

ENABLING THE FLOURISHING AND
EVOLUTION OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP
FOR INNOVATIVE AND INCLUSIVE SOCIETIES

EFSEIIS



This project has received funding from the
European Union's Seventh Framework Programme
for research, technological development and
demonstration under grant agreement no 613179

Social Entrepreneurs in Germany: Barriers and Drivers for Building up an Eco-System

Focus Group Analysis Report

Andrea Walter, Stephanie Bräuer and Prof. Dr. Annette Zimmer

Westfälische Wilhelms University, Germany

March 2015

Contents

1	Introduction: Social Entrepreneurs in Germany	2
2	Sampling strategy, conducting focus group interviews and process of analysis	4
3	Results	4
3.1	<i>Definitions of social entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurship</i>	4
3.2	<i>The role of promoters of social entrepreneurs in Germany.....</i>	6
3.2.1	Government.....	6
3.2.2	Business Foundations	7
3.2.3	Other promoters (incubators, financiers)	8
3.3	<i>Main drivers and barriers for promoters in building up an eco-system</i>	9
3.3.1	Neither drivers, nor barriers – the absence of a common legal framework.....	9
3.3.2	Many players, but no comprehensive network between the promoters.....	9
3.3.3	Many programs and initiatives, few coordinated offers.....	10
4	Concluding remarks	10
5	References	10
6	Appendix 1: List of conducted focus group interviews.....	11
6.1	<i>Focus group interview 1, conducted November 4th, 2014</i>	11
6.2	<i>Focus group interview 2, conducted November 5th, 2014</i>	12

1 Introduction: Social Entrepreneurs in Germany

The development of social entrepreneurs in Germany¹

Today, the current amount of social entrepreneurs in Germany is unclear and depends on the chosen definition. The federal government assumed in 2012 an amount of approximately 100 social entrepreneurs defining them as actors founding social organizations out of their individual citizen engagement in order to cope with social challenges through innovative and entrepreneurial approaches (Deutscher Bundestag 10/5/2012). The MEFOSE study identified in its survey around 1700 potential social entrepreneurs² (Scheu-erle, Glänzel 2012, p. 41).

With regard to their historical forerunners who came into existence in the second half of the 19th century, social entrepreneurs traditionally addressed specific societal needs by covering a wide range of activities and action fields ranging from educational mentoring, providing measures aiming at the inclusion into the labor market to developing sustainable solutions for environmental needs.

The current discourse on social entrepreneurs in Germany is interconnected with (at least) three (inter-) national developments: First of all the Nobel Prize for Mohammad Yunus in 2006 for his Grameen Bank created awareness, at least among professionals, for strengthening social inclusion by innovative ideas. Furthermore, the issue gained momentum by the establishment of the Ashoka and the Schwab Foundations in Germany, both big umbrella organizations supporting social entrepreneurs and their development. They provide resources for social entrepreneurs and create public awareness (Glänzel, Schmitz 2012, p. 7). Other big German foundations, such as the Mercator, the Vodafone, the BMW Herbert Quandt or the Bertelsmann foundation followed. Finally, due to the budget cuts in the late 1980s and 1990s in the field of welfare provision and the need to economize the welfare provision, there emerged a discussion focusing on the need to develop innovative ways in the provision of social goods in the nexus between the market and the state. This initiated a discussion on social entrepreneurs in academic and political circles as a potential solution for the crisis of the German welfare state (Evers, Schulze-Böing 2001, p. 122).

Despite, an unanimous definition of social entrepreneurship in the German discourse is still missing. Due to the uncertain concept, there is a lack of a broadly accepted differentiation between social entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurial activities. This ambiguity leads repeatedly to confusion in discussions among academics, practitioners and stakeholders with regard to the respective object of discussion.

Furthermore, there is no special legal framework for social entrepreneurs in Germany, they are rather operating under diverse legal forms, such as foundations (*Stiftungen*), voluntary associations (*Vereine*), limited liability companies (*GmbHs*) and co-operatives (*Genossenschaften*). Similar diverse as their legal form, is the composition of social entrepreneurs' income in Germany. It ranges from own profit, donations, membership fees, committed stocks, private capital and mixtures between these components (Pöllath 2011, p. 47).

¹ For a deeper understanding, cf. Zimmer, Annette/Bräuer, Stephanie (2014): National Country Report "The Development of Social Entrepreneurs in Germany" available from: <http://www.fp7-efeseis.eu/national-report-germany/> [Accessed: 12 March 2015]

² The MEFOSE definition of social entrepreneurs is not congruent with the working definition provided in the EFESIIS project.

The eco-system for social entrepreneurs: who promotes them?

Social entrepreneurs need an environment composed of promoting actors and structures meeting their needs. At the same time this environment can hinder their development, by producing obstacles. The eco-system of social entrepreneurs in Germany includes the following main actors:

The German national government provides direct and indirect support for social entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurship is perceived as professional institutionalization of individual engagement for the common good and is as such since 2010 an integral part of *the National Engagement Strategy* of the Federal Ministry of Families, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ 2012). As part of their new strategy, the Federal Ministry held a multistakeholder dialogue in 2011 and a multistakeholder conference in 2013.

Furthermore, financial and ideal support is provided from a broad range of actors. First, there are many foundations (especially business foundations) and associations in Germany which support social entrepreneurs by specific programs or by holding competitions for emerging social entrepreneurs (e.g. startsocial).

Incubators like the Social Impact Lab in Berlin and Hamburg or the Impact Hubs in Berlin and Munich offer social entrepreneurs necessary facilities to develop their business strategy and networks in co-working spaces. Furthermore, these organizations provide workshops for emerging social entrepreneurs aiming at the enhancement of their economic and social skills.

For social entrepreneurs, financial support becomes relevant in three different phases: the pilot period, the early stage of financing and then the phase of scaling up. For example, the state-owned KfW bank group and the BMFSFJ provide a joint program to financially support social entrepreneurs (SE). Financial consulting and specific programs are provided in part by the mentioned actors above, but also especially by financiers (e.g. some social-ecological and state-owned banks in Germany).

Why this focus group report? Identifying barriers and drivers from the perspective of SE's promoters

The conducted focus groups aim at the identification of the barriers and drivers for promoters responding to the needs of social entrepreneurs, ergo for emerging social entrepreneurship in Germany. While earlier conducted expert interviews with regard to the EFESIIS' German sub-study clear up the chances and challenges for social entrepreneurs in Germany, the focus group interviews want to extract how the different stakeholders are related to each other, how they evaluate the existing conditions for social entrepreneurs and how they understand their role in the field (as individual players or a group based on common goals and attitudes towards the promotion of social entrepreneurs in Germany). Due to this goals the qualitative method of focus groups dedicated to "encourage greater candour" in this field which helps "accessing the 'hard to reach' insights was selected as an adequate methodological approach (Barbour 2008: 27). The results are a preliminary step in giving recommendations for building up an ecosystem for social entrepreneurs in Germany.

2 Sampling strategy, conducting focus group interviews and process of analysis

The five or six participants chosen for each focus group represented the variation of stakeholders in the field of social entrepreneurship. Hence, the sample consisted of social entrepreneurs and promoters of social entrepreneurs in Germany.

Concretely, the first focus group based on a mixed sample including in total six representatives from the fields of federal government (Federal Ministry), social entrepreneurs, incubators, other promoting institutions and from a social and ecological bank. The second focus group based on a sample including five representatives from four German business foundations supporting social entrepreneurs in different ways or working on the issue of social innovation without directly promoting social entrepreneurs. Furthermore, the group involved one representative from the Association of German Foundations, the umbrella organization for German foundations.

The focus group interviews took place on 4th and 5th of November 2014, both in the facilities of the BMW foundation Herbert Quandt in Berlin. Both interviews were conducted by two members of the German EFESIIS research team over a time period of two hours. To coordinate the discussion a semi-structured guideline focusing on the categories “development of social entrepreneurship in Germany”, “barriers and drivers for promoting actors” as well as “outlook” was applied. A short video input served as icebreaker to start discussion. For the process of analysis both interviews were recorded and transcribed. The process of content analysis based on professional software for qualitative and mixed methods data analysis (MAXQDA). The generated data was systematically structured by a set of variables and categories. The relevant information was extracted from the data in order to prepare the interpretation of the textual data. The main categories were called “definition/understanding of social entrepreneurs”, “identifying barriers and drivers in promoting social entrepreneurs”, “meaning of a legal framework”, and “role of promoters for building up an eco-system”, “role of government for building up an eco-system”.

3 Results

With regard to the aim of this report, to identify barriers and drivers in the supporting ecosystem for emerging social entrepreneurs in Germany, the results of the conducting focus group interviews are presented in the following chapter.

3.1 Definitions of social entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurship

Both focus groups underline one of the main results from the National Report that academics, practitioners and stakeholders have no common ground debating this issue. Among experts who are engaged in the field of social entrepreneurs exist difficulties to agree on a common definition of social entrepreneurship and in particular on a clear distinction between both terms *social entrepreneur* and *social enterprise*. The strong linkage between the organization and the person who is managing is underlined by one representative in the following way:

“Obviously, an enterprise itself isn’t able to provide any outcome [...] it’s always the people. I think we all agree about this.” (representative from a bank)³

Another question which opened a broad debate focused on the understanding of individuals acting as change makers within (traditional) welfare organizations.

“It is indisputable that the individual stands in the centre, because he or she is the change maker. But [...] is a change maker who is working in a welfare organization and providing an innovative service delivery also a social entrepreneur?” (representative of an incubator)⁴

Later on, the same interviewee adds that typically an entrepreneur is characterised by an economic responsibility towards his organization including his staff. For him, individuals who initiate change in an organizational context do not have to carry the entrepreneurial risk, are a kind of “social managers”⁵ and therefore are no social entrepreneurs.

By and large, the interviewees have defined social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs close to their respective (professional) background. For example, two representatives from foundations underlined the orientation towards common goods as very important feature of a social entrepreneur.

“There is an obvious orientation towards common goods and this point stands above the goal of economization.”⁶ (representative from a business foundation).

The different highlighted features illustrate the respective priority areas of the promoters. One of the interviewees identifies three priority areas of the term social entrepreneurship: innovation, business start-ups and financing.

“Some people aim at its innovative character, then we talk about innovation. Others highlight business start-ups, then we talk about business start-ups. Still others highlight financing, then we talk about forms of financing. Everything is o.k. The great thing is that the term can be used quite context-specific. The term makes many promises. I believe this is one of the reasons why this term is so attractive.” (representative from an association promoting social entrepreneurs by counselling them pro bono)⁷

³ „Klar ist auch, dass ein Unternehmen an sich nichts bewirken kann [...] Es sind immer Menschen. Da sind wir uns an dieser Stelle wohl einig.“

⁴ “Es ist unstrittig, dass der Mensch im Mittelpunkt steht, weil der Mensch der Veränderer ist. Aber [...] Ist denn ein Veränderer, ein Mensch, der in einer Wohlfahrtsorganisation tätig ist und dort eine neue soziale Dienstleistung generiert ein Sozialunternehmer – oder nicht?“

⁵ „Das ist für mich ein Sozialmanager“

⁶ „[...] es ist eine klare Gemeinwohlorientierung und die steht über diesem Ziel der Ökonomisierung, das Ganze.“

⁷ „Die einen zielen auf den Innovationscharakter ab, dann reden wir über Innovationen. Die anderen reden über Existenzgründungen, dann reden wir über Existenzgründungen. Wieder andere reden über Finanzierung, dann reden wir über Finanzierungsformen. Ist alles ok, das ist ja das Schöne an dem Begriff, dass er so kontextabhängig verwendet werden kann, und so viele Versprechungen hat, ich glaube, das ist übrigens auch ein Grund, warum er so attraktiv ist.“

3.2 The role of promoters of social entrepreneurs in Germany

The promoters described in the following section include representatives from business foundations, government and the financial sector as well as incubators of social entrepreneurs.

3.2.1 Government

Government representatives understand their role as a “convenor” for social entrepreneurs and stakeholders, as facilitator for exchange. Concretely, the invited representative from a Federal Ministry explained their role perception in the following way:

“Yes, firstly, we understood ourselves as ‚convenor‘, as facilitator for meetings and forums, for enabling conversation. Anything else would have been unreasonable with regard to our knowledge about this issue. Insofar, it has always been clear that we didn’t want to get involved in social entrepreneurs’ affairs whereto we are not asked for our contribution and whereto we still had too little know-how at that time.”⁸ (representative from the Federal Ministry where the promotion of social innovation is located).

This quote shows that the unclear definition of social entrepreneurship even effects how the Government approaches the field of social entrepreneurs and copes with this issue. That’s why the Federal Government decided to point on social innovation in its engagement strategy as umbrella term for promoting social innovation and social entrepreneurship in Germany.

Concerning the discussion about the terms social entrepreneurs and social enterprises, the representative explains that the individuals were very important to promote this issue. Thus, from a policy perspective, they were fit for storytelling, while the enterprises were difficult to grasp due to their different legal forms.

“The individual fits very well for storytelling, this is indeed quite important in politics [...] these enterprises are difficult because there are so many different legal forms.”⁹

Vice versa, from a funding perspective, individuals are more difficult to promote than enterprises. It needs convincing reasons why one individual social entrepreneur receives public funding and another one does not. Strategically, the Federal Government aims at enabling structural support for social entrepreneurs, for example to build up a nationwide structural framework for social start-up consultancy.

With regard to the issues of social innovation and social entrepreneurship, the federal level is connected with the state and the local level through common meetings which have been organized by the federal level in the past. The representative from the Federal Ministry explains that there is no regularly exchange due to the limited personnel resources working on these issues at the different political levels.

⁸ „Ja, wir haben unsere Rolle eigentlich in erster Linie immer als ‚Convenor‘ gesehen, also sozusagen als Gespräch und Foren zu schaffen, ein Gespräch zu ermöglichen, alles andere wäre auch völlig vermessen gewesen, so, mit dem was wir über das Thema wussten, und insofern war immer klar, dass wir uns eigentlich in nichts einmischen wollten was a) wo wir nicht gefragt sind und b) wo wir noch wenig Ahnung von haben.“

⁹ „Die Person eignet sich unheimlich gut für Geschichten, das ist ja in der Politik total wichtig [...] Die Unternehmen sind insofern schwierig, weil wir eben auch so viele verschiedene Formen haben.“

3.2.2 Business Foundations

The invited foundations understood themselves as facilitators for social entrepreneurs and their specific needs during the different phases of establishing their organization. They understood themselves as promoters for the individual social entrepreneur (to improve their business skills and creativeness) as well as for the management of their organization (human resources development, scaling up strategies). One of the interviewees illustrates this comprehensive understanding of promoting social entrepreneurs by the following statement:

“Promoting means more than exclusively financial funding.”¹⁰ (representative from a business foundation)

The unclear definition of social entrepreneurs (see discussion in chapter 3.1.) and the hype about the individuals discouraged also some business foundations from starting social entrepreneurs' promotion, they take rather a broader focus and promote - in a bottom-up-approach - so-called “movers”¹¹ (representative from a business foundation).

The invited representatives explain that they regularly promote social entrepreneurs by project funding. But this traditional promoting strategy focusing mainly on the respective project seems to show a blind spot: The entrepreneurial vision of a NPO founder (many social entrepreneurs are rooted in NPOs) differs greatly from the vision of an economic founder according to Schumpeter. Usually, NPO founders are not familiar with the management of organizational structures or human resource management. The invited representatives self-critically advise to take this fact into account and systematically include promoting offers focusing on the developing of sustainable organizational structures.

“For me [...] project funding had a blind spot. You had never analyzed what has happened with these organizations which carried out good projects, what does this mean for their organizational growth.”¹² (representative from a business foundation)

Closely linked with this blind spot in the traditional strategy of project funding is a problem concerning the nonprofit tax law in Germany. Foundations are not able to promote applicants who act in an economical way. But economical action is a key feature of social entrepreneurs. Therefore existing promoters like business foundations have to rethink their support schemes and initiatives and – if possible – adapt them.

“Let's have a look on the promoting structures. I think, there is still much to do from an institutional perspective, but rather from NPO-perspective. If we as NPO promote a social entrepreneur, we are nonetheless tied on our status of public utility. That means, if we note, that he is building up an income-model, where people are excluded, it's difficult for us to promote him. Public authorities could cope with these circumstances, but there is the paradigm of project funding.” (representative from a business foundation)¹³

¹⁰ „Unterstützung heißt eben nicht nur Geld zu geben.“

¹¹ „Beweger“

¹² „Und für mich [...] war die Projektfokussierung, hatte einen blinden Fleck. Man hatte nie genau geguckt, was passiert eigentlich mit der Organisation, die plötzlich gute Projekte macht und was heißt das eigentlich für organisationales Wachstum.“

¹³ [...] lässt uns mal die Förderstrukturen angucken, weil ich glaube, da ist vieles zu tun, auf institutioneller Seite, aber auch auf gemeinnützigen Organisationen [...] wenn wir als gemeinnützige Organisation einen Sozialunternehmer fördern, sind wir trotzdem immer noch an unseren Gemeinnützigkeitsstatus gebunden. Das heißt, wenn wir dann merken, dass er ein Einkommensmodell aufbaut, wo er Leute wieder ausschließt, haben wir eine Schwierigkeit mit der Förderung. Die öffentliche Hand könnte da ganz anders mit umgehen, hat aber in Moment das Paradigma der Projektförderung.“

3.2.3 Other promoters (incubators, financiers)

Similar to the representatives from the business foundations, the other invited promoters understand themselves also as facilitators for social entrepreneurs and their specific needs. According to their respective mission statement and financial resources their strategies differ, ranging from the provision of capacity building measures (acquiring financial resources, contacts or managing the own organization) to the supplying of working space.

A representative from an association providing counselling for social entrepreneurs explained that individuals who are visible in the scene have best chances to be promoted:

„Actually, we had the strong experience [...] that unions or social projects which we promote, in the end it is mainly the individuals, we call them ‘front-line pigs’ (Frontschweine), the persons who are visible in the scene. They are the persons who are continued to be supported, for example by Ashoka. But actually, there are many projects, which are unions from individuals. They have often problems to find further support.“¹⁴ (representative from an association providing counselling for social entrepreneurs)

The story or better the meaningfulness of a project is relevant to gain financial support. A representative from a social and ecological bank explains that he evaluates the idea and “meaningfulness” first of all, one step before the business-plan.¹⁵ Furthermore, he pointed out the limitations of funding programs focusing on funding priorities social entrepreneurs have to tie up with their ideas. Thus, it seems as if funding lines often hardly fit the financial needs of social entrepreneurs.

“Then you decide for a funding priority for the next four or six years, then a rail is positioned in all states, in society and the actors wonder who has expertise in these new conditions and how their ideas fit with these framework conditions. Here you see, this measure doesn’t work. The general idea shouldn’t be limited by social funding programs. You have to go down to the basement to ask for the individual needs. Therefore it needs funding tools. Long-term plans and opening up funding periods with an own professional industry which counsel interests, I think this takes us down the wrong road or at least a difficult road.”¹⁶ (representative from a social and ecological bank)

These identified difficulties for social entrepreneurs to fulfill specific funding criteria before they are able to apply were shared by the invited social entrepreneur. A representative from an incubator added that the

¹⁴ „Also, da haben wir tatsächlich ganz stark die Erfahrung gemacht [...] dass die Vereinigungen oder sozialen Projekte, die wir fördern, am Ende, das hauptsächlich die Einzelpersonen- also wir nennen die dann immer die Frontschweine (Lachen), die Leute, die tatsächlich sehr präsent sind in der Szene. Die werden weitergefördert, zum Beispiel von Ashoka. Tatsächlich gibt es aber viele Projekte, die aus einem Zusammenschluss von vielen Einzelpersonen bestehen, die dann oft Schwierigkeiten in der Weiterförderung haben.“

¹⁵ „[...] wir versuchen [...] die Sinnhaftigkeit einer Geschichte als erstes zu beurteilen. Bevor ich mir den Businessplan angucke.“

¹⁶ „[...] dann entscheidet man sich in einer bestimmten Art und sagt für die nächsten vier Jahre oder sechs Jahre oder was auch immer, soll dieser Förderschwerpunkt sein“, dann kommt sozusagen so eine Schiene auf die Länder, auf die Gesellschaft, auf die Akteure zu, und die sagen "OK, wer kennt die neuesten Bedingungen, und wie kriege ich das Vernünftige, was ich machen will, irgendwie in diese Bedingungen rein, damit das irgendwie dazu passt? Also daran merkt man, dieses Instrumentarium taugt eigentlich gar nicht. Es müsste sozusagen, also, die Richtung haben, dass man das Allgemeine in der sozialen Förderung als Möglichkeit offen lässt, und dann im Sinne von Beratern ganz nah an der Basis wahrnehmen, was ist denn-, was wird denn gebraucht, was wird denn gemacht, was wird denn geplant? Und dafür die Förderinstrumente einsetzen. Also dieses langfristige Vorausplanen und damit Förderperioden eröffnen und wiederum eine Fachindustrie zu finanzieren, die einen darüber informiert, was in die Förderung wie reinpasst, das halte ich für einen völlig falschen Weg. Oder zu mindestens einen schwierigen Weg. [...] Ansonsten ist es für uns so, dass wir versuchen, deswegen hatte ich das auch in der Einleitung so gesagt, die Sinnhaftigkeit einer Geschichte als erstes zu beurteilen. Bevor ich mir den Businessplan angucke, gucke ich mir an, was will die oder der machen, das ist die allererste Frage.“

largest part of funding resources for social entrepreneurs is provided by foundations and cooperative partners, not by the public domain.

3.3 Main drivers and barriers for promoters in building up an eco-system

After analysing the role perceptions of the different promoters and their estimations about the status quo of the existing framework conditions for social entrepreneurs in Germany, main drivers and barriers for promoters in building up a sustainable eco-system should be identified and described in more detail.

3.3.1 Neither drivers, nor barriers – the absence of a common legal framework

The absence of a common legal framework for social entrepreneurs is seen neither as a driver, nor as a barrier for the development of an eco-system. The legal forms under which social entrepreneurs operate are not considered by social entrepreneurs as well as by stakeholders as a relevant factor for acquiring financial funding. Therefore, the respective project (the idea) and the business-plan are more relevant aspects.

3.3.2 Many players, but no comprehensive network between the promoters

Both focus group interviews illustrate that the field of social entrepreneur's promoters is highly divers consisting of representatives from various fields: government (on federal, state and local level), financiers and NPOs (welfare agencies, promoting foundations and associations or incubators), but an interplay between actors within the same field is sometimes missing (barrier). This aspect was pointed out in the focus group interview with the representatives from renowned business foundations and other associations working on social entrepreneurship in Germany. Forms as well as the level of co-operation between organizations sometimes depends more on the employees themselves and their personal engagement to connect themselves, than on implemented structural frameworks.

Furthermore, cross-sectorial co-operations (between different spheres) could be more strengthened – especially including representatives from the economy. The current interest of the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy in this issue can be considered as a first step to integrate economic actors in the eco-system for social entrepreneurs.

To sum it up, the interplay of promoters within the same field and between different ones are seen as necessary by the stakeholders and as basement for the establishment of a sustainable eco-system. But to build up such a (comprehensive) network between non-public and public promoters essential resources are time, funding (for building up a structural framework) and confidence among the involved promoters. The representative from the incubator explained that capacity-building and strengthening networks among the promoters became only recently, within the last two or three years, a relevant topic. This is a quite challenging task because promoters in some way always strive for a unique position in the field of promoters.

At the same time the interviewee saw willingness from most of the involved stakeholders to co-operate and to connect each other (driver). For example, the representative from a Federal Ministry points out current co-operations between social entrepreneurs and welfare agencies which, in her experience, would have been quite inconceivable a few years ago.

3.3.3 Many programs and initiatives, few coordinated offers

According to the broad range of actors promoting social entrepreneurship in Germany, there are also many different forms of their promotion (financial funding, counselling the individuals and in managing the organizations, funding priorities, programs). Against this background it can be difficult for social entrepreneurs to find the 'proper' offer for their individual needs. Furthermore, for promoters this 'jungle of promoting actors and different offers can challenge them to optimize their offers geared to the social entrepreneurs' needs (barrier). That is why the developing eco-system needs more coordination and synchronization. Promoters should reflect their role perception, their goals as well as the impact of their implemented offers for social entrepreneurs.

4 Concluding remarks

The focus group analysis illustrates that social entrepreneurship in Germany including the development of a sustainable ecosystem for social entrepreneurs is in flux. Since the beginning of the 2000s, when social entrepreneurship entered the societal and political agenda in Germany, the range of stakeholders and especially promoters has increasingly grown up. There are various promoters with innovative ideas from different spheres (public and non-public actors). But interplay between these actors within the same field as well as a cross-sectional co-operation is predominantly missing. This can be explained by several reasons: the novelty of this issue, missing structures and capacity building between the different players.

Furthermore, there is a broad jungle of offers for social entrepreneurs, programs and initiatives and illustrates that the existing eco-system for social entrepreneurs needs more coordination.

Both focus groups identify the role-perceptions of the stakeholders and furthermore main barriers and drivers for promoters in building up an eco-system. A main result of the interviews is that there is a great willingness among the different promoters to implement new forms of cooperation and innovative instruments as well as to rethink existing structures and funding programs.

What can stakeholders learn from the results of the focus group analysis?

The empirical findings of both focus group interviews identified a need for action for the promoters of social entrepreneurs. Particularly, the foundations and the government should revise parts of their promoting strategies. The identified willingness among the stakeholders to rethink established structures may be helpful for this process. Preliminary recommendations for stakeholders in Germany are proposed by Zimmer, Bräuer, Walter (2015). By further research these recommendations should be more specified and tested.

5 References

Barbour, Rosalie (2008): Doing Focus groups interviews. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Bundesministerium für Familien, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (BMFSFJ) (10/6/2010): Nationale Engagementstrategie der Bundesregierung. Berlin. Available online at: <http://www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/freiwilliges-engagement,did=172514.html> [Accessed: 03/14/2015].

- Deutscher Bundestag (10/5/2012): Antwort des Bundestages auf die Kleine Anfrage der Abgeordneten Ulrich Schneider, Britta Haßelmann, Beate Walter-Rosenheimer, weiterer Abgeordneter und der Fraktion BÜNDNIS 90/ DIE GRÜNEN. Förderung von Sozialunternehmern. Drucksache 17/10926. Berlin. Available online at: <http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/17/109/1710926.pdf> [Accessed: 03/12/2015].
- Evers, Adalbert, Schulze-Böing, Matthias (2001): Germany. Social enterprises and transitional employment. In Carlo Borzaga, Jacques Defourny (Eds.): The emergence of social enterprise. London, New York: Routledge (Routledge studies in the management of voluntary and non-profit organizations, 4), pp. 120–135.
- Glänzel, Gunnar, Schmitz, Björn (2012): Hybride Organisationen – Spezial- oder Regelfall. In Helmut K. Anheier, Andreas Schröer, Volker Then (Eds.): Soziale Investitionen. Interdisziplinäre Perspektiven. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften / Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH, Wiesbaden (Springer-Link : Bücher), pp. 181–203.
- Pöllath, Reinhard (2011): Rechtsformfrage. In Ann-Kristin Achleitner, Reinhard Pöllath, Erwin Stahl (Eds.): Finanzierung von Sozialunternehmern. Konzepte zur finanziellen Unterstützung von Social Entrepreneurs. Stuttgart: Schäffer-Poeschel Verlag für Wirtschaft Steuern Recht, pp. 44–53.
- Scheuerle, Thomas, Glänzel, Gunnar (2012): Social Entrepreneurship in Deutschland. Available online at <https://www.kfw.de/PDF/Download-Center/Konzernthemen/Research/PDF-Dokumente-Studien-und-Materialien/Social-Entrepreneurship-in-Deutschland-LF.pdf> [Accessed: 03/14/2015].
- Zimmer, Annette, Bräuer, Stephanie, Walter, Andrea (2015): Handlungsempfehlungen für Stakeholder von Sozialunternehmern. In: BBE Europa-Nachrichten - Newsletter für Engagement und Partizipation Nr. 1 vom 29.1.2015. Schwerpunktthema “Europa regieren?!” Available online at: http://www.b-b-e.de/fileadmin/inhalte/aktuelles/2015/01/recommendations_for_stakeholders_of_social_entrepreneurs.pdf [Accessed: 20/03/2015]
- Zimmer, Annette, Bräuer, Stephanie (2014): National Country Report “The Development of Social Entrepreneurs in Germany.” Available online at: <http://www.fp7-efeseiis.eu/national-report-germany/> [Accessed: 12/03/2015]

6 Appendix 1: List of conducted focus group interviews

6.1 Focus group interview 1, conducted November 4th, 2014

The first conducted focus group interview included the following six participants:

- 1 representative from a German Federal Ministry
- 1 social entrepreneur
- 1 representative from an incubator
- 2 representatives from promoting organizations (associations)
- 1 representative from a social and ecological bank

6.2 Focus group interview 2, conducted November 5th, 2014

The second conducted focus group interview included the following six participants:

- 5 representatives from four German business foundations supporting social entrepreneurs in different ways or working on the topic social innovation without directly promoting social entrepreneurs (1 foundation)
- 1 representatives from the Association of German Foundations also working on the issue of social entrepreneurship