

1. Beyond Borders: Entrepreneurship, Co-operatives and Education in Sweden and Tanzania

MIKAEL LÖNNBORG, BENSON OTIENO NDIEGE & BESRAT TESFAYE

This book is an attempt to enhance the collaboration between Södertörn University in Stockholm, Sweden, and Moshi Co-operative University in Tanzania in the field of research. The collaboration has been ongoing for about a decade but has mainly concerned an exchange of teachers, and master and graduate students. However, one common research project has been launched, on women entrepreneurship, and others are being discussed. In 2016, the collaboration was extended through a joint workshop held in Moshi, Tanzania. The theme of the workshop was wide but had innovation and entrepreneurship among cooperatives, the public sector, and the private sector as a common dominator. A lot of papers were presented at the workshop and this book is a selection of those papers. Without any doubt, the approaches of research and the research questions are different in Sweden and Tanzania, due to the different contexts. The traditions on how to address and present research findings are at a first glance also different. However, it is surprising that there are more factors that are common than different if we look at research methods and larger research questions. In both countries, we aim at understanding how the economy is working, how enterprises with different ownership are formed and other kinds of state and private organizations contribute to economic growth or decline. However, one major difference is that research from Tanzania is often concluded with policy recommendations and that is rare in the Swedish context. Nevertheless, comparing research between different institutional, economic and social contexts, in other words, beyond borders, will hopefully enrich the research in both countries.

The reason for combining the topics of entrepreneurship and cooperatives reflects the research areas of interest at the two collaborating research institutes. Enter Forum is a research centre at Södertörn University, School of Social Sciences, Department of Business Studies, that specializes in entrepreneurship and innovation, but also conducts research on business in general and small business in particular. In addition, the research centre has also published about different ownership forms and cooperatives. Enter Forum is the Swedish partner in this collaboration. The partner from Tanzania is Moshi Co-operative University and as understood from the name, the majority of its research revolves around the issue of cooperatives. Further, the issue of entrepreneur-

ship is also an important topic, because even though cooperatives are normally built on previous experiences, a lot of new ventures have connections to entrepreneurship research. In other words, the issues of entrepreneurship and cooperatives are common denominators in this research collaboration, and the reason for combining these topics in this volume.

This book discusses many different topics but the common denominator, as noted, is entrepreneurship in the context of different forms of ownership, in particular cooperatives. Entrepreneurial activities can be undertaken by an individual or as a collective action by a group of individuals. Collective entrepreneurship is often instantiated by a cooperative, that is, an enterprise owned jointly by an autonomous association of individuals. Individuals initiate cooperatives in order to meet their common needs by joining forces. Thus, a cooperative can be regarded as a vehicle for collective entrepreneurship (Dana & Dana, 2008:89). As an economic function (Schumpeter, 1934), entrepreneurship is an abstract concept that can manifest itself in various contexts and organizational forms. But the entrepreneurial processes and the institutional paths followed by two approaches can give rise to quite disparate patterns. Therefore, it is important to bring together the practice of entrepreneurship in the context of individual and collective action.

By any standards, entrepreneurship from a broad perspective is a widely researched area with diverse studies influenced by different academic traditions situated on the border between the social sciences and the humanities. The selection of contributions in this volume shows that the borders of the subject entrepreneurship are expansive and have connections to many different academic disciplines. The subject of entrepreneurship research demonstrates a remarkable scope and an impressive vitality, both in Sweden and Tanzania, and indeed internationally.

Some of the most important questions in the social sciences are concerned with how to build an economic system, which generates sustained economic growth, why some geographic areas have experienced prosperity and why certain regions has not, and why this has changed over time. According to traditional economic theories – the so-called neoclassical school – economic growth is partly instrumental and according to the Cobb-Douglas function, growth is created by combining such production factors as land, capital, labour and technology. Arguably, this macro-oriented model has broadly described the drivers of economic development but does not give any insights into how this is performed, generated and sustained in practice.

Although the intention here is not to cover all international research on entrepreneurship – which would require an entire volume by itself – it is im-

possible not to mention an individual researcher who made significant foundational contributions and created scientific credibility for the field, namely Joseph A. Schumpeter (1883–1950). Schumpeter introduced the concept of ‘creative destruction’ whereby he analysed how the economy evolves and changes over time. At the centre of Schumpeter’s theory is the entrepreneur, who creates something new by recombining existing resources, which can, for instance, be a new product, a new organization, a new distribution system or a new way of marketing. Schumpeter denoted these new combinations innovation. If the innovation is successful, other actors will most likely imitate it and thereby change the technological frontier and, in turn, push productivity forward in the entire economy. Furthermore, successful innovations will create so-called development blocks (or clusters) around the new product, such as, for instance, the steam engine or the microprocessor, and be an important driving force for economic growth. As a result, this view posits that redundant and uncompetitive technology and associated industries will vanish. This is the essence of how Schumpeter explains economic development with the entrepreneur in the middle of the process.

The definition of ‘entrepreneur’ has been widely criticised for being too vague a term without any clear substantive or scientific meaning. In addition, the entrepreneur has often been regarded as the ‘hero’ in discovering innovation, implementing ‘new things’ on a market and being the main explanation for successful corporations. While the ‘dark side of entrepreneurship’, for instance the new formation of crime syndicates, new advanced and hidden agreements among corporations and new methods for circumventing environment policies, still being some kind of entrepreneurship, are of course less used as examples of the concept (Casson, 2003; Casson et al., 2009; Baumol, 1998). In short, the concept of an ‘entrepreneur’ is often misused, and we need a closer and more accurate definition of the scientific meaning of the concept. However, in explaining the rise of new businesses or the introduction of new technology, it is highly unlikely that any scholar would sidestep the concept of the entrepreneur. This shows the major impact of Schumpeter on research within the fields of economics, business administration and business history. Further, Schumpeter has also contributed to a wider and general debate about the connection between entrepreneurs and economic growth, the reason for business cycles (due to creative destruction) and even more grandly about the makings and development of capitalism (Schumpeter, 1934, 1942; Swedberg, 1993). Again, we have to be careful when using the concept, avoid speaking of ex post ‘heroes’ and giving the concept an empirically accurate description,

which will hopefully make the definition of an entrepreneur clearer in the future.

Another important theorist that has contributed to our understanding of the makings of the modern capitalism was Alfred D. Chandler Jr (1918–2007). Chandler's work revolved around enterprises and the formation of entire business systems in different countries. His work challenged the dominating notion of Adam Smith and others, that the emergence of capitalism was due to the 'invisible hand', also called the price mechanism or simply the market, where everyone acts to optimize their self-interests and in doing so contributes to the making of the market-based economic system. In response to Smith, and with inspiration from the transaction cost analysis proposed by Coase (1937), and in particular Berle & Means (1932) who claimed that American firms had divided the functions of ownership and management within the modern corporation, Chandler developed the concept of managerial capitalism. Chandler labelled this the 'visible hand' that emerged during the so-called second industrial revolution. According to Chandler, the emergence of big corporations was a far more efficient measure of organizing scarce resources than through single transactions on a market. In short, Chandler claimed that the emergence of large industrial firms promoted economic growth, by mobilizing capital and labour, supporting research and development, and education in managerial skills, and finally because they provide a focal point for smaller companies as sub-contractors. This thinking is also consistent with Schumpeter's concept of development blocks (Chandler, 1977, 1990; Langlois, 2007).

A great deal of criticism has been directed at Chandler's work, in particular his stage development theory and the success of other kinds of business organizations (John, 1997; Lamoreaux et al., 2003). The work of Schumpeter and Chandler, and many others, including March and Simon (1958), Penrose (1959), DiMaggio and Powell (1983), Michael Porter (1985), and Israel Kirzner (1973) have served as important theoretical platforms. However, because of the eclectic range of topics within the field, theories used in entrepreneurship have been derived from several different disciplines. The main theories draw on a wide range of influences from economics, economic history, business administration and history as well as also from sociology, psychology and cognitive sciences. That being said, economic theory is, of course, the main contributor; however, institutional economic theory has also been drawn upon extensively. Indeed, institutional economic theory has become a serious contender challenging neo-classical economic theory, primarily by explaining the role of institutions in limiting as well as promoting economic transactions and the relationship of these dynamics to economic change. Institutional theory itself

has a broad conceptual basis and, accordingly, it is rooted in several different academic disciplines (Veblen, 1975: 1904; Scott, 2001; Rutherford, 1994; Hodgson, 1988; Gruchy, 1987, 1972).

Within institutional economic theory, the role of institutions in the creation, maintenance and change of the economy is in focus. A simple definition of 'institutions' is that they consist of formal and informal rules and norms, which construct and facilitate as well as constrain human interaction (North, 1990). The focus on institutions has, in turn, generated an interest in the state and how private business and politics have interacted in creating the market. The institutional economic approach actually brings together neo-classical theory with an emphasis on how transactions are conducted in explaining the functioning of an economy. It is posited that in an economy based on market exchanges, it is necessary to develop formal and informal rules that make interactions between individuals and/or organizations possible. These rules of the game make it possible for market exchanges, where a third party, often the state, ensures that these rules are valid and reliable. The neo-institutional approach also attempts to understand why organizations have developed and how this has underpinned economic growth or failures. The reason for individuals to create a firm, since Coase (1937), is generally attributed to the existence of transaction costs and the ability of the firm to economize on them. However, transaction costs, as such, are not easily definable, but may include those costs not directly related to the cost of production (for instance labour, capital and R&D). They include less conspicuous business function costs such as coordination, transportation, information and contract enforcement (Matthews, 1986: 906).

The view of how exchanges take place has been categorized into three different transactional contexts. First, the exchange can be made on a market where two parties meet and perform a single transaction, and this is the classical market exchange. Second, market exchanges can be organized and coordinated within a company, or as Chandler would call it, within a hierarchy as a means of increasing productivity. Third, it is possible to create something in between these cases by forming networks through repeated transactions and building trustworthy relations while maintaining flexibility not characteristic of different organizational forms, such as bureaucracies. As an example, Chandler highlighted the existence of something that has been highly discredited but, which is a normal feature of capitalistic exchange, namely planning. Chandler observed that the growth of large business enterprises in the nineteenth and twentieth century suggested that their planning capability was central to their growth, the inference being that sometimes the 'visible hand' of

corporate headquarters is more efficient than the ‘invisible hand’ of the market. In addition, the network approach, as used in some chapters in this anthology, has been an important theoretical tool for understanding how smaller firms such as family companies (with different ownership structures) have been able to survive in spite of fierce competition from hierarchically structured multinational joint stock corporations.

It is obvious that any business depends heavily on the management’s capacity to undertake planning tasks around such key areas as the in- and outflow of raw materials, production technology, labour, research and development, logistics, marketing and sales channels. And as institutional economic theory tells us, any transaction on a market is associated with a cost (Williamson, 1985; Eggertsson, 1990, 2005). Ronald Coase even claims that positive transaction costs are why firms exist because the internal coordination of multi-diverse transactions is more efficient than doing so through the market transaction for each resource. The price mechanism – the invisible hand – is thus associated with the costs of searching, negotiating and monitoring and therefore, the planning of a firm is in many cases superior to market exchanges.

Theories derived from neoclassical microeconomics regard the firm as simply driven by a maximizing profit strategy. From this view, the firm is regarded as a ‘black box’ where different inputs are transformed into products and output is delivered to the market and the success of the firm is determined by the price and ultimately determined by the company’s competitive power. However, business studies have shown us that the reality is much more complex. In short, this book will show evidence that enterprises – cooperatives, private and public – (and indeed markets) are embedded in routines, norms and rules in a complex way, and are entities that arise, prosper or vanish in interaction with their economic, social and political surroundings.

Furthermore, studies have, by highlighting market exchanges, shown that we need to go beyond simple demand and supply analysis to understand the creation of companies, cooperatives, the rise of multinational corporations and the existence of family capitalism; or even more significantly to grasp the making and reproduction of capitalism (or the destruction of other kinds of economic systems). So much more is involved in making the price mechanism or the market function in practice. Other theoretical approaches that have been important within entrepreneurship and also for cooperatives revolve around how to organize a company through the respective conceptual lenses of principal-agent, moral hazard and property-rights. In addition, markets have been created through interest groups and lobbyists, professionals as well as trade organizations, religious groups, and social reformists.

To sum up, after this introduction, we will now turn in more detail to the two large areas of research around, which this book revolves, namely entrepreneurship and co-operatives. We can only present a fraction of the different theoretical issues and earlier research that cover the entire spectrum within these fields.

Entrepreneurship in theory and the development of research in Sweden and Tanzania

In this section we discuss the formation of entrepreneurship theory but also how the research field emerged and developed in Sweden and Tanzania, respectively. Entrepreneurship is usually associated with something positive regardless of the context in, which the term is discussed. The function entrepreneurship has been discussed for several centuries and we can distinguish several groups of theories. In the Middle Ages, for example, organizers of military expeditions or builders of cathedrals were defined as entrepreneurs. The formal introduction of the idea of the importance of entrepreneurship for the economy is attributed to the French economist Richard Cantillon in the early 1700s. He put the entrepreneur in the centre and as a driver of economic progress. Cantillon saw the contractor, that is the entrepreneur, as someone who is predisposed and willing to carry risk, and act to make a profit. These self-directed actions had important implications. The entrepreneur detects price differences in different markets and creates arbitrage gains by responding to them. By responding to price signals, the entrepreneur restores the balance between supply and demand in specific markets. For example, a merchant buys goods in one place to transport to another without knowing in advance whether the demand will be high or low. Therefore, according to Cantillon, to develop efficient markets, risk-taking entrepreneurs are needed who are crucial in fully exploiting the economic potential and thereby contribute to economic growth.

For Cantillon, it was the entrepreneur's function and not the individual that was of importance. This feature was in focus for his perception of the market system and the system would not work or rather not reach its optimal potential without the entrepreneurial function. Cantillon's explanation of the entrepreneur's function was promulgated. He did not see the entrepreneur as a creator of demand through new production or new sales engineers. The entrepreneur was instead regarded as the force that provided the right goods in the right place in order to satisfy the consumers' wishes. Therefore, Cantillon's entrepreneurship must be foreseeable but not necessarily innovative. Cantillon changed

the view of the entrepreneurial role from colonial adventurers to risk carriers and the force of equilibrium on the market (Hérbert & Link, 1982).

The person who made entrepreneurship a central economic function was the already noted Austrian economist Joseph Alois Schumpeter who focused on how existing structures break down and how new ones come into being. Schumpeter's economic theory, however, meant that the entrepreneurial concept partially disappeared from the main subject of economic research. The idea of entrepreneurship disappeared from economic theory in the 1930s when the theories became more mathematical and did not recur until in the 1970s (Baumol, 1993). The entrepreneurial function could, despite several attempts, not be formalized in mathematical deterministic models, and the entrepreneur as a concept thus disappeared from the microeconomic models (Johansson, 2005). Since the academic field of economics could not play any leading role, behavioural scientists became an increasingly important part of the development of entrepreneurship theory. The pioneer was David McClelland who formulated the assumption that it is societal values and norms that are crucial to a country's entrepreneurial vitality. The focus revolved around cultural aspects within specific countries and what kinds of environments that fostered entrepreneurial attributes in individuals (Landström, 2005).

Naturally, the view on what role entrepreneurs actually play in the economy and how the entrepreneurial function should be understood has changed over time. The principal role of the entrepreneur has, according to some theories, been that of the innovator (Schumpeter, 1987: 1911), while other theories have seen the entrepreneur as an arbitrator who discovers and exploits untapped profitability (Kirzner, 1973). A third school of academics has focused on the entrepreneur's role as a decision-maker under real uncertainty (Knight, 1921). A fourth school sees the entrepreneur as a coordinator of different production factors (Say, 1816). There are also other definitions of entrepreneurship, but these have been variations of the mentioned fourth school, and many studies have also combined different definitions of entrepreneurship (Casson, 1982; Baumol, 1993; Shane, 2003). Thus, it is difficult to find a common solid definition of an 'entrepreneur' and the 'entrepreneurial function' in the literature. Nevertheless, virtually all entrepreneurial theories have been based on risk, innovation or a combination of these concepts (Gratzer, 2013). Mainstream behavioural theories (Ajzén, 1991, 2002; Shapero & Sokol, 1982) have evolved around entrepreneurial traits and the social and psychological dimensions of the entrepreneur as a decision maker.

In short, operationally entrepreneurial research can be divided into three different schools: 'The business school approach', 'the Schumpeter school' and

‘the trait approach’. The first is based on a tradition from, among others, studies from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM). This school has received a great deal of attention and is probably the most dominant view in business economics research. The approach is characterized by trying to ‘measure’ entrepreneurship, primarily by looking at the number of newly established companies, the number of self-employed and the pace of growth in newly established companies. In addition, the general attitude towards entrepreneurship and the regulatory regime (whether endorsing or hampering entrepreneurship) within specific countries is measured. The advantage of the business school approach is that the measurement is relatively simple and data accessible, which facilitates comparative studies and has resulted in a large number of surveys in a large number of countries, and over time. However, there are also problems. One is that the connection to entrepreneurship theories is relatively weak. Entrepreneurship is measured at the organizational level, which can also create concerns. The operational measures mean that qualitative aspects such as transformation, development, innovation, and renewal in both new and established companies are not captured satisfactorily. In sum, the school has produced a lot of studies, but the mentioned limitations are not usually discussed in detail.

The Schumpeter school is, of course, based on the writings of Joseph Schumpeter. The main advantage of this school is its emphasis on innovation and its strong link to a coherent theory. In addition, the relationship between quantitative economic growth and qualitative transformation is possible to incorporate. On the other hand, the theory is difficult to operationalize because there is usually no available data for comparative studies and, in general, the theory is difficult to operationalize on empirical studies. According to Schumpeter, the economy was usually a circular flow without growth, but he tried to explain how growth was only possible through innovations. The concept of innovation includes, as most of us have learned and as was noted earlier, the following; the introduction of new goods, technological changes in existing production, the opening of new markets or the discovery of raw materials and new types of business organizations. In broad terms, everything that can be termed as ‘doing things differently’, that creates and changes the world and promotes development forward is an innovation.

Another issue regarding the work of Schumpeter is the definition of the entrepreneur. In his early work, only the individual that brings the innovation to the market could be defined as a true entrepreneur. However, here Schumpeter changed his argument over time. In the early phase of his research, the so-called Schumpeter mark I, he advocated that the entrepreneur was an indi-

vidual. Later on, during the so-called Schumpeter mark II, he recognized that a great deal of the research and development happens within larger corporations that had the financial capability and therefore, innovation could be carried out by organizations as well. In short, one solution to this problem is to speak about an entrepreneurial function, regardless of whether it is an individual, a team or a corporation that makes the innovation possible. Further, the division between entrepreneurs and those imitating entrepreneurs is crucial for Schumpeter's theory of economic development. The most important incentive for innovation is profit. The inclusion of successful innovations gives rise to a chain reaction, because other entrepreneurs wish to benefit from the innovator's monopoly gain. Consequently, imitators appear in so-called clusters. The entrepreneur removes obstacles not only to his own work but also to that of others. It is easier to copy than being the first, as this implies a reduced risk while the development process has become calculable. In perspective, those who follow continue to increase, but they are less qualified, and novelty has been turned into a common good or service on the market (Schumpeter, 1987: 1911: 334–341).

The last school is known as the 'trait approach' and derives from behavioural science and has concentrated on entrepreneurial characteristics. The pioneer was the noted American psychologist David McClelland and already in 1961, he asked the question why some societies developed faster than others. The answer according to him was the norms and values that dominate a society – primarily in terms of incentives that foster the need for achievement in individuals. McClelland stressed, however, that the scope of achievement motivation was not enough to explain something as complex as economic development. Therefore, other incentives were also introduced, such as individuals' need for affiliation and need for power, which is the individual's need for control (Landström, 2000: 60ff). The implication of McClelland's theory was that the entrepreneurial role was personalized, and the entrepreneur's personal qualities became critical. The starting point for the trait approach was often the question; why do some individuals tend to start firms while others do not? The answer was that these individuals had a number of characteristics that others lacked, such as the need for achievement. This tradition is based on psychological patterns of individuals' personality and other characteristics that are directly linked to performance in entrepreneurship.

However, according to the critics, there are fundamental difficulties associated with defining the entrepreneur by pointing to the existence of different characteristics. Several research reviews of the trait approach literature highlight the shortcomings in the selection of contractors (e.g., only commercially

successful entrepreneurs) used in these studies. There is also some criticism that the entrepreneur would be a special kind of person with special characteristics that can be documented and recreated (Brockhaus & Horwitz, 1986: 42–43). For example, William B. Gartner pointed out that a consequence of such an approach is the perspective of ‘once an entrepreneur, always an entrepreneur’. The perception that entrepreneurship is a permanent attribute of some people, according to him, has remained unproven. This is evident from the fact that many studies have chosen individuals several years after they started their businesses and defined them as entrepreneurs. In empirical studies, where individual psychological features that were claimed to be characteristics of entrepreneurs were tested, it proved impossible to distinguish entrepreneurs from regular managers but also from the population as a whole (Gartner, 1989: 48). It seems that this research school has reached a dead-end (see, for example, Beckman, 1990: 95–96).

If we turn to the actual development of research in entrepreneurship, it gained an academic position already in the late 1940s, primarily represented by the interdisciplinary Center for Research in Entrepreneurial History at Harvard Business School. The centre was led by Arthur Cole but also included scholars such as Joseph Schumpeter and Alfred Chandler, and also established its own journal, *Explorations in Entrepreneurial History*. However, the study of entrepreneurship did, in particular, experience methodological problems, and instead the attention was shifted to the corporation more in general, the study of entrepreneurship became marginalized, and the centre was wound down in 1958 (Jones & Wadhvani, 2006; Fredona & Reinert, 2017). Not until 1981 did entrepreneurial research regain its status in academia, in the United States, initially at Babson College. After World War II, entrepreneurial research mainly remained limited to the United States, Great Britain and Canada, without any kind of academic foundation.

In general, business research has mainly dealt with larger companies, and considering that the world economy in the last century has been characterized by corporations that have dominated the economy through economies of scale and scope, this is not surprising (Chandler, 1990). Even the most famous advocate of modern entrepreneurship, Joseph Schumpeter, argued in a convincing way for the superiority of large firms. Schumpeter stressed that big companies had taken over the role of smaller enterprise as a catalyst for creating innovations, and thereby the creative destruction that may push the economy forward. According to Schumpeter (mark II), large scale was not only inevitable but the only way to reach the highest possible growth. Until the 1970s, small businesses were considered to play a subordinate role for the develop-

ment, and smaller companies and entrepreneurs were almost regarded as a historical and out-dated phenomenon. However, this approach began to be questioned in the 1970s. In conjunction with the industrial crisis (in the wake of the quadruple increase of oil prices by OPEC in 1973), it became apparent that the costs for operating bureaucratic organizations could be large. Economies of scale could develop into disadvantages when there was a change in market demand and it was difficult to quickly adapt the activities of a giant business group (Arndt, 1978). In a relatively short period of time, the situation deteriorated for many of the big corporations. In Sweden, for instance the iron ore mining industry, the steel industry, the textile industry and the shipyards were affected by structural problems and outcompeted, in particular by corporations from the so-called tiger economies in Asia. It was no longer possible to continue production according to the same guidelines as those that emerged after World War II. Extensive capacity cuts, restructuring processes and closures were required, which completely changed the view of the superiority of large companies (Dahmén, 1988: 35).

Looking more closely at actual research in entrepreneurship, we begin in Sweden and then turn to the development in Tanzania. Swedish entrepreneurial research began to grow in the 1960s and 1970s. In Sweden, it was particularly one scholar that used Schumpeter's theory and advocated his view on economic progress and development, namely Erik Dahmén. Already in his dissertation from 1950 he promoted the view of Schumpeter, but mainstream research neither acknowledged nor paid much attention to small businesses or entrepreneurship before the 1970s. However, in 1968, Dick Ramström became professor at Umeå University – the university opened in 1965 – and started to focus on small firms and entrepreneurship. It was argued that small businesses were not only smaller but also different and important for adapting the business structure to rapid changes. Dick Ramström was the one who drew special attention to the lack of research on small businesses and managed to build a viable research environment. A large number of graduate students from Umeå did later on become professors all around Sweden and promoted entrepreneurship research, for instance Bengt Johannisson (the first professor in entrepreneurship in Sweden), Elisabeth Sundin (professor in Linköping), Leif Lindmark and Carin Holmquist (professors at the Stockholm School of Economics) and Per Davidsson (professor in Lund). In sum, a large number of graduate students from Umeå further developed dynamic research environments for small businesses and entrepreneurs (Gratzer, 2013).

From the 1970s, entrepreneurship emerged as a separate field of research, with a particular interest in empirically oriented mapping and description of

small businesses. In the 1980s, this research gained a firm position within business studies at several universities. The organization-based small business research was linked to individual-oriented entrepreneurship research and the number of publications increased significantly (see further Landström & Johannisson, 1998). In the 1980s, the research shifted focus from studies of traditional family businesses to newer types of small businesses such as technology-based and fast-growing companies (so-called gazelle companies). In 1989, the first professor – Bengt Johannisson – in the field was appointed at Lund University, with the following title: ‘Entrepreneurship and Business Development’.

Factors that contributed to the boost of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship research in the 1980s were low economic growth, structural changes in the industrial sector, and consequently rising unemployment together with an increasing importance of the service sector, in particular the fact that large companies started out-sourcing their operations, thus enhancing the population of small firms. The development of new ICT technology favoured small firms and a general change of ‘attitude’ in society made it more popular to start self-employment businesses. Small corporations and their owners were promoted as ‘heroes’ in connection to the neo-liberal ideology that emerged during this decade. Entrepreneurs became a symbol of freedom from the social-democratic government and a heavily regulated society. In the 1990s, entrepreneurial research gained legitimacy as a proper academic field of study and spread to other disciplines, such as for instance history, economic history, sociology and psychology. There was also a tendency to distinguish research on entrepreneurship from research on small firms. At the same time, the production of dissertations from universities increased rapidly in the 1990s. New emerging research issues included rapid-growth companies (gazelles) and what kind of impact entrepreneurship had on macroeconomic growth. An important general issue that began to be discussed was how entrepreneurship should be channelled into productive courses (creating innovations), and how unproductive ‘rent seeking’ or even destructive and criminal aspects of entrepreneurship should be harnessed.

A survey in 1997 of research in Sweden about entrepreneurship and small businesses found that a total of 190 researchers had conducted such kinds of research at universities and institutes of higher education. The number of researchers was greatest in Stockholm, Gothenburg and Umeå (33, 20 and 19 per cent respectively). Nearly half of these (43 per cent) had already finished their dissertation. The largest part of the research (two thirds) was conducted in the field of business administration and at the country’s technical institutes

of higher education. The rest belonged to the disciplines of history, economic history and economics. Several new chairs had been installed at universities and institutes of higher education and several national and international networks were founded or consolidated (see below). This led to an institutional setting of entrepreneurship research within academia and the number of dissertations in the field rose immensely. An analysis of Swedish doctoral theses in the field between 1970–1995 showed that Swedish entrepreneurship and small business research were deeply rooted in the subject of business administration and especially in organizational and decision-making theories. An increasing number of institutes of higher education offered single courses or full-time educational programmes in entrepreneurship (Aronsson & Hansson, 1997).

During the 1990s, small businesses and entrepreneurship became a hot issue. One important reason for this was that small businesses were considered to be the most important factor in reducing unemployment after the financial crisis in 1991–1993 (when the unemployment rate increased immensely from 2 to 10 per cent). Another argument was that new small businesses were perceived to provide a more differentiated and dynamic business structure. Using a more differentiated business structure, it was possible to avoid dependency on individual large companies, whose downfall could pound an entire region and, in the long run, even threaten the long-term growth in the Swedish economy (SOU 1998:77). An important event for consolidating entrepreneurship research was that the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) began its investigations. As noted, GEM is an annual international comparative study on entrepreneurship, ambitions and attitudes, among other things, the relationship between entrepreneurship and growth at the macro level. GEM is the largest on-going study of entrepreneurial dynamics and activity in the world. The study began in 1999 and today includes studies of a large number of countries all over the world (see www.gemconsortium.org).

In addition, various organizations were established to promote the cooperation between academic institutions and the industrial sector. One important milestone was the creation of the Forum for Small Business Research (FSF) in 1994. FSE was a national network organization for linking theories and practices on entrepreneurship and small businesses. FSF annually organizes the ‘Small Business Days’ and the ‘Entrepreneurship Week’. In addition, financial and organizational support was given to national research programmes as well as for publishing current research in books and reports. In 2009, the name was changed to Entrepreneurship Forum. A clear indication that entrepreneurship had a stable position in Sweden was the establishment of ‘The Global Award

for Entrepreneurship' in 1996. The prize was created by FSF and the purpose of the prize is to reward researchers that have made significant contributions to the development of the field of entrepreneurship and small firms.

To sum up, the development of entrepreneurship research in Sweden has not been straightforward, and it has experienced its ups and downs, much related to the changing discourse on how to foster viable corporations. Until the 1970s, the dominant view was that growth and job creation were primarily solved by large and mostly internationally oriented corporations, but in the wake of the industrial crisis in the 1970s and the financial crisis in the 1990s, this view changed considerably. Keynesian economic models were seriously questioned during the period of stagflation (high inflation and unemployment at the same time) and instead supply-side models by monetarists such as Milton Friedman were promoted and also Schumpeter's view of the entrepreneur as the driver of economic change and growth gained a renewed interest. In addition, many of the previous theoretical economic models had more or less excluded Schumpeter's views on economic transformation, and the shortcomings of the mainstream models now became obvious. Consequently, researchers re-discovered Schumpeter's theories and this kind of research became an integral part of the research among scholars around the country. The subject of entrepreneurship is now institutionalized within the education system and has become more homogenous. However, it is still a viable and relatively new area of research and most likely it will develop further in the future. One important shift has been the division between entrepreneurship and innovation and the latter has gained much more attention in the last few decades (see for instance Fayolle et al., 2018; Landström et al., 2016; Gratzler, 2013).

As in all parts of the world, the field of entrepreneurship in Tanzania has been in focus since the 1980s. However, only a small number of studies, as for instance Jotta (2013), sketch a broad background view of entrepreneurship in Tanzania. According to Jotta (2013), entrepreneurship was constrained during the colonial period because the indigenous productive activities were stifled by colonial regulations and competition from imports. Furthermore, a few years after the independence in 1961, the Tanzanian government, under president Julius Nyerere, did in 1967 decide to follow a socialist system in, which the government monopolizes the production and distribution of goods and services. Thus, entrepreneurship was not considered desirable in general, until the mid-1980s.

The change in status of entrepreneurship was thus first demonstrated in the early 1980s. Since then, more research has been conducted and has improved

the knowledge of entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurship has become mandatory in the university curricula in Tanzania (Kalimasi & Herman, 2016). From the mid-1970s to the early 1980s, the economy was showing low growth rates, which more or less forced the government to liberalize the economy (Skarstein, 2005; Noorbakhsh & Paloni, 1999). In the mid-1980s, Tanzania started implementing transformation programmes with the support of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The Economic Restructuring Programme involved the liberalization of all sectors of the economy and the privatization of state-owned properties. This enhanced the role of the private sector in becoming the engine of economic growth and the role of the government was expected to only be to facilitate growth and set the rules of the game, rather than acting through direct ownership and management of state-owned enterprises. Among other things, the impact of the economic liberalization in Tanzania was that the proportion of self-employed individuals rose and thus, entrepreneurship was promoted as a proper path to create professional business careers among citizens.

Moreover, entrepreneurship development has in recent years been associated with the rapid urbanization in Tanzania (Collier & Jones, 2016). The urbanization resulted in the up-scaling of cities and rural-urban migration seemed to be an important factor in entrepreneurship development. Although there is limited specific research on 'urbanization and entrepreneurship', extant literature including Cockx et al. (2017), Lazaro et al. (2017), Jönsson & Bryceson (2017) and Christiansen et al. (2017) showed how urbanization changed both the spatial and social transformation in dynamic rural areas. Urbanization modernized life in general and around the cities, and changed land use and, in particular, it reduced the size of employment in agriculture and other traditional activities, which in turn diminished the subsistence activities. Moreover, urbanization increased the demand for goods and services in and around the cities and became an important driving force for the promotion of business and entrepreneurship.

Furthermore, the government recognized the important role of entrepreneurship for economic development. Thus, several institutional frameworks have been implemented with the objectives to support entrepreneurship development. These include the Tanzania Development Vision 2025 that is intended to guide economic and social development efforts and the National Five-Year Development Plan 2016/17–2020/21: Nurturing Industrialization for Economic Transformation and Human Development. These work together with The Sustainable Industrial Development Policy (SIDP) (1996–2020), which places a specific emphasis on the promotion of SMEs (Small and

Medium-sized Enterprises) through the following measures: Tanzanian SME Development Policy 2003, and The Small Industries Development Organization (SIDO), to mention a few (see The Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Growth Landscape, 2017). The development of these frameworks needs constant attention as concerns their influences on entrepreneurship development among different groups. This is a crucial area as recent research on the determinants of entrepreneurship growth in Tanzania including Mori (2014) and Tundui (2012) indicates that institutional barriers are crucial in understanding the development (or hampering) of business, in particular among specific groups such as, for instance, women (which will be explicitly addressed in this volume).

Current research shows that the participation in entrepreneurial activities has increased over time, for men as well as women (Mori, 2014; Stevenson & St-Onge, 2005). For instance, the proportion of women-owned enterprises has increased from 35 per cent in the 1990s to 54 per cent in 2012. This progress is presumed to be a result of the creation of favourable socio-economic, legal and political environments for women entrepreneurs. It has been suggested that the more entrepreneurship-friendly environment was created jointly by the government, development partners, civil societies, and philanthropists, both at the local and international level (Stevenson & St-Onge, 2005). Despite the efforts to promote entrepreneurship, challenges stemming from cultural, institutional and economic barriers continue to be an obstacle to the establishment of a larger number of enterprises (Mori, 2014; Tundui, 2012). This means that despite the growing number of entrepreneurs in Tanzania – and also the greater interest among researchers in investigating entrepreneurship – more reforms have to be made by the government to promote entrepreneurship but also that we need more research to understand the relationship between institutional framework and successful (and failed) entrepreneurship.

Most of the enterprises in Tanzania are still small and operate within the informal sector, and thereby have limited growth opportunities (Henry, 2015; Watson & Robinson, 2003). Many small businesses are hardly expected to be growing because they are disadvantaged in terms of resources and costs. Other reasons that have hindered their growth include gender barriers, poor managerial and technical skills, the inability to access credit from formal financial institutions and the inability to re-invest part of the profit. Understanding growth opportunities and implementing a policy for enhancing the growth of the small enterprises is a positive step toward development in Tanzania, especially in its move toward a middle (industrial) economy. In the same context, the

chapters in this book contribute to the understanding of entrepreneurship in Tanzania.

Co-operatives in Sweden and Tanzania

As noted, one of the most important questions in the social sciences concerns how to build an economic system, which generates sustained economic growth, why some geographic areas have experienced prosperity while certain regions have not, and why this has changed over time? One of the most important explanations for the industrialization that took off in the United Kingdom in the eighteenth century and then spread worldwide in the nineteenth century, was the introduction of the joint-stock corporation (Micklethwait & Woolridge, 2005; Freeman et al., 2011). This creates an organizational form that enabled an easier mobilization of capital, a limitation of risk for individual investors, and offered a possibility to withdraw from the investment by selling the shares on a secondary market. Without any doubt, the corporation act – introduced in Sweden in 1848 – has been crucial in promoting economic growth and has, in the long run, facilitated the emergence of welfare economies in a large number of countries. However, other organizational forms have been important in promoting business activities and securing survival for individuals, in particular during specific periods in history but some of these organizational forms still prevail today, which demonstrates that they are indeed viable and competitive. One of these ownership forms is cooperative, meaning that individuals come together and collaborate in different fields of the economy. As noted in the discussion about entrepreneurship and small firms, co-operatives and the so-called friendly societies (without any profit interest) were regarded as obsolete and out-dated phenomena among researchers and policymakers in the late twentieth century and predicted the total disappearance of these organizations. However, history has indeed proved them wrong.

What then is a co-operative? According to the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA, 2017) it is: ‘an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically-controlled enterprise’. In addition, ICA states that co-operatives are based on the values of self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity and solidarity. There are seven internationally recognized co-operative principles: voluntary and open membership; democratic member control; member economic participation; autonomy and independence; provision of education, training and information; co-

operation among co-operatives; and concern for the community (see also Barton, 1989; Hilson et al., 2017; Patmore & Balnave, 2018). However, different forms of co-operatives have existed for a long time with a wide variety of forms of collaboration. The cooperative ideas – in a more modern sense – have developed since the late 1700s, gaining momentum in the early 1800s, primarily in Great Britain (consumer cooperatives), Switzerland (consumer and producer cooperatives), Denmark (producer cooperatives), Germany (bank cooperatives) and Sweden and Norway (mutual insurance companies and consumer and producer cooperatives). The modern type of cooperatives was initially formed in the United Kingdom in the nineteenth century, mainly as shops selling food, and later on insurance services to the working class. The idea that the consumer or a policyholder of an insurance contract was also the owner of the company was in response to greedy capitalists seeking the highest possible profit and exploiting the wage-earner class of society without any social responsibility. From a theoretical point of view, these organizations were regarded as inefficient and were expected to disappear from the market as the economy progressed and developed. However, in Western Europe, North America and Oceania, we see that these kinds of organizations still prevail. Furthermore, in emerging economies, these kinds of organizations have become important entities to support economic development (Furlough & Strikwerda, 1999; Pearson & Yoneyama, 2015).

According to a Swedish dissertation in history (Rydén, 1998: 37–40), farmers' cooperatives were spread in Europe from the latter part of the nineteenth century. In his study about the Swedish farmers' organizational process, major reasons to join the cooperatives were the opportunities for farmers to take part in new market opportunities and technical innovations in the early twentieth century.

In summary, cooperative societies are economic enterprises based on voluntarily membership and democratic control. They are owned by their members and the objective of all their activities is to pursue the interests of their members/owners. Cooperatives can roughly be divided into 4 categories: consumer, worker, producer and purchasing/shared services cooperatives. Individuals – consumers – can buy goods or, for example, financial services from a consumer cooperative. Workers' cooperatives are owned and managed by the employees. Producer cooperatives are most commonly owned by farmers and are generally engaged in either buying the members' produce or supplying them with inputs. Purchasing/shared services cooperatives are commercial associations that join together in cooperatives to exploit their competitive advantage. These categories are not always fixed over time and can have slightly

different meanings in different institutional settings. For instance, historically in Sweden, there have existed mixes of producer cooperatives and consumer cooperatives.

One fundamental difference between cooperatives and other forms of economic organization is the connection between members and capital. In cooperatives, the individual is more important than capital, with the principle that one member has one vote. In joint-stock corporations, the influence is normally proportionate to the number of shares owned (if the shares do not have different voting rights). This means that large shareholders have a larger influence as compared to shareholders with a lesser proportion of shares, and must occasionally be protected through legislation, as a means of securing sound corporate governance. From a theoretical point of view, membership in a cooperative association means that every customer/owner has an equal power to influence and in joint-stock corporations the amount of capital invested will determine the power of influence.

However, the organizational characteristics of cooperatives can produce potential difficulties. The principle of one member one vote does, on the one hand, make cooperatives more democratically governed than joint-stock companies. On the other hand, this principle can create a low propensity to invest in more shares (or rather more capital), since this does not provide the investor with any more control over the business. This is a dilemma of moral hazard. Another associated difficulty with cooperation is the issue of free-riding and, in other words, it creates a situation where members with little contribution will receive equal benefits from their membership as those members putting in substantially more effort towards the performance of the organization (Baumol, 1952; Coase, 1937, 1960).

Cooperative initiatives in Sweden emerged around the nineteenth century, with examples such as *Länsförsäkringar* (County Insurances) (1801), and the housing society (1790s). During the 1880s, the cooperative ideas were spread around Sweden by the so-called Ring Movement. However, the Ring Movement did more or less vanish in the 1890s but contributed to spreading the cooperative idea and people deciding to become part of the movement. Initially, the cooperative (Co-op) was in conflict with the labour movement, which regarded the Co-op to be associated with liberalism and liberal conservatives. The Swedish cooperatives were inspired by the experiences of Belgium where a socialist cooperative movement grew strong in contrast to the British, which had a closer connection to the liberal movement. The Labour Consumption Association founded the first organization in 1895 and its first store was opened in 1897 (Sjölin, 1949).

The Swedish nationwide Co-op was initiated at a congress in 1899, when 44 representatives gathered from 41 associations to a three-day 'general cooperative congress' in Stockholm. The formation took place as part of the fast-growing labour movement and attempts, among other things, by unions and several political parties to make the business owners' position towards customers more ethical. The principles that the Co-op set up for its activities can, among other things, be seen as reflecting the problems experienced by the workers' movement with the conventional grocery trade. In the early years, associations had problems with their finances: they were often opposed and only got business premises outside the centres of larger towns (Sjölin, 1949).

Prior to World War II, the Co-op started to produce a wide array of products, such as light bulbs, butter and flour, and different rubber products. This trend continued after the war and the Co-op added several other products to their production lines and promoted the products under a common brand name (Kylebäck, 1974). However, in the 1980s and particularly in the wake of the financial crisis in the 1990s, the production facilities were closed down or sold, mainly because of higher competition and strained profitability. The consumer cooperative movement has since then been focusing on the retail sector (Edsta & Näslund, 2014).

Beside the Co-op movement, the agricultural producers' cooperatives have remained vital during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries in organizing the production within the agricultural sector. One specific sector within the agricultural cooperatives is the dairy sector that has been very successful – and this volume contains two chapters that revolve around the Swedish experience.

To sum up, in the Swedish case, the cooperative organizations have not been out-competed by joint-stock corporations and are indeed alive and kicking. In the case of the mutual insurance companies, the cooperative organizational form has shown to be very successful. The life insurance market is almost entirely dominated by mutual insurers and in the non-life sector, they have a very large market share (Larsson & Lönnborg, 2015, 2018, 2019). The cooperative in the agricultural sector is still standing strong, and when it comes to the dairy industry, Arla, for example, merger of Danish and Swedish cooperatives, has become an international player that combines mutual ownership and joint-stock corporations within their business group. In the case of the Co-op, even though the Swedish Co-op has been struggling with low profitability and sinking market shares as well as disinvestment in own production, the movement still has a large market share and still prevails as a major player on the market. Even though a very ambitious strategy to merge the Co-op movements in the Nordic countries recently failed, the Co-op still plays an important role

on the retail market in Sweden (Edsta & Näslund, 2014; Ekberg & Jensen, 2018).

If we turn our attention to the development of cooperatives in Tanzania, we can, as a point of departure, state that cooperatives are organizations of people who have the same needs and would like to solve their problems jointly through self-help (Chambo, 2009). The cooperative organization in Tanzania began as a common mission to empower small-scale agricultural producers in production and distribution to capture the profit from crop trade. The history of cooperatives in Tanzania is documented in a number of publications including Seimu (2015), Maghimbi (2010), Bibby (2006), Mwakajumilo (2011), Birchall & Simmons (2010) and Sizya (2001). The cooperatives in Tanzania began during the British colonial era when the native small-scale growers were encouraged to engage in farming coffee, cotton and tobacco in the 1920s. The first cooperatives in Tanzania were Agricultural Marketing Cooperative Societies (AMCOS) whose principal objective is the business of supplying inputs for agricultural crop production and purchasing. The growth of cooperatives in other locations in Tanzania was basically an initiative from the colonial authorities in the given localities. Cooperatives Savings and Credit Societies (SACCOS) emerged between 1936 and 1938, motivated by interests of the members as well as other types of cooperatives (Kutundu, 2018).

The post-colonial government prioritized AMCOS as a vehicle in the realization of its rural development policies and they became powerful in the economy. Furthermore, SACCOS and other types of cooperatives were recognized as indigenous efforts to provide most of the services, and AMCOS were dissolved by the government under the 1967 Arusha Declaration. Under the Arusha Declaration – which focused on socialism – AMCOS became government controlled and the objectives of the cooperatives were defined by the government and not the members. This was in contrast to the basis of cooperatives in which these are considered to be autonomous organizations, which are owned and managed by members and serve the interests of members. Therefore, AMCOS were mismanaged under government control and were highly vulnerable to corruption that resulted in their failure and subsequent official abolition in 1976 (Savage et al., 1982). Then, AMCOS were restored in 1982 to engage in crop handling, but their role to build and mould rural communities remained under socialist orientation (Seimu, 2015).

Since the re-establishment of AMCOS, the government of Tanzania has continued to recognize the cooperative sector as an important driver of socio-economic development. In order to facilitate this development, the government came up with a Cooperative Act of 1991. The Act aimed at forming

autonomous cooperative organizations, controlled and managed by the members with less government interference. The objective of the Act was to ensure that members are given the freedom to own and control their cooperative and that only economically viable societies are registered, and members have the final say on their cooperative, while the government only has an advisory role. To operationalize these purposes, the government has been framing various policies, laws, rules and programmes that ensure a fast-track development of cooperative institutions. These include the Cooperative Development Policy (2002). The policy has been a roadmap to the formation and growth of all forms of cooperatives. Its role is built on four objectives; first to encourage the establishment of member-owned and controlled cooperatives. The second is to encourage the establishment of economically viable and strong cooperative societies. The third is to promote good cooperative governance and, lastly to provide support in the provision of cooperative education, training, and research. The government amended the Cooperative Societies Act of 1991 in the Act of 2003. Moreover, the government introduced the Cooperative Society's Rules of 2004 to guide the establishment and management of cooperatives in the country. Moreover, the government prepared a Cooperative Reform and Modernization Programme (CRMP) for 2005–2015. The objectives of CRMP are to initiate a comprehensive transformation of cooperatives to become organizations that are member-owned and controlled, competitive, viable, sustainable, and with the capability of fulfilling members' economic and social needs (Magigi, 2013; Mushi, 2013).

The international efforts were also backed up by the development of cooperatives in Tanzania (Pollet, 2009). For example, the United Nations (UN) continues to campaign to raise the public awareness of the contributions of cooperative enterprises to support economic development and alleviate poverty. The UN announced the 2020s as the cooperative development decade with the vision that cooperative business should be leading economic, social and environmental sustainability. Furthermore, cooperatives should be the enterprise business model preferred by people and becoming the fastest growing form of enterprises. To operationalize the cooperative development decade agenda, the ICA-Africa has prepared the African cooperative development strategy to be implemented by the African countries.

Since the 1990s, SACCOS have become of a focal point in the cooperative movement in Tanzania. SACCOS are currently the most used cooperative in the country (Sumelius et al., 2014). While they are not always cooperative businesses themselves, they promote individual businesses and small group businesses by bringing in financial services to the members. These are types of

cooperatives that can be formed and operate in any society in both rural and urban areas. According to SACCOS' statistics in Tanzania, the number of Savings and Credit Societies (SACCOS) and memberships in Tanzania has increased from 156 societies with 19,884 members in 1991 to 5,478 societies with 935,121 members by March 2014. Data for the year 2012 shows that, out of 5,424 SACCOS, 3,039 (56 per cent) were rural SACCOS, and 2,385 (44 per cent) were urban SACCOS of which 57 per cent were male members and 43 per cent were female. However, their impacts on the economy became evident from the late 1980s, see Mwakajumilo (2011) following the government intervention in promoting SACCOS.

Despite being recognized as an important model for development in Tanzania for more than 60 years, cooperatives continue to attract the researchers' attention. Some recent researchers in AMCOS have continued to suggest solutions to various challenges hindering their success and development. The knowledge about AMCOS includes studies by Mmasa (2017), Anania and Sambuo (2017), Anania and Rwekaza (2016) and Bee (2013). The dominance of SACCOS has, in turn, attracted more researchers and, recently, research has focused on their spread and whether they show efficiency and sustainability (Marwa and Aziakpono, 2014; Ndiege et al., 2014; Magali and Pastory, 2013), the contribution of SACCOS to the Tanzanian economy (e.g. Kwai & Urassa, 2015; Qin & Ndiege, 2013), and the role of SACCOS in empowering special groups including women and youth (Maleko et al., 2013). Other recent works on SACCOS include Kaleshu & Temu (2012) and Ishengoma (2012). For both forms of co-cooperatives, most of the research originates from the leading cooperative institution in Tanzania, namely the Moshi Co-operative University (MoCU).

It is clear that cooperatives in Tanzania perform a valuable role in supporting their members' economic and social needs. However, recent experiences show that many stakeholders including the government are not satisfied with the performance of cooperatives at the primary and the apex level. This indicates that, to meet their potential in the future, a comprehensive transformation of cooperatives in Tanzania is necessary. To achieve these objectives, research needs to show stakeholders how cooperatives should be commercial and viable enterprises that are able to survive and prosper under the current market conditions. Research in the cooperative field should continue to search for the ways and means of recreating the cooperative organization for current and future generations. One question that has been in focus concerns how cooperative organizations can better link to their communities, that is, focusing cooperatives on innovation that will enhance their becoming sustainable

business organizations. Lastly, other cooperatives including housing cooperatives, fishing cooperatives and others are still completely neglected in the literature.

The contents of the book

The book is structured into two different parts, one on entrepreneurship and the other on cooperatives. The section on entrepreneurship departs with two chapters that revolve around an under-researched topic, namely female entrepreneurship. The chapter by Besrat Tesfaye, Benson Otieno Ndiege and Esther Towo discusses the subject of small businesses created and sustained by women in the Moshi, Kilimanjaro district in Tanzania. Women entrepreneurs in emerging economies are caught in the middle of societal transformations that prescribe roles for women that are at a variance with each other and with the institutions in, which they are embedded. On the one hand, women are expected to engage more in entrepreneurship and deliver growth and prosperity to themselves and their communities. On the other hand, women are expected to abide traditional rules and institutional norms that counteract the entrepreneurial efforts of women, however traditional values and norms are slowly changing and underpin/reshape the essence of the formal institutions. Therefore, it is important to understand how the institutional systems in emerging economies impact on the participation and performance of women entrepreneurs in the formal economy.

The following chapter by Blendina E. Owalla continues the discussion of female entrepreneurship with a comparison between Sweden and Tanzania. Women's entrepreneurship has received global recognition and support due to its contribution to the economy, with many initiatives focusing on entrepreneurship programmes as a tool for influencing women's perceptions and attitudes towards entrepreneurship. The socio-cultural context also plays a role, with a society's gender role ideology determining the level of normative support and legitimacy accorded to women entrepreneurs. Based on semi-structured interviews, the chapter focuses on analysing women's entrepreneurial motives and perceptions regarding entrepreneurship programmes in two different socio-cultural contexts, namely Sweden and Tanzania. The study contributes to the existing literature on entrepreneurial motives by identifying different non-mutually exclusive categories of 'pull' (*personal identity, prior experiences, social mission and self-achievement*), 'push' (*providing solutions*) and 'combined' (*part-time entrepreneurs*) factors that influence women's decisions to become entrepreneurs. Second, the study stresses that the socio-cul-

tural context influences the prevalence of entrepreneurial motives in each context. This highlights the fact that women's entrepreneurial motives are more nuanced and complex than the ongoing academic discourse on 'necessity' versus 'opportunity' entrepreneurs. Third, entrepreneurship programmes can be viewed as having an overall positive impact on women entrepreneurs. However, what was perceived as being of value by the women entrepreneurs differed based on their entrepreneurial motives. In conclusion, the implications for policy and practice are highlighted.

The chapter by Tommy Larsson Segerlind studies the concept of teams and the issue of understanding entrepreneurial ventures from a more theoretical point of view. The essay reflects on methodological insights from studying venture teams and venture processes in the context of institutional transformation. The argument is that venture teams as a level and unit of analysis in the entrepreneurship field are still overlooked and there is a need for making the venture team more explicit, as well as evaluating earlier theoretical results and exploring new methods and their applicability. The chapter includes a methodological reevaluation of four specific empirical studies. From an adaptation and selection perspective, the conclusions are that both processual and longitudinal methods were able to give potentially important contributions to studies of venture teams and venture processes in the context of institutional transformation. However, to go further, we need to work together at national and international levels and continue to explore the contextual perspective on team entrepreneurship where different research groups may contribute with contextualized data and studies and different methods.

As noted in the introduction, the general view in both Sweden and Tanzania is that small businesses and entrepreneurs are the most important factor in generating job opportunities in the future. This notion is the subject of the two following chapters, although with different approaches, the first practical and the latter more theoretical, where both chapters revolve around teams. The chapter by Bukaza Chachage, Deo Sabokwigina, Hosea Mpogole, Yusuph Sessanga and Gabriel Malima discusses the prospect of entrepreneurship education at the institutional level of institutes of higher education, its present situation and the challenges it faces. The study uses the Team Academy Programme of University of Iringa as a case study. This essay applies reflective methodology to explore the potential diffusion of the Team Academy processes to complement the training and development of modern cooperative entrepreneurs in the East Africa Region in general and Tanzania in particular.

It was found that University of Iringa (UoI) runs the Team Academy Programme with the objective that students should learn entrepreneurship

experientially, that is by 'doing real businesses'. The programme uses the 'rocket model' to impart practical entrepreneurial and management skills and competences to students in the form of contextual learning by doing. The model motivates and inspires a concurrent positive reinforcement of three-fold learning; student-entrepreneurs' learning; business organizational learning; and coaches' learning. The synergetic developmental relationship of the cooperative efforts of these three types of reinforcement provides a positive learning loop and a unique innovative environment for the participants. Thus, the chapter suggests transforming the entrepreneurship education in such a way that learners could acquire entrepreneurial knowledge, skills and competences through learning by doing, and that this has the highest potential to produce excellence among graduate entrepreneurs. This is the first study conducted on Team Academy education in Tanzania, based on a reflective methodology.

The next chapter in this section about entrepreneurship by Blandina W. Kori and S. M. Maina discusses the inclusion rate of university graduates in economic development activities immediately after graduation in Tanzania. The study focused on individual creative initiatives as a result of academic achievements. The study is anchored in the human capital theory of economic development. A descriptive research design was used to obtain cross-sectional data from individuals and focus groups that were among the graduates from the universities in Moshi, Tanzania, and using a snowball sampling design. The main conclusion of the study is that creativity is neglected in the training of graduates since both the trainers (universities) and the trainees (young graduates) invest their resources primarily in theoretical training, rather than in skills and vocational training. The trainers trained for ready employment and the trainee attitudes towards self-employment were highly negative. Consequently, graduates make little effort to create self-employment after finishing their studies. The lack of initiative towards self-employment contributes to the lack of employment among young graduates and the inability to boost growth in the national/regional economy.

The chapter by Malin Gawell revolves around social entrepreneurship for women's rights. The struggle for women's rights has taken many forms throughout history. Studies of social and political movements in various ways give us valuable knowledge about the processes and mechanisms that affect inequality as well as equality. Studies on how the so-called gender contracts are constructed and reconstructed in different types of organizations highlight several of the mechanisms that influence the design of the conditions attached to female/male roles. Social and political movements can be seen as contexts for entrepreneurial initiatives – that is initiatives to act in intertwinement with

the development of organizational structures to support the undertaken activities. The distinction between an organization and a social movement is difficult to draw because of the dynamic interplay between the two entities. In this chapter, entrepreneurship, and more specifically social entrepreneurship, are highlighted with the aim of deepening our understanding of this interplay.

The next chapter has a different approach to entrepreneurship. The chapter by Karl Gratzner, Mikael Lönnborg and Mikael Olsson highlights the issue of state ownership, nationalization and privatization of firms in Sweden. The main questions are; why was state ownership initiated and how was it so widely extended during the twentieth century, and why has state-owned property during different periods been privatized and how were these operations conducted? In addition, the chapter discusses whether the privatization processes can be understood as an entrepreneurial venture. The study underlines that state-ownership of companies constituted a natural part of market economies. There has been a large number of motives for state-ownership of companies, for example natural monopolies, high investment costs, military emergency and infrastructural reasons, and, last but not least economic crises where the state has acted as an 'owner of last resort'.

The second part of the book revolves around cooperatives and other organizations that seek other means than only profits. However, the first chapter in this section is an essay by Yohanan Stryjan that neatly binds the two parts of the book together. Stryjan discusses from a theoretical point of view the connections between entrepreneurship and cooperatives. The prime aim is to relate to the current entrepreneurship discourse, and the largely submerged discourse on cooperative action, on local and regional development. The discourse that has evolved in the few last decades around economic development and change has highlighted the pivotal role of entrepreneurship, largely equalling it with the creation of private firms. Other forms of economic action, most notably the formation of cooperatives, and the impact of social infrastructures on economic action, were largely displaced from the focus of attention. The disregard for cooperation among mainstream entrepreneurship advocates is amply mirrored by a correspondingly low interest in entrepreneurship among cooperators. Cooperative development systems are often shaped at the interface between the cooperative sphere and newly emergent spheres. The interests of the various stakeholders may differ considerably. Whereas the cooperatively minded focus on cooperatives being formed,

treating economic and community effects as desirable externalities, the position of the policymaker will be the obverse. Whatever their cooperative contribution, the central economic contribution of cooperative support organizations is in developing an infrastructure for entrepreneurship.

The chapter by Somo M. L. Seimu discusses the history of the cooperative movement in Tanzania, mainly policy and political aspects during the period from the 1930s to the 1980s. By the mid-1970s, Tanzania had the biggest cooperative movement in Africa and the oldest in East Africa. Despite such an achievement, for decades, the literature on Tanzania's small-scale coffee and cotton cultivation and marketing cooperatives has suffered from a dearth of substantive historical accounts. The available literature is fragmented along various academic disciplines, mostly political science and sociology. In addition, there is no single substantive secondary historical study specifically dedicated to the cooperative movement since its inception in 1932. This chapter seeks to fill this gap by utilizing primary sources from the Cooperative College archive in Manchester and the Tanzania National Archive (TNA) to examine and evaluate the coffee and cotton marketing cooperatives during the 1932 to early 1980s. The study explores the interlocking forces and policies that led to its growth and development. The development is also examined against the changing political and ideological influences during the interwar, and post-war to independence periods. In short, the chapter gives us a description of how the cooperative movement developed through periods of threats and is still a viable organizational form in Tanzania today.

The chapter by Suleiman Adam Chambo, Esther Towo, Gervas Machimu, Alban Mchopa and Maulid Bwabo discusses the practicability of an integrated cooperative model in Tanzania. Cooperative movements are seen by proponents to have contributed to reduce poverty in developing countries. However, critics consider cooperatives' effort to help their members in cooperative movements as questionable. Subsequently, cooperative efforts to alleviate the poverty among farmers are sometimes perceived to be ineffective. There is also a concern that to help their members, cooperatives should work towards vertical and horizontal integration to be more effective. Thus, the main question in the chapter is whether an integrated co-cooperative is a practical model in Tanzania and how the integrated cooperative operates in the country? The chapter established that small-scale farmers in Tanzania have opted for horizontal integration in the form of multiple memberships that is, being a member of an Agricultural Marketing Co-operative Society and a Savings and Credit Co-operative Society as a strategy for improving one's livelihood. This form of integration therefore generates future implications for the growing cooperative

movement in Tanzania. Members involved in the integrated model were found, relatively, to have generated more wealth and had the comparative advantage of accessing various services provided in their communities. This reflects the importance of the existing integrated model, which has been formed by members themselves.

The following chapter by Joseph Hella and Fanuel Isaya Sirikwa studies cooperatives from a completely different viewpoint, and analyses cooperatives from a micro-oriented approach. It is stated that the entrepreneurial capability in farm management through cooperative arrangement is a key factor for efficient and profitable production. The study compares the performance of two innovative management practices, that is, a private and a cooperative institutional arrangement for rice irrigation schemes in the Mbarali District. Two schemes, Igomero under cooperative and Mbarali under private institutional arrangements, are compared. Both primary and secondary data was collected and analysed using regression, gross margin and return on investments. The results on scheme performance were captured through physical, institutional and economic key factors. The results showed significant differences in the performance between private and cooperative irrigation schemes. In general, the performance of cooperative irrigation schemes scored significantly better – more than 6 per cent – compared to privately managed irrigation schemes. Specifically, private companies scored higher on physical and institutional factors while the co-operative scheme scored higher on economic factors. Based on these findings, entrepreneurial capabilities through a cooperative arrangement seem to have a significant contribution on farm level productivity and profitability. In short, the cooperative arrangement did in these cases underpin enhanced productivity and efficiency, as compared to privately organized business.

Turning to the Swedish case and cooperatives, the next two chapters will discuss the Swedish dairy industry. The first by Paulina Rytkönen, Martin Ragnar and Mikael Lönnborg discusses the long-term development of the industry. During the last century the Swedish dairy sector has undergone a far-reaching process of structural rationalization. In the early twentieth century, no other industrial branch had as large a number of firms and processing plants, and just a few decades later the number had been reduced dramatically. Likewise, the firm characteristics varied as there were many privately owned farm-based dairies of varying sizes, but there were also village dairies sometimes owned collectively and sometimes by one single owner, and there was also an incipient cooperative movement that strived to solve problems related to a lack of infrastructure and meeting the needs of growing cities. Already in

the early twentieth century, the Stockholm based dairy cooperative Mjölkc-centralen (since 1975 Arla and since 2000 Arla Foods, following the merger with Danish MD Foods), differed from all other dairy enterprises, as it grew rapidly after taking control of the Stockholm market, which allowed Mjölkc-centralen to rapidly expand into the provinces south of Stockholm. The most important event triggering the structural rationalization in the dairy industry was the compromise between the Social Democratic Party and the Agrarian Party in the Swedish parliament in the early 1930s, which offered the agro-based industrial sector economic protection from international competition and farm subsidies in return for a voluntary process of self-rationalization. In exchange, the Agrarian Party agreed to support the Social Democratic Party's unemployment policy among industrial workers. The main features of this institutional setting were valid until the 1990s when the preparations for the Swedish EU membership were initiated.

The chapter by Marcus Box, Mikael Lönnborg and Paulina Rytkönen continues the discussion presented in the previous chapter, about the Swedish dairy industry and the cooperative movement. As noted, the dairy industry has a very interesting ownership form, namely a hybrid organizational form that combines cooperatives with joint-stock corporations. This chapter looks more closely at the international operations of the Swedish-Danish producer cooperative Arla Foods. Production in the dairy industry is almost always conducted locally and dairy products are seldom exported. Yet, the industry is today global, dominated by large transnationals. Several of them are organized as cooperatives, which is a rare situation among multinationals. In some geographical markets, or in particular market areas, these transnationals – corporations as well as cooperatives – may compete fiercely, and their growth strategy is often to merge with or acquire local producers in other areas. However, the multinationals also actively cooperate in other areas (e.g. in branding or distribution) or on other geographical markets. In contrast to other multinational corporations that started an international business already in the nineteenth century, the dairy industry commenced this strategy in the late 1990s.

The chapter by Kitala Christian Tobias Malamsha and Grace Ngiwiri Meleko discusses the contribution to the community of cooperative financial institutions, particularly SACCOS (Savings and Credit Cooperative Organizations). It argued that the existence of the cooperative financial institutions can be of vital importance in Tanzania if they fulfil the following four policy objectives; enhancement of outreach, sustainability, enterprises development and improvement of the well-being among members. The four are supposed to be achieved simultaneously by each co-operative financial institution, which

has produced the theorem of the so-called 'square attainment'. The main question in the chapter is whether SACCOS have attained this square improvement? In short, the answer is yes. There was a positive change in outreach of SACCOS from 2005 to 2015. The number of SACCOS increased by almost 200 per cent and the number of members rose by over 260 per cent in this period. Most of the SACCOS have also demonstrated financial sustainability. Without any doubt, SACCOS have supported the small business community and entrepreneurial enhancement in various ways. They have offered better conditions for loans through lower interest rates and reasonable repayment plans than regular banks. These conditions have, of course, constituted a competitive advantage for SACCOS. Furthermore, the income level among members was indeed higher after joining a SACCO than before joining. SACCOS have in general contributed to an increase in the number of new business ventures and growth among corporations, and most credits provided to members were used for business undertakings and production purposes. In addition, the entrepreneurship education provided by SACCOS enhanced the incomes of the members and also helped members apply better accounting methods and in general improved how business was conducted. Well-being changes were also improved among members after using SACCOS' services.

The chapter by Karin Dahlström, Anna Nyquist and Johanna Fernholm is somewhat different than the rest of the contributions concerning cooperatives. The chapter discusses a hybrid organization close to an NGO that was sponsored by hundreds of individuals, foundations, governments, institutions, and corporate partners, namely the Millennium Villages Project. The chapter examines if the quintuple helix innovation model could contribute to the understanding of sustainability and innovation initiatives undertaken in cross-organizational partnerships. The study draws on the case of the Millennium Villages Project (MVP), which is a ten-year rural development project that was initiated in 2005 with the aim of implementing the UN Millennium Project's recommended interventions across multiple sectors in rural sub-Saharan Africa. The main question is whether any lessons can be learnt from the quintuple innovation model in order to understand cross-organizational partnerships for sustainability and innovation?

The results indicate that the quintuple helix innovation model is a suitable model to use in order to examine and understand relational balances and imbalances in partnerships between the five sub-systems; the media- and culture based public system, the political system, the educational system, the economic system and the natural system. The findings of the study also suggest that imbalances between the partners in the MVP cross-organizational part-

nership could be identified. This is something that could lead to less innovation according to the quintuple helix innovation model. Considering that the chapter includes non-profit organizations but also touches upon aspects of entrepreneurship and innovation and returns to issues that constituted the point of departure of the book, the chapter has been chosen to round up the entire volume.

This volume highlights two topics, entrepreneurship and co-operatives (and education within these fields), which may be regarded as essentially disparate themes. However, looking more closely it is apparent that they have some interesting intersections. Entrepreneurship revolves around issues of finding combinations of resources to create an innovation, that is something new that hopefully will generate a viable corporation. At the same time, the innovation may change the circumstances of industries, create new employment opportunities and boost economic growth. Entrepreneurship is in other word, the force that develops the economy in the short and the long run. Co-operatives has a long history and is connected to different forms of collaboration among producers or consumers for contributing to common goals. The shared ownership form has managed to prevail over time and is stronger than ever before. Co-operatives are normally built on previous experiences, but many new ventures have been undertaken within these organizations and has therefore, a strong connection to entrepreneurship research.

This book is hence an output of the collaboration between Södertörn University in Stockholm, Sweden, and Moshi Co-operative University in Moshi, Tanzania. The theme of the anthology relates to innovation and entrepreneurship among co-operatives, the public sector, and the private sector as a common dominator. In both countries we aim to understand how the economy is working, how enterprises with different ownership forms and other kinds of state and private organizations contribute to economic growth or decline. Discussion and editing these chapters have giving us many different insights about the topics of entrepreneurship and co-operatives, which hopefully can pave the way for future research agendas. The contexts are dissimilar in these countries, but hopefully by putting these cases together, it may contribute to new perspectives in Sweden as well as in Tanzania. These chapters have been written with empirical material from a specific country, with one important exception, about female entrepreneurs in Sweden and Tanzania. However, in the future, cross-cultural approaches should be deployed to give

us further knowledge about issues as impact of political policies for instance on entrepreneurship, co-operatives and role of women on short- and long-term economic performance. In addition, by comparing and addressing different kind of research methods and empirics, cross-cultural thereby facilitate theoretical development. Hopefully can this volume inspire to further collaboration among universities in countries with major differences in institutional settings, which may highlight general and unique features.

In concluding the introduction, we hope that this book can serve as a brief overview of research on entrepreneurship, cooperatives and education in Sweden and Tanzania. In addition, the intention is that the book will contribute to evolve the research in these areas in both countries but also further deepen the collaboration between Södertörn University and Moshi Co-operative University on, among other things, teacher/student exchanges and common research projects in the future.

References

- Ajzén, I. (2002). Perceived Behavioral Control, Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 32(4): 664–884.
- Ajzén, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 50: 179–211.
- Anania, P. & Rwekaza, G. C. (2016). The determinants of success in agricultural marketing co-operatives in Tanzania: the experience from Mweka Sungu, Mruwia and Uru North Njari agricultural marketing co-operatives in Moshi district. *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences* 4(3).
- Anania, P. & Sambuo, D. B. (2017). 'The Co-Operative Enterprise and Youths Employment Creation: Prospects and Challenges, (Reflections from Tanzanian Agricultural Sector).' *Noble International Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(2):55–67.
- Arndt, H. W. (1978). *The Rise and Fall of Economic Growth. A Study in Contemporary Thought*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.
- Aronsson, M. & Hansson, M. (1997). *Vem gör vad inom svensk entreprenörskaps- & småföretagsforskning 1997* [Who does what in Swedish entrepreneurship- & small business research 1997]. Stockholm: Institutet för entreprenörskaps- och småföretagsforskning (ESBRI).
- Barreto, H. (1989). *The Entrepreneur in Microeconomic Theory: Disappearance and Explanation*. London: Routledge.
- Barton, D. (1989). What is a Co-operative? In: Cobia, D. (Ed.). *Co-operatives in Agriculture*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Baumol, W. J. (1968). 'Entrepreneurship in economic theory.' *American Economic Review*. 58(2).
- Baumol, W. J. (1993). *Entrepreneurship, Management, and the Structure of Payoffs*, Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press.
- Beckman, S. (1990). *Utvecklingens hjältar. Om den innovativa individen i samhällstänkandet* [The Heroes of Development. About the Innovative Individual Within Society Thinking]. Stockholm: Carlsson.
- Bee, F. K. (2013). The Role of Social and Solidarity Economy in Tanzania. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*. 1(05): 1–11.
- Bibby, A. (2006). Tanzania's co-operatives look to the future. Accessed on <http://www.andrewbibby.com/pdf/Tanzania.pdf>, 19, 03–15.
- Birchall, J., & Simmons, R. (2010). The Co-operative Reform Process in Tanzania and Sri Lanka. *Annals of Public and Co-operative Economics*. 81(3), 467–500.
- Brockhaus, R. H. & Horwitz, P. (1986). 'The psychology of the entrepreneur'. In: Sexton, D. L. & Smilor, R W, (eds.). *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship*. Cambridge (MA): Ballinger.
- Carlsson, B., Braunerhjelm, P., McKelvey, M., Olofsson, C., Persson, L. & Ylinenpää, H. (2013). The evolving domain of entrepreneurship research. *IFN Working Paper 948*. Stockholm: IFN.
- Casson, M. (1982). *The Entrepreneur. An Economic Theory*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.

- Chambo, S. A. (2009). Agricultural co-operatives: role in food security and rural development. In: *UN expert group meeting on co-operatives*: 28–3).
- Chandler, A. D. Jr. (1990). *Scale and Scope: The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism*. Cambridge (MA): Belknap Press.
- Christiaensen, L., De Weerd, J., & Kanbur, R. (2017). Secondary towns and poverty reduction in Tanzania.
- Cockx, L., Colen, L., & De Weerd, J. (2017). From corn to popcorn? Urbanization and food consumption in sub-saharan Africa: evidence from rural-urban migrants in Tanzania.
- Collier, P., & Jones, P. (2016). Transforming Dar es Salaam into a City that Work. Tanzania: The Path to Prosperity. 86.
- Dahmén, E. (1997). Industrial development since the Second World War. In: Jonung, L. & Ohlsson, R. (Eds.). *The Economic Development of Sweden since 1870*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Dahmén, E. (1988). *Den ekonomiska tillväxtens förutsättningar: Återblick och framtids-perspektiv: Exemplet Sverige [Preconditions for Economic Growth. The Example of Sweden]*. Stockholm: Näringslivets ekonomifakta.
- Dahmén, E. (1965). 'Familjeföretagens roll i framtidens Sverige [The family business' role in the future in Sweden].' *Industriförbundets Tidskrift*, 8:450–57.
- Dahmén, E. (1950). *Svensk industriell företagarverksamhet: Kausalanalys av den industriella utvecklingen 1919–1939 [Swedish industrial business. Causal analysis of the industrial development 1919–1939]*. 2 volumes. Stockholm: Industriens Utredningsinstitut.
- Dahmén, E., Hanna, L. & Kirzner, I. M. (1994). *The Dynamics of Entrepreneurship*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Dana, L-P. & Dana, T. E. (2008). Collective Entrepreneurship in a Mennonite Community in Paraguay. *Latin American Business Review*. 8(4): 82–96
- Davidsson, P. (1990). *Continued entrepreneurship: Ability, need and opportunity as determinants of small firm growth*. Umeå: Institutionen för Företags ekonomi.
- DiMaggio, P. J. & Powell, W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited. Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organization Fields. *American Sociological Review*. 48: 147–60.
- Edsta, B. & Näslund, B. (2014). *Sista striden för Coop. En granskning av KFs och Coops affärer [The last battle for COOP. An assessment of the business of the Co-operative Association and COOP]*. Stockholm: Ultima Esperanza.
- Eggertsson, T. (1990), *Economic Behavior and Institutions*. Cambridge (MA): Cambridge University Press.
- Eggertsson, T. (2005), *Imperfect Institutions. Possibilities and Limits of Reform*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Ekberg, E. & Jensen, K. (2018). The non-globalisation of modern food retailing: the case of the failed Coop Norden merger. *Scandinavian Economic History Review*. 66(2): 170–185.
- Espeli, H. (2004). 'Bøndernes interesseorganisasjoner i Norge siden midten av 1800-talle. Samarbeid, drakamp og konflikter [The farmers trade organizations in Norway

- since the middle of the 19th century. Cooperation, tug-of-war and conflicts].’ In: Rydén, R. (Ed.). *Jordbrukarnas kooperativa föreningar och intresseorganisationer i ett historiskt perspektiv [Farmer’s co-operative association and trade organizations in a historical perspective]*. Stockholm: Kungl. Skogs- och lantbruksakademien: 53–72
- Fayolle, A., Landström, H., Gartner, W. B. & Berglund, K. (2018) (Eds.). *Institutionalization of Entrepreneurship Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fredona, R. & Reinert, S. A. (2017). The Harvard Research Center in Entrepreneurial History and the Daimonic Entrepreneur. *History of Political Economy*. 49(2): 267–314.
- Freeman, M., Pearson, R. & Taylor, J. (2011). *Shareholder Democracies? Corporate Governance in Britain and Ireland before 1850*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Furlough, E. & Strikewerda, C. (1999) (Eds.). *Consumer against Capitalism? Consumer Cooperation in Europe, North America and Japan 1840–1990*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gartner, W. B. (1989). Who Is an Entrepreneur? Is the Wrong Question. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Summer.
- Hébert, R. F. & Link, A. N. (1982). *The Entrepreneur: Mainstream Views and Radical Critiques*. New York: Praeger.
- Henreksson, M. & Stenkula, M. (2016). *Understanding entrepreneurship. Definition, function and policy*. Stockholm: SNS.
- Henry, (2015).
- Hilson, M. Neunsinger, S. & Patmore, G. (2017). *A global history of consumer co-operation since 1850: Movements and businesses*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Hwang, S-J. (1995). *Folkrörelse eller affärsföretag? Den svenska konsumentkooperationen 1945–1990 [Popular movement or business enterprise? The Swedish consumer co-operative 1945–1990]*. Dissertation. Stockholm: Department of Political Science.
- ICA (2017). *International Co-operative Alliance (ICA)*. Annual report 2017.
- Ishengoma, E. K. (2012). *Financial linkages, institutional factors and loan repayment performance: the case of microfinance co-operatives in Tanzania*. Department of Finance. Dar es Salaam University.
- John, R. R. (1997). Elaborations, Revisions, Dissents: Alfred D. Chandler Jr.’s, The Visible Hand after Twenty Years. *Business History Review* 71: 151–200.
- Jones, G. & Wadhvani, D. R. (2006). ‘Entrepreneurship and Business History: Renewing the Research Agenda’. *Working Papers* 7(7). Boston (MA): Harvard Business School.
- Jönsson, J. B., & Bryceson, D. F. (2017). Beyond the artisanal mining site: migration, housing capital accumulation and indirect urbanization in East Africa. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*. 11(1): 3–23.
- Jotta, S. (2013). The History of Entrepreneurship in Tanzania. http://saut-ec.blogspot.se/2013/02/the-history-of-entrepreneurship-in_8442.html. visited on 20/01/2018.
- Kaleshu, J., & Temu, S. (2012). Expansion of rural financial services through linkage banking in Tanzania: Is joint action between savings and credit co-operative societies (SACCOS) a promising approach? *Enterprise Development and Microfinance*. 23(2): 146–160.

- Kalimasi, P. J. & Herman, C. (2016). Integrating entrepreneurship education across university-wide curricula: The case of two public universities in Tanzania. *Industry and Higher Education*. 30(5): 344–354.
- Karantininis, K. & Nilsson, J. (2007) (Eds). *Vertical markets and co-operative hierarchies: The role of co-operatives in the agri-food industry*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Katundu, M. (2018). Role of Cooperative Organizations in Tanzania's Industrialization. In: Efobi, U. & Asongu, S. (Eds.). *Financing Sustainable Development in Africa*. Cham: Palgrave MacMillan: 298–420.
- Kirzner, I. (1973). *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Köll, A-M. (1994). *Peasants on the World Market, Agricultural Experience of Independent Estonia 1919–1939*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Knight, F. H. (1921). *Risk, uncertainty and profit*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
- Kylebäck, H. (1983). *Konsumentkooperationen i strukturomvandling. Del 1 1946–1960 [The structural change of the consumer cooperation. Part 1 1946–1960]*. Kungälv: Gotab.
- Kylebäck, H. (1989). *Konsumentkooperationen i strukturomvandling. Del 2 1960–1985 [The structural change of the consumer co-operative. Part 2 1960–1985]*. Stockholm: Raben & Sjögren.
- Kylebäck, H. (1999). *Federation eller Konsum Sverige? Konsumentkooperativ förändringsprocess (Vol. 3). 1985–1995 [Federation or Coop Sweden? The Changing Process of the Consumer Movements]*. Göteborg: Novum Grafiska AB.
- Kwai, M. D., & Urassa, J. K. (2015). The contribution of savings and credit co-operative societies to income poverty reduction: A case study of Mbozi District, Tanzania. *Journal of African Studies and Development*. 7(4): 99.
- Lamoreaux, N. R., Raff, D. M. G. & Temin, P. (2003). Beyond Markets and Hierarchies: Toward a New Synthesis of American Business History. *American Historical Review*. 108 (2): 404–433.
- Landström, H. (2000). *Entreprenörskapets rötter [The roots of entrepreneurship]*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Landström, H., Harichi, G. & Åström, F. (2011). Entrepreneurship: Exploring the knowledge base. *Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy (CIRCLE)*. Working Paper 08.
- Landström, H. & Johannisson, B. (1998). *Theoretical foundation in Swedish entrepreneurship and small business research*. SIRE. Working paper 1998:1.
- Landström, H. Parhankangas, A, Fayolle, A. & Riot, P. (2016) (Eds.). *Challenging entrepreneurship research*. Abingdon; Routledge.
- Landström, H. & Schön, L. (2010). Industrial renewal and entrepreneurship in Sweden: A structural cycle explanation. In: Landström, H. & Lohrke, F. (Eds.). *Historical Foundations of Entrepreneurship Research*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Lange, E. (2007) (Ed.). *Organisert kjøpekraft [Organised purchase power]*. Oslo: Pax.
- Langlois, R. N. (2007). *The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism. Schumpeter, Chandler and the New Economy*, Routledge, London.

- Larsson, M. & Lönnborg, M. (2015). Survival and Success of Swedish Mutual Insurer. In: Pearson, R. & Yoneyama, T. (Eds.). *Corporate forms and organizational choice in international insurance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 93–113.
- Larsson, M. & Lönnborg, M. (2018). *Ömsesidig försäkring. Bolag, kunder och marknaden* [Mutual insurance. Firms, customers and the market]. Stockholm: Dialogos.
- Lazaro, E., Agergaard, J., Larsen, M. N., Makindara, J., & Birch-Thomsen, T. (2017). The emergence of urban centres: An exploration of the intertwinement of rural transformation and urbanization in Tanzania. In 7th European Conference on Africa Studies (ECAS): Urban Africa-Urban Africans new encounters of the urban and the rural.
- Lindgren, M. & Packendorff, J. (2007). *Konstruktion av entreprenörskap: Teori, praktik och interaktion* [Construction of entrepreneurship: Theory, practice and interaction]. Örebro: Forum för småföretagsforskning.
- Magali, J., & Pastory, D. (2013). Technical efficiency of the rural savings and credits co-operative societies in Tanzania: A DEA Approach.
- Maghimbi, S. (2010). Co-operatives in Tanzania mainland: Revival and growth. ILO.
- Magigi, W. (2013). Putting Co-operative Development in Urban Development Agenda: An Analysis and Lessons from Co-operative Reform and Modernization Program Implementation Intervention with Case Reality in Tanzania. *International Journal of Co-operative Studies*, 2(2), 66–75.
- Maleko, G. N., Liheta, B. S., Aikaruwa, D., Lukas, A., & Sumari, G. A. (2013). Women Participation in Microfinance Institutions of Tanzania: The Case of Savings and Credit Co-operative Societies (SACCOS). *Journal of Business Administration and Education*, 4(2).
- March, J. G. & Simon, H. (1958). *Organizations. The Foundation of Modern Organization Theory*. New York: Wiley.
- Marwa, N., & Aziakpono, M. (2014). Efficiency and profitability of Tanzanian saving and credit co-operatives: who is a star?
- Micklethwait, J. & Woolridge, A. (2005). *The Company. A Short History of a Revolutionary Idea*. New York: Modern Library.
- Mmasa, J. J. (2017). Determinants of Smallholder women farmers access to informal credit in Tanzania—A case of Singida and Chamwino districts.
- Mori, N. (2014). Women's Entrepreneurship Development in Tanzania: Insights and recommendations. International Labour Organization (ILO).
- Mushi, B. A. (2013). *Assessment of the Extent of Corporate Governance Adoption in Co-operative Societies: A Survey of Dar Es Salaam SACCOS* (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania).
- Mwakajumilo, S. L. (2011). *The Role of Informal Microfinance Institutions in Saving Mobilization, Investment and Poverty Reduction: A Case of Savings and Credit Co-operative Societies (SACCOS) in Tanzania From 1961–2008*. PhD Thesis, St. Clement University. Turks and Caicos Islands.
- Ndiege, B. O., Qin, X., Kazungu, I., & Moshi, J. (2014). The impacts of financial linkage on sustainability of less-formal financial institutions: Experience of savings and credit

- co-operative societies in Tanzania. *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management*, 2(2): 65–71.
- Nilsson, J. (1991). *Kooperativ utveckling [Co-operative development]*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Noorbakhsh, F., Paloni, A. & Youssef, A. (1999). *Low wages or skilled labour? Prospects for foreign direct investment in developing countries*. Department of Economics, University of Glasgow.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (MA).
- North, D. C. (2005). *Understanding the Process of Economic Change*. Princeton University Press, Princeton (N. J.).
- Patmore, G. & Balnave, N. (2018). *A Global History of Co-operative Business*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Persson, B. (1997). "Småföretagen som forskningsfält [Small business as research field]." I: Persson, B. (red.) *Småföretagande, entreprenörskap och jobben: Ett forskningsfält i förändring [Small business, entrepreneurship and the jobs. A research field in transition]*. Stockholm. Rådet för arbetslivsforskning.
- Pearson, R. & Yoneyama, T. (2015) (Eds.). *Corporate forms and organizational choice in international insurance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollet, I. (2009). *Co-operatives in Africa: The age of reconstruction–synthesis of a survey in nine African Countries*. ILO Office for Kenya, Somalia, Tanzania and Uganda.
- Qin, X., & Ndiege, B. O. (2013). 'Role of financial development in economic growth: Evidence from savings and credits co-operative societies in Tanzania.' *International Journal of Financial Research*, 4(2), 115.
- Ramström, D. (1971) (red.). *Mindre företag – problem och villkor: Företagsekonomer vid Umeå universitet diskuterar de mindre och medelstora företagens problem och möjligheter [Smaller firms – problems and conditions. Business economists at Umeå University discuss the smaller and medium-sized firms problems and possibilities]*. Stockholm: Prisma.
- Ramström, D. (1975) (red.). *Små företag – stora problem [Small firms – big problems]*. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Ruin, O. (1960). *Kooperativa förbundet 1899–1929. En organisationsstudie (The co-operative association 1899–1929. An organizational study)*. Lund Political Studies. Stockholm: Rabén & Sjögren.
- Rutherford, M. (1994). *Institutions in Economics: The Old and the New Institutionalism*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Rydén, R. (2004) (Ed.). *Jordbrukarnas kooperativa föreningar och intresseorganisationer i ett historiskt perspektiv [Farmer's co-operative association and trade organizations in a historical perspective]*. Stockholm: Kungl. Skogs- och lantbruksakademien.
- Rydén, R. (1998). "Att åka snålskjuts är icke hederligt". *De svenska jordbrukarnas organisationsprocess 1880–1947 [Free-riding is not honorable'. The Swedish Farmers' Organization Process]*. Dissertation. Gothenburg: Department of History.
- Shane, S. (2003). *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship. The Individual-Opportunity Nexus*.

- Sjölin, W. (1949). *Med Förenade krafter. Kooperativa förbundet 1899–1949 [With united forces. The co-operative association]*. Stockholm: Kooperativa Förbundet.
- Shane, S. (2003). *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship. The Individual-Opportunity Nexus*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Shane, S. & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research. *Academy of Management Review*. 25: 217–226.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1987:1911). *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*. Leipzig: Dunker & Humblot.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*. Harvard Economic Studies: Cambridge.
- Schumpeter J. A. (1939). *Business Cycles: A Theoretical, Historical, and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process*. Vol. 1. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1947). 'The creative response in economic history'. *The Journal of Economic History*. 7(2): 149–159.
- Seimu, S. M. L. (2015). *The Growth and Development of Coffee and Cotton Marketing Cooperatives in Tanzania, c.1932–1982*. Doctoral thesis. University of Central Lancashire.
- Shapero, A. & Sokol, L. (1982). Some social dimensions of entrepreneurship. In: Kent, C. et al. (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall: 72–90.
- Sizya, M. J. (2001). The role co-operatives play in poverty reduction in Tanzania. *United Nations International Day for Eradication of Poverty* 17.
- Skarstein, R. (2005). 'Economic Liberalization and Smallholder Productivity in Tanzania. From Promised Success to Real Failure, 1985–1998'. *Journal of Agrarian Change*. 5(3): 334–362.
- Statens Offentliga Utredningar [Governmental Public Investigations] (SOU 2001:123). Utvecklingskraft för hållbar utveckling. Delbetänkande av Ansvarskommittén. Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Statens Offentliga Utredningar (SOU 1998:77). Kompetens i småföretag. Småföretagardelegationen. Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Stanworth, M. J. K & Curran, J. (1976). Growth and the Small Firm. An Alternative View. *Journal of Management Studies*. 13(2).
- Stevenson, L. & St-Onge, A. (2005). Support for Growth-oriented Women Entrepreneurs in Tanzania. *International Labour Organization*.
- Sumelius, J., Tenaw, S., Bäckman, S., Bee, F., Chambo, S., Machimu, G., & Kumburu, N. Co-operatives as a Tool for Poverty Reduction and Promoting Business in Tanzania.
- Swedberg, R. (1993). *Joseph A. Schumpeter: His Life and Work*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford Polity Press.
- Tundui, H. P. (2012). *Gender and small business growth in Tanzania: the role of habitus*. Groningen: University of Groningen.

- Veblen, T. (1975:1904). *The Theory of Business Enterprise* (With a prefatory note by Joseph Dorfman and a Review by James Hayden). Clifton (N. J.): A. Kelley.
- Watson, J. and Robinson, S. (2003). Adjusting for risk in comparing the performances of male- and female-controlled SMEs. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 18(6): 773–788.
- Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism: Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting*. New York: Free Press.