New Research and Insights. Forbes. URL: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/rahimkanani/2014/03/15/how-to-measure-social-impact-new-research-and-insights/#4e2bc674be62> [Accessed 02.09.16].
- Kiron** (2016)Homepage.URL: <https://kiron.ngo/about> [Accessed 18.12.16].
- Lombardi P., Wulfhorst E.** (2016). US named top country for entrepreneurs using business to do good but public left puzzled. URL: <http://poll2016.trust.org/i/?id=6730fcfd-0c58-4fb3-82d0-0d94ac42fcbc> [Accessed 21.12.16].
- Martin, L. Osberg, S.** (2007). Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition. Stanford Social Innovation Review. URL: http://ssir.org/articles/entry/social_entrepreneurship_the_case_for_definition [Accessed 01.09.16].
- Manzini, E.** (2016). Migrants, Social Innovation and Collaborative Inclusion. European Commission. Social Innovation Europe. URL: <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/socialinnovationeurope/en/magazine/beyond-crisis-migrant-integration/collection/migrants-social-innovation-and-collaborative> [Accessed 01.09.16].
- Matsangou, E.** (2015). Refugees are an economic benefit, not burden, to Europe. World Finance. URL: <http://www.worldfinance.com/infrastructure-investment/government-policy/refugees-are-an-economic-benefit-not-burden-to-europe> [Accessed 30.09.16].

- Micallef J. V.** (2015): The Mediterranean Refugees Crisis, Huffington Post. URL: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joseph-v-micallef/the-mediterranean-refugee_b_7083198.html [Accessed 30.08.15].
- Murriel, M.** (2016). UN Speaker: Being a Refugee is an experience, not an identity. PRI The World. URL: <http://www.pri.org/stories/2016-09-22/un-speaker-being-refugee-experience-not-identity> [Accessed 11.10.16].
- Nitsche, L., Roskam, K.,** (2015): Private Initiatives Take The Helm in Solving Europe's Shipwreck Crisis. Global Voices. <https://globalvoicesonline.org/2015/05/03/private-initiatives-take-the-helm-in-solving-europes-shipwreck-crisis/> [Accessed 28.09.15].
- Norbury, M** (2016). Social Enterprise: A Vital Force for Tackling World's Biggest Challenges. UE <http://poll2016.trust.org/i/?id=e41efd3e-d9b0-49ef-b9d7-132da2d617c1>. [Accessed 12.12.16].
- OECD** (2015): Policy Brief on Social Impact Measurement for Social Enterprises. Policies for Social Entrepreneurship. URL: <http://www.oecd.org/social/PB-SIM-FinalVersion-Web.pdf> [Accessed 11.10.16].
- Oltermann, P.** (2016). Syrian refugees design app for navigating German bureaucracy. The Guardian. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/aug/05/syrian-refugees-app-navigating-german-bureaucracy-bureaucrazy> [Accessed 23.10.16].
- Rismyhr, S.** (2012). The Other and Othering. New Narratives Multicultural Literature at the University of Oslo. URL: <http://newnarratives.wordpress.com/issue-2-theother/other-and-othering-2/> [Accessed: 6.4. 2015].
- Refugees Welcome** (2016). URL: <http://www.refugees-welcome.net/> [Accessed 18.12.16].
- RefugeesWork.at** (2016). URL: <https://refugeeswork.at/>
- Refugee Youth Project** (2015). URL: <http://www.refugeeyouthproject.org/about/> [Accessed 09.11.16].
- SEFORIS** (2016). Project Funded by European Commission. <http://www.seforis.eu/about-seforis/> [Accessed 30.09.16].
- Sharma, J.** (2016). A Neo-liberal takeover of Social Entrepreneurship? Stanford Social Innovation Review. URL: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/a_neoliberal_takeover_of_social_entrepreneurship [Accessed 25.10.16].

- Singer, P.** (1972). *Famine, Affluence, and Morality*. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*. URL: <https://www.utilitarianism.net/singer/by/1972----.htm>. [Accessed 11.03.16].
- Skoll Foundation** *Beyond Better How Do We Know We're Changing the Status Quo?"* (Video) <http://www.skollfoundation.org/sally-osberg-roger-martin-on-stamina-and-tough-minded-optimism/#more-15383> [Accessed on 08.08.16].
- Thomson Reuters Foundation** (2016). *The Best Countries to be a Social Entrepreneur in 2016. Methodology and Scope*. URL: <http://poll2016.trust.org/methodology/> [Accessed 20.12.16].
- Social Innovation Community** (2016): *Let's Talk About: Missing Links Integration Debates in Austria*. URL: https://www.siceurope.eu/sic-themes/migration/lets-talk-about-missing-links-integration-debates-austria?alt_path=node/17 [Accessed 22.11.16].
- Torno, A., Broussard, E.** (2015): *Impact Hub Ventures Support Refugees*. URL: <http://vienna.impacthub.net/2015/09/23/impact-hub-ventures-support-refugees/>. [Accessed 15.10.15].
- Topfreisen** (2016). URL: <http://www.topfreisen.at/>. [Accessed 18.12.16].
- Train of Hope** (2015). URL: <http://www.trainofhope.at/> [Accessed 05.03.16].
- The Connection** (2016). URL: <http://www.theconnection.at/> [Accessed 18.12.16].
- The Global Challenge** (2016). *Third Prize, University of Oxford*. URL: http://www.oxfordglobalchallenge.com/maps_and_reports/ [Accessed 25.11.16].
- Thorpe, D.** (2016). *1.1 Million Refugees Arrive in Germany: This Entrepreneur goes to Work*. *Forbes*. URL: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/devinthorpe/2016/08/09/1-1-million-refugees-arrive-in-germany-this-entrepreneur-goes-to-work/#701201c6be8c> [Accessed 20.12.16].
- UNESCO** (2016). *Refolement. Learning to Live Together*. URL: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/refoulement/> [Accessed 19.12.12].
- UNHCR** (2014): *Mediterranean crossings more deadly a year after Lampedusa tragedy*. URL: <http://www.unhcr.org/542d12de9.html> [Accessed 20.1.16].
- UNHCR** (2015). *Central European Sea Initiative. March*. URL: <http://www.unhcr.org/531990199.html> [Accessed 21.1.16].

- UNHCR** (2016a). Refugee Crisis in Europe. Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection European Commission. URL:
http://ec.europa.eu/echo/refugee-crisis_en [Accessed 15.09.16].
- UNHCR** (2016b). As 300,000 cross Mediterranean this year, UNHCR calls for admission pathways for refugees and speedy relocation out of Italy and Greece. URL:
<http://www.unhcr.org/news/briefing/2016/9/57e0fb264/300000-cross-mediterranean-year-unhcr-calls-admission-pathways-refugees.html> [Accessed 19.12.16].
- United Nations** (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. URL:
<http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html> [Accessed 12.04.16].
- Van Kouwen, S.** (2016). Kama: Integrating Asylum Seekers and Migrants Through Workshops. Cities in Transition.
 URL:<https://citiesintransition.eu/plek/kama> [Accessed 12.16.16].
- Watch the Med** (2016). URL: <http://watchthemed.net/> [Accessed 13.08.16].
- Winchell, N.** (2015). Establishing a more Humane Culture of Welcoming Refugees-How can we change the refugee discourse? The Changer. URL:
<http://thechanger.org/community/establishing-more-humane-culture-welcoming-refugees> [Accessed 21.07.16].
- Winchell, N.** (2016) Fintech For Refugees. The Changer.org. URL:
<http://thechanger.org/community/fintech-refugees>. [Accessed 21.07.16].
- Zweynert, A.** (2016). FACTBOX - Seeking to do good but what is a social entrepreneur? URL:
<http://poll2016.trust.org/i/?id=d8bbbd5b-c419-4f05-abad-4ec637d3f917> [Accessed 11.12.16].