

Social Entrepreneurship – a precursor to for-profit entrepreneurship in peripheral communities

Emer NÍ BHRÁDAIGH

Abstract

A longitudinal study using qualitative and quantitative data spanning more than one century, tracked the emergence and evolution of entrepreneurship in a historically disadvantaged, peripheral, rural, minority language area over 100 years. Rooted in the theoretical frameworks of corporate demography, organisation evolution, and entrepreneurship capital, social entrepreneurship (co-operatives & non-profits) was found to be important in developing the necessary entrepreneurship capital for private organisation building (rather than self-employed multiple income activity) entrepreneurship. While physical and human capitals were important, soft support-related social and psychological capitals were also key factors in the tourism, marine, and audio-visual sectors analysed.

Introduction

While enterprise development has come centre stage in terms of regional development, peripheral areas have often been developed primarily via inward / foreign direct investment, with indigenous entrepreneurship an afterthought. In rural areas incomers are often more entrepreneurially active than those born and reared in the area. While this pattern was largely well-known and documented in the chosen region, another factor uncovered during this longitudinal research project was the importance of public and social (in the sense of non-profit, or more than profit) entrepreneurship in kickstarting new industries which eventually attracted and/or fostered private entrepreneurship. This paper outlines how public and social entrepreneurship, in terms of strategic organisation-building, seems to have preceeded private for-profit entrepreneurship. The paper starts with a description of the focal area, the Irish County Galway Gaeltacht (Irish speaking area) and an overview of some Gaeltacht Studies research. This is followed by a review of the literatures of social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship capital as well as a brief review of corporate demography and organisation evolution. Following a description of the research methods used, the results obtained in terms of quantitative and qualitative data are presented. The paper ends with a discussion of a number of conclusions as well as some implications for policy development.

Focal Region

The focal community is a peripheral rural community in Co Galway on the West coast of Ireland, where the Irish (Gaelic) language is the main community language. Related to other Celtic languages such as Breton, Scots Gaelic, and Welsh, the Irish language was the majority language up to the mid 19th century when there was a remarkable shift to English within two generations, with the Irish language declining drastically from more than three million to 700,000 speakers (Hindley, 1990; Ó Murchú, 1970; Ó Tuathaigh, 1990). With a scholarly tradition stretching back centuries and across Europe through the monks 18th century colleges in Continental European cities such as Louvain, Paris, Rome, and Salamanca, by the late 19th century the language had become primarily an oral language spoken mainly along the western seaboard, in poorer regions. The language was viewed as an impediment to economic and social advancement, the colonial English language the key to success. By the end of the 19th century all administrative structures were operated through the medium of English with Irish speakers ridiculed for using the language in villages, towns, and cities. The Celtic Revival of the late 19th and early 20th century led to a renewed interest in the language. The government of the new independent Free State, later to become the Republic of Ireland, embraced the language and established the Gaeltacht Commission which delivered its report in 1926 (Government of Ireland, 1926). Since then

the areas in which the language is the dominant community language have been afforded specific Gaeltacht status ('Irish speaking community / region') in order to preserve and promote the language. The Gaeltacht covers areas in seven counties, mainly along the western seaboard, the largest area being in Co Galway. In terms of industrial development and entrepreneurship development, the area is currently administered by Údarás na Gaeltachta (The Gaeltacht Authority), a state body with a democratically-elected board. From the the 1950s to 1970s Gaeltarra Éireann ('Gaelic Products of Ireland') served this function. Due to the area's peripherality and more so its particular disadvantage (very poor land, jagged coastline, weak infrastructure, overall lack of development), it was afforded particular developmental support from 1891 to the 1920s, by the Congested Districts Board, and by a series of Government departments from then to the 1950s.

The Galway Gaeltacht is the subject of this study. With a population of 42,000, it spans an area stretching 80km from the suburbs of Galway city westwards in South Connemara. It also includes the three Aran islands well-known to tourists. The area has the dubious honour of having been one of the poorest areas in the former Congested Districts and still has some of the pockets of the highest unemployment rates in the state. At present the main economic activities are marine resources, the audio-visual sector, some light manufacturing, and small modern clusters such as medical devices. A large percentage of people work in the public sector either in the area or in Galway city. Tourism is largely based on day trippers and short stay tourists on the Aran Islands and on language-based Irish colleges, similar to youth summer camps, with teenagers staying with local families and attending classes and other activities during the day. As the Irish language is the first official language of the state, and is a compulsory subject in the school curriculum, and is afforded particular protection in the Official Languages Act (2003), there are particular employment opportunities available to Gaeltacht Irish speakers in the public sector.

Gaeltacht Studies Research

Most of the research and intellectual writing on the Gaeltacht has been in the disciplines of socio-linguistics (language revival and preservation) (Denvir, 2002; Mac an Iomaire, 1983; Ó Giollagáin et al, 2007; Ó Tuathaigh, 1990); rural development (Ó Cinnéide Keane & Cawley, 1985); socio-economic development (Fennell, 1976; Johnson, 1993; Keane, Cawley & Ó Cinnéide, 1983; Kearns, 1974; Mac Aodha, 1971; Ó Conghaile, 1988); co-operative studies (Akutagawa, 1986; Breathnach, 1986; Johnson, 1979) and the impact of state aid and policy (Kenny, 1972; Commins, 1988; Ó Cinnéide & Keane, 1988). In summary there is general agreement on the following issues in this literature. From the turn of the 20th century, much of the impetus for the development of the Gaeltacht came from the urban-based middle classes and intelligentsia which voiced reservations about the detrimental effects of modernisation on the Irish language. Meanwhile the Gaeltacht people themselves continued to feel peripheral and disadvantaged; and continued to see emigration and the adoption of the English language as a means of advancement. They developed a dependency on state support. The state policy dating from the 1920s, of using the education system to initially create an Irish speaking nation and later at least a bilingual nation attracted many Gaeltacht school leavers out of the Gaeltacht and into the teaching profession (Johnson, 1992; Jones, 2006, Kelly, 2002) or into the public sector in general.

In terms of industrial or enterprise development, in the private sector and in the relevant state bodies, most of the managerial positions were held by non-Gaeltacht people based outside the Gaeltacht, and later by incomers to the Gaeltacht. The Gaeltacht Civil Rights movement in the 1960s was the first time Gaeltacht people organised themselves into a proper bottom-up 'collective effervescence'. This led to the establishment of the co-operative movement (long after elsewhere in the country) in the 1970s and the establishment of the local state-funded community radio station (Raidió na Gaeltachta) in 1973, and the eventual establishment of TG4 the Irish-medium television broadcaster in 1996. Gaeltarra Éireann initially set up in 1957 with headquarters in Dublin, to develop Gaeltacht state industries such as knitting and weaving transferred its headquarters to the Galway Gaeltacht in 1969). An eventual result of the Gaeltacht Civil Rights campaign was the replacement of

Gaeltarra Éireann with a democratically elected Gaeltacht Authority – Údarás na Gaeltachta with the responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural development of the region.

In conclusion much of the Gaeltacht business-related research addressed socio-economic development, industrialisation, and self-organisation in the second half of the 20th century; or was framed in the linguistic impact of these changes. None specifically addressed enterprise development and this author's work is the first such comprehensive study. It tracks the emergence and evolution of entrepreneurship in the area from the 1890s to date. This paper discusses the role of social entrepreneurship in that pattern of evolution.

Literature Review

This section is a review of some of the relevant social entrepreneurship literature as well as a review of the theoretical framework used in this study – namely longitudinal corporate demographic organisation evolution in conjunction with entrepreneurship capital.

Social Entrepreneurship – definitions and differences

Social entrepreneurship is a relatively new but growing domain within entrepreneurship research. Definitions abound but are in general agreement on addressing societal problems, and being about more than profit as distinct from the more established definitions of 'non-profit' or not-for-profit (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006; Nyssens, 2006; Perrini, 2006; Scottish Executive, 2007). This author's favoured definition of entrepreneurship is the encompassing generalist one suggested by Steyaert and Hjorth:

Entrepreneurship is a complex social-creative process that influences, multiplies, transforms, re-imagines and alters the outlook of the space in society in which it is at once grounded and contextualised. (2006, 2)

This definition embraces the concept of social entrepreneurship. In this research social entrepreneurship is operationalised as new enterprises established by the state or state bodies or state-funded public bodier, or those established by voluntary or community groups, including co-operatives. This It excludes enterprises established and owned by private individuals or groups of private individuals with a for-profit motive. This definition is largely in line with that used by Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern (2006). It is more encompassing than the European Commission's definition of the social economy namely co-operatives, mutuals, associations and foundations (McManus, 2004).

One of the differences between for-profit and social entrepreneurship include the greater need for social entrepreneurs to marshal the necessary resources and skills (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006; Perrini, 2006), thus having to draw more heavily on weak ties in a larger network. 'Patient capital' is required as the return on investment may take a decade or a generation or even more (Marino, 2006) especially when deep-rooted social problems are being addressed. In less developed countries or communities, there may be a modest perception of the need for social services and most provided on an informal family basis. By contrast in well-developed welfare states, these services are provided by the state itself or by the non-profit sector leading to a higher social capital or higher number of organisations. In drawing on a wider range of resources, social enterprises need a supportive institutional environment which nurtures their development (Hulgård & Spear, 2006). However the problem with self-help social enterprises established by disadvantaged people is that the internal high bonding social capital and strong ties overshadow the low levels of bridging social capital with other groups – in other words networking outside of one's own community (Hulgård & Spear, 2006). These organisations can benefit from including 'outsiders' on their boards to ensure higher bridging social capital. Another differing characteristic of social enterprises is the over emphasis on the social mission of the organisation to the detriment of high performance, accountability or value for money (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2006), and the difficulty in measuring 'social value' (Brooks, 2009). Underperforming social enterprises enjoy higher levels of forgiveness than market-based for-profit organisations. It is against this backdrop that the theoretical framework of longitudinal corporate demography organisational evolution and entrepreneurship capital are discussed.

Longitudinal Studies

Leading thinkers such as Durkheim (1912 [1971]) and Schumpeter (1943) have stated that change, such as creative destruction, takes time. In their work on corporate demography and organisation evolution, Carroll & Hannon (2000) and Aldrich & Ruef (2006) have also highlighted the benefits of tracing back to the origins of new beginnings. By taking a longitudinal view, one can gain different insights – especially at the macro level of a particular human community or region. No landscape is a tabula rasa; it has centuries and millennia of history. Similar to a physical landscape the entrepreneurial landscape might witness dramatic changes such as the building of an industrial estate, or a mushrooming of new audio-visual companies, but it also witnesses changes over longer periods of time – increases in education levels, changes in attitudes towards innovation. Much such cultural change requires more than generation or more. A factory can be built in a rural community but can the local population hitherto mainly involved in small-scale agriculture take on the senior management roles and strategically develop a new industry sector overnight? At micro level one can often explain why no new firm of a particular kind exists but explaining the dearth of entrepreneurship at a regional level requires this longer term view and understanding. Identifying the Pioneers, those initial innovative enterprises who kickstarted a new industry, and identifying patterns across different industries should better inform policy makers on how to kickstart further new industries. This can be done via the theoretical approaches of corporate demography and organisational evolution. At societal level the patterns uncovered can be analysed through the concept of entrepreneurship capital and its constituent capitals. These issues are now discussed.

Corporate Demography

Carroll and Hannon (2000) take organisational ecology and demographics as their base in looking at the 'flow of corporate vital events over time and their interrelationships' (2000, 39). Demographic analysis is perhaps most insightful when conducted at a number of different levels from the individual firm up to the collective, and by comparisons between the levels. While we can see the number of new firms established in any given year, the overall macro patterns might provide more insight. While one new fish farm is interesting, the birth and evolution of the fish farming sector takes time, perhaps a few decades. Tracing back to that original fish farm, how it developed, how (or whether) it was fostered, what setbacks it encountered, how it was the catalyst for a whole new industry or business model could give insights into how new industries may be planned, born, or kickstarted. Numerous studies have looked at Populations of organisations – that is, particular industries or business models (co-operatives; trade unions) (Aldrich et al, 1990; Delacroix & Carroll, 1983; Freeman, 1990; Hannan et al, 1990, Singh, 1990) and there is a need for more Community level research. Baum and Singh (1994) also suggest that in addition to the ecological approach one can examine the genealogical aspects. For example, a study the furniture industry in Co Monaghan, Ireland showed that 75 percent of respondent firms were in some way related to the largest and one of the oldest firms in the area (Mottiar & Jacobson, 2002).

Organisational Evolution

The key issues of interest to Aldrich and Ruef (2006) in their survey of a wide range of studies on organisational evolution are how new Populations emerge, how new variations of organisational forms emerge out of these Populations, and how the organisations are imprinted and legitimised by the environment at the time of emergence. Triggering events and the imprinting that happens at that stage can have life long impacts and lead to path dependency consequences (Stinchcombe, 1965). The form of the first fish farm or the first Irish college can become the accepted way business / ownership model. The environment at time of founding of individual firms or of a new Pioneer can imprint how that new Population evolves. The co-operatives initially established to provide water and other utility services for the local community can find it difficult to vary from that home community focus. The co-operative involved in many different activities can find it difficult to specialise in one area in

order to successfully grow. In Aldrich and Ruef's model (2006) these variations are what creates new forms of business perhaps spawning a new Population of businesses.

Emergence of New Populations

Working back from the current landscape of enterprises is about seeking out when and how did these new Populations of organisations emerge; what variations and selections occurred; why did the Populations evolve as they did; and what strategies did the individual firms in the Populations, the Population as a whole, and the Communities of Populations employ to develop and grow, to gain legitimacy within the environment in which they operated. This author has identified three interrelated issues related to this emergence of new Populations – namely a) the Pioneers who first emerge with the new form; b) the liability of newness they may have suffered, c) the imprinting they suffered via the contemporaneous forces and factors at time of establishment. The next section discusses these issues and the strategies the Population members employ in order to facilitate growth.

Pioneers

Pioneering entrepreneurs are those who lead the way in establishing new forms of enterprise (Aldrich & Ruef, 2006, 187). They are the true innovators and creative destructors, whose ideas and leadership are copied and / or modified by the 'early fledglings' and later by the rest. They often encounter disbelief; discouragement; and lack of understanding as they endeavour to marshal the resources required to realise their visions. They are on a steep learning curve in striving to gain socio-political and cognitive legitimacy. They spawn new Populations and as these new Populations emerge, variations in the organisational form occur, some intentionally through experimentation, or because of incentives to innovate, others through mistakes or general collective action in response to new situations. The more variation occurs the more opportunities for transformation there are. Due to various forces, some variations are eliminated, and others selected and retained as more suitable to the new environmental context and situation. These retained variations are then preserved and/or duplicated. They eventually struggle in contest for the limited resources available. By now a new Population has become embedded in the system.

Liability of Newness and Imprinting

The pioneering firms and the early fledglings in this new Population are affected by Stinchcombe's liability of newness (1965), in other words the difficulties faced by new organisations in their infancy compared to older organisations. As new industries or nascent entrepreneurs are particularly dependent on the surrounding environment in their efforts to marshal the required resources, they are particularly influenced by this liability of newness. Tripathy (1990) and Nenadic (1990) found evidence to support this theory in their longitudinal studies. Teasdale and Minty (2004) found that 50 percent of Scottish VAT registered firms had ceased operations within five years.

New and especially pioneering organisations have to make such an effort to marshal resources from the surrounding environment that they are heavily scrutinised and affected by the environment at that crucial stage (Carroll & Hannan, 2000). They are imprinted (Stinchcombe, 1965) by the culture, society, values, and prevailing attitudes and conditions at that time, especially in their efforts to gain cognitive and social legitimacy from the key actors in the environment such as policy makers, investors, unions, and other stakeholders. Carroll and Hannan define imprinting as 'a process in which events occurring at certain key developmental stages have persisting, possibly lifelong consequences' (2000, 205), especially at the founding stage. Due to the strong effect of imprinting, focussing on the period during which a new Population (or form of organisation) emerges is a crucial theoretical issue (Aldrich, 1995). By focussing on the emergence of a new Population of organisations (a new industry sector or a new form of organisation for example) one may uncover / reveal particular circumstances of theoretical, empirical, and policy importance.

In their study of organisational design and human resources policies in high technology firms in Silicon Valley, Baron, Burton and Hannan (1999) found that the employment relations models adopted by the founders significantly affected the early careers of their firms – they had adopted the conventional wisdom at that time, and policies adopted by subsequent CEOs had less of an impact. Tucker, Singh and Meinhard's (1990) study of voluntary social services organisations (VSSOs) in Toronto over a period of 13 years showed that organisations founded in a dense organisational population environment, were less likely to change than those founded at other times.

Strategies Facilitating Growth of New Populations

Successful entrepreneurs need a supportive environment (Bull & Willard, 1995) in which their actions are legitimised by the 'rules and norms of the society in which they organisation functions' (van de Ven, 1995, 45). A number of strategies are required to facilitate the growth of entrepreneurs' firms and of new Populations. Aldrich and Ruef (2006) analyse these strategies at four different levels – within the individual organisation; within the Population; between the Populations and at the Community level. They propose a typology of socio-political and cognitive legitimacy. Cognitive legitimacy is about how understood or taken for granted a particular form or way of doing business has become, within a given region or industry. Pioneering entrepreneurs learn 'on the job' but by the time the new Population is established there is an accepted, known way of running it. Thus Irish colleges are run on a seasonal part-time basis, are educational establishments rather than specialist or multi-functional tourism organisations targeting the second level school pupil market among other markets. Routines become culturally embedded; efforts at improvements are based on competency enhancement rather than creative destruction. Socio-political legitimacy is about how the institutions and cultural and political élite (for example, Education, mass media, religion, local and national government) who have the power to change cultural norms and values in a society approve of the new form (Aldrich & Ruef, 2006). Successful entrepreneurs have to work on building networks of trust and co-operation in their efforts to gain legitimacy. It is all the more difficult for the competency-destroying Pioneer introducing a private for-profit adult language tourism enterprise learning on the job – as there are now know accepted ways of conducting the business. In addition the Pioneer needs to build a network of trust and co-operation via the institutions hitherto unfamiliar with the new form of business.

Stages of Emergence of New Populations

The Pioneers establish new forms of enterprises, which in time develop into a Population of enterprises, such as the fish processing stations which were developed along the West coast of Ireland at the end of the 19th century. As this Population develops, related organisations emerge – netmaking, boatmaking, salt supply, barrell making and marketing, thus creating a social structure of interrelated Populations of organisations – a Community of organisations. These Populations struggle in the beginning to gain legitimacy among their peers (other organisations), the local (human) community and the various local, national and supranational institutions. In this paper it will be argued that the Pioneers in three key industries or Communities of Populations in the chosen peripheral region, namely marine resources, tourism, and audio-visual were primarily social or public entrepreneurs followed eventually by private for-profit entrepreneurs. The social and public entrepreneurship paved the way for the private entrepreneurs who would otherwise have faced enormous challenges in terms of marshalling the necessary resources and gaining the relevant legitimacy to exploit the opportunities they saw, or indeed opportunities may have been more difficult to recognise much less exploit given the disadvantages and low entrepreneurship capital in the area.

At macro regional or community level, environmental issues arguably have more effect, especially in new industries and in the start-up phases where entrepreneurs have to depend far more on the environment than in larger organisations, as they marshal the resources to establish a new form of business. This environment can be analysed through the relatively new concept of entrepreneurship capital and its constituents, physical, human,

financial, social, cultural, and psychological capital. The more well established concepts of physical and financial capital are well discussed in the literature of planning, economics, geography, and industrial development. They could be termed the 'hard' tangible capitals. The latter four capitals are intangible 'soft' assets which pose more difficulty in their definition and measurement, and are discussed here in more details.

What follows is a description of entrepreneurship capital, and the constituent capitals of interest in this study, namely – human, psychological, cultural, and social. Physical and financial capital are not discussed in depth as they did not emerge as being of particular relevance in this research any more than might be in any rural or peripheral area. However reference is made to some physical and financial capital issues in the findings.

Entrepreneurship Capital

Entrepreneurship capital (Audretsch & Keilbach, 2004) is a recent addition to other forms of capital listed above and is defined by Audretsch and Keilbach (2004) as:

A milieu of agents and institutions conducive to the creation of new firms ... such as social acceptance of entrepreneurial behaviour, individuals willing to deal with the risk of creating new firms, and the activity of bankers and venture capital agents willing to share risks and benefits. (Audretsch, Keilbach and Lehmann, 2006, 60).

They acknowledge that the measurement and operationalising of entrepreneurship capital is complex and difficult, and that many of its components 'defy quantification' (2006, 69). Their subsequent measures are largely rooted in economics literature through the unidimensional measure of new firm start-up rates, with two submeasures based on start-ups in high technology manufacturing industries with an R&D expenditure of more than 2.5 percent of sales, and start-ups in the ICT industries. While they themselves are of the opinion that start-up activity in any industry should be included, they have taken on board the opinions of other scholars that only those start-ups involving innovative activity should be included.

Given the influence of human, social, and cultural capital as discussed below, Audretsch, Keilbach and Lehmann's definition is quite limiting, excluding non-technical innovation, such as new business forms, social and public entrepreneurship and the wide range of factors which lead to the emergence of new forms of Populations, whether high-tech or not. The general findings of their research are that entrepreneurial capital (as they define it, namely new firm start-ups) is a phenomenon of densely populated regions and that it improves economic performance. While they propose that public policies promoting entrepreneurship are expected to positively affect economic performance, they do not discuss what type of policies might be appropriate. It is interesting to note that although Audretsch et al say that new firm start-ups are a phenomenon of densely populated areas, rural areas actually have high start-up rates (GEM Wales, 2007), although not with the high growth levels normally found in urban areas, where high growth (and usually high tech) firms tend to be established. The usefulness of their definition does not extend beyond this context to underdeveloped or peripheral areas where entrepreneurship capital needs to be fostered from a very low starting point.

Beugelsdijk (2007) examined what he termed entrepreneurial culture, by combining specific questions from the European Values Survey, with human capital education levels, and patent per capita information. He found that economic growth in European regions could be explained by differences in entrepreneurial culture, but in an indirect manner. An earlier study (Beugeldjik & van Schaik, 2005) showed a correlation between regional economic growth and social capital in the EU NUTS1 areas in 54 regions in seven EU countries. Their measure of social capital was based on trust and association membership questions in the European Values Survey, measures also used by Putnam et al (2003) in Italy. In Beugelsdijk and van Schaik's study, Wales and Scotland, the surveyed regions nearest to Ireland, scored relatively low on the associational score, relatively high on trust, but relatively low overall on the social capital index.

Entrepreneurship capital is shaped by values concerning entrepreneurial behaviour, career expectations, norms that affect entrepreneurial expression, social and economic networks, and socio-cultural legitimacy of entrepreneurial behaviour. In any particular region, especially a peripheral rural region, entrepreneurial capital can be inhibited by some aspects of social capital, such as an emphasis on tradition and outmigration of potential leaders. High entrepreneurship areas, once established, can be self-reinforcing in providing much entrepreneurial activity and providing role models for potential entrepreneurs (Bygrave & Minniti, 2000; Lee, Florida & Acs, 2004). In addition, while other capitals might be well developed, psychological capital might prevail as a barrier to higher entrepreneurship capital.

Human Capital

Human capital in terms of the entrepreneur's formal education, knowledge, skills and prior experience was first discussed by Adam Smith ([1904]1976) and later developed by Gary Becker (1964). A number of researchers have highlighted the importance of this capital in terms of entrepreneurship (Beugelsdijk, 2007; Brüderl & Preisendörfer, 1998; Butler & Herring, 1991; Georgellis & Wall, 2000; Shane, 2003). Brüderl & Preisendörfer examined whether business founders with low human capital made additional efforts to compensate for this disadvantage by investing more effort in developing social capital, and found partial evidence to support their hypothesis. Butler and Herring (1991) found human capital to be less predictive than other aspects of an individual's make-up, such as religion and psychological traits. In their study of entrepreneurial human capital in British regions, Georgellis and Wall (2000) refer to all aspects of a region apart from the economic market factors affecting self-employment levels. They use the term more to describe psychological and behavioural traits, rather than the meaning traditionally used - that is, an individual's skills, knowledge, education, and experience.

High levels of education and of human capital do not necessarily lead to increased recognition and exploitation of opportunities (Davidsson & Honig, 2003). Overemphasis on formal education and certification may dampen risk-taking, the forms of formal education chosen or given high status in a society may lead individuals on particular career paths. Davidsson and Honig's research on 380 nascent entrepreneurs illustrated that high human capital led to a higher incidence of opportunity recognition, but that the aspect of human capital most influential in successful opportunity exploitation and establishment of new enterprises was previous experience in a business start-up (2003). While they also addressed business education and training in their research they found it not to have much influence.

Psychological Capital

A fairly new concept is psychological capital (PsyCap), developed by Luthans, Youssef and Avolio (2007) using human and social capital as their point of departure. They measured four components of PsyCap, namely self-efficacy, optimism, hope/perseverance, and resiliency. Luthans et al apply this concept to management and leadership issues, proposing that it can be measured in relation to firms' success. Their work is new pioneering work developed and tested in the field of organisational behaviour. It is generated from the relatively new field of positive psychology. Positive psychology has roots in humanist psychology, with emphasis on wellness and on self-actualisation, rather than the more well known areas of psychology which since the middle of the 20th century have mainly addressed psychological problems and disorders and how they can be treated. In the last few years, this new concept of psychological capital has been applied to entrepreneurship, for example in the link between entrepreneurs' psychological capital and their authentic leadership (Jensen & Luthans, 2006); the relationship between entrepreneurs' psychological capital and well-being (Hmieleski & Carr, 2007); and the value of the psychological capital of immigrant entrepreneurs (Luthans, Norman & Jensen, 2007). The author has not located any study linking psychological capital with a peripheral community or an indigenous minority community, such as that of the Galway Gaeltacht. Given the number of references to

psychological issues the author found during the course of this research, it could be a fruitful avenue of research.

Cultural Capital

The concept of cultural capital was developed by the French psychologist Pierre Bourdieu in the 1970s (Fowler, 1997). It refers to the advantages and status a person can gain in society through her/his forms of knowledge, skills and education. Much of a person's cultural capital is gained from parents, and includes the language one speaks (accent, vocabulary etc), interest in and knowledge of art forms, especially 'high arts' such as classical music and visual art. Cultural capital is related to social class and as the education system and curriculum are primarily developed by the well-educated middle classes, that class benefits more from the system. Sociologist Florida's thesis (2002) is that those of high intellect and cultural capital congregate where their diversity, innovation and creativity are encouraged to flourish, in turn attracting entrepreneurs and those of high human capital. Essentially entrepreneurs and well-educated people choose where to live, based on life-style and quality of life issues as well as on economic opportunities. Regions with heavy emphasis on tradition, lacking in high cultural capital will have difficulty attracting or fostering high human capital or innovative entrepreneurs (Florida, 2002; Lee, Florida & Acs, 2004).

Social Capital

The idea of social capital has a long history dating back to debates on groups, democracy and social integration. It was Bourdieu who first defined and systematically analysed the concept, defining it as 'the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition (Bourdieu, 1985, quoted in Portes, 1998, 3). Putnam has researched the historical roots of social capital in his work on the economically successful Emilia-Romagna region in Italy. He proposes that the economic success is rooted in civic engagement and high social capital stretching back as far as the 11th century through the formation of guilds and of mutual co-operative organisations such as co-operatives and rotating credit organisations in the 19th century (Putnam et al, 1993). His thesis is that history matters, and that civics and culture influence economic development rather than vice versa. He posits that social context and history profoundly affect the effectiveness of institutions. Citizens in high social capital communities demand, and are prepared to act collectively to get, more effective public services. Those in less civic communities are more commonly alienated and cynical supplicants (Putnam et al, 1993, 182). Svendsen and Svendsen (2004) have also traced the evolution of social capital in a number of Danish rural communities.

Institutional Thickness

The theory of social capital seeks to explain how some people make beneficial use of their networks and links with others in their community/society. A community with high social capital will have a large number of organisations and institutions such as churches, schools, sports, leisure and cultural clubs and associations, business associations, political parties etc., in essence high institutional thickness (Beugelsdijk & van Schaik, 2005). Through the strong network of interrelationships, certain attitudes, norms and values will emerge. Strong and weak ties will develop between individuals (Granovetter, 1995); high levels of trust will develop between group members, reducing transaction costs and increasing the possibility of co-operative / collective action (Beugelsdijk & van Schaik, 2005). This trust, the ties and networks, and the high social capital can influence educational attainment, and access to sources of beneficial information, to employment, to new ideas and practices, to suppliers and customers. Entrepreneurs make use of these institutions and ties in gaining the legitimacy they require to build their enterprises.

Detrimental Effects of Social Capital

While high social capital is generally seen as positive, there are detrimental effects that can arise out of certain aspects such as emphasis on tradition at the expense of innovation, the

exclusion of outsiders, or dense strong ties (Portes, 1998). These would be common in marginal or disadvantaged groups such as urban enclaves, peripheral communities or indigenous, immigrant or linguistic minorities. Years or generations of outside discrimination are followed by the emergence of downward levelling norms where the community itself frowns on the more ambitious. Group members are pressurised by the group to maintain group solidarity by not joining another group – such as the managerial team or the middle classes. They might be under pressure to support an extended family and community preventing advancement, specialisation and the accumulation of entrepreneurial success. Associating with a new group and adopting new behaviours or attitudes, might limit the socio-cultural legitimacy of their entrepreneurial achievements. The incomer might find it easier to creatively destruct the equilibrium. This form of high social capital might lead to outmigration by those individuals whose entrepreneurial spirit and ambition have been crushed by the pressures of tradition and the stifling barriers to individuality and modernity they encounter in their own communities (Kane, 1977). In the 1980s, a time of high unemployment, 35 percent of recent Irish emigrants left permanent full-time jobs due to low job satisfaction and lack of suitable opportunities at home. These outmigrants may have become entrepreneurs in the places and communities where they themselves were incomers, as attested for in the well-researched literature on immigrant or 'ethnic' entrepreneurship (Ram & Deakins, 1995).

Social Capital and Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship researchers have drawn heavily on social capital (Aldrich & Martinez, 2003; Brüderl & Presendörfer, 1998; Jack & Anderson, 2002; Licht & Siegel, 2006) primarily with reference to networks and to Granovetter's work on weak and strong ties (Burt, 2002; Davidsson & Honig, 2003; Granovetter, 1995). High social capital can exist not only in individuals but also at firm, Population of firms and Community of Population levels. Entrepreneurs can work collectively at developing social networks that result in collective action at the level of Populations of new enterprises – for example in legitimising new technologies or business models (Aldrich & Martinez, 2003). High network support in the form of Chambers of Commerce for example can increase the probability of survival and growth (Brüderl & Presendörfer, 1998). In rural areas being embedded in the local community can benefit small entrepreneurs (Jack & Anderson, 2002), legitimising their business and providing customer and employee loyalty, but overembeddedness could stifle entrepreneurial behaviour. Davidsson and Honig (2003) found that during the process from opportunity recognition to opportunity exploitation, specialist knowledge, contacts and actions were increasingly required. Interaction with public support agencies was not as important. From a public policy point of view this would mean that support agencies need to provide increasingly specialist tailored support as nascent entrepreneurs go through the process of enterprise growth.

Methods Used

As no enterprise development research had been conducted on Gaeltacht data, this author's research is primarily a descriptive, exploratory and explanatory project. The first step was to describe what had happened. The exploratory aspect was to gain familiarity and understanding; to seek out and examine trends, categories, exceptions, contradictions, and to put them in context. One objective was to find particularly interesting topics requiring further more rigorous study. The chosen paradigm is a blend of positivist research based largely on quantitative data from secondary sources and phenomenological research based mainly on qualitative data from secondary and primary sources. The two approaches complement and enrich each other. A database of all state-supported new enterprises was collated from annual reports of the three main state bodies which have had responsibility for enterprise or industrial development since the late 1800s – namely the Congested Districts Board (1891–1923), Gaeltarra Éireann (1958–1979) and Údarás na Gaeltachta (1980–2003). Data for the intervening period 1923 to 1957 was collated from official state department documents in National Archive and various university libraries. These data were complemented by qualitative data from historical documents, secondary sources such as local history publications and memoirs, and interviews with 57 key interviewees, the eldest of

whom had served in a senior civil service position in the 1940s. Interviewees included entrepreneurs in the three chosen Communities (audio-visual, marine resources, and tourism); community leaders; public policy makers and others. The author has also spent an extensive amount of her time since childhood in the area, including a five month stay during the interviewing stage.

While the data collated were comprehensive and wide-ranging, there were a number of limitations. The quantitative data are limited to state-supported enterprises. National state business related statistics are published at county level only, and for the earlier period prior to the 1970s, at provincial (regional) level, particularly for the the less developed, less populated province of Connaught in which Co Galway is situated. While the Companies Registration Office database was consulted to ascertain formal registration and thus size/growth aspirations of new start-ups, data per county or per part of county cannot be retrieved. In addition the Central Statistics Office does not publish Gaeltacht region data for any human or corporate census except for data on Irish language usage patterns. Business directories and databases were consulted in an effort to ascertain the extent of non-state supported entrepreneurial activity. Business directories from the 1980s to 2003 revealed a small number of additional start-ups. Business directories for the earlier period, especially from the 1890s to the 1960s did not exist, or where they did, were limited to the three main cities of Dublin, Belfast and Cork. Given the dearth of entries in the early 20th century state provincial-level statistics and in the private business directories; and the extent of state support available to the region, and the qualitative data evidence, the author is confident that the state-supported enterprises provide an accurate and reliable reflection of the evolution and emergence of entrepreneurship in the focal region. The strength of convergence of stories and opinions from the archives and interviews increases the quality of the data and the findings.

Results Obtained

The patterns of emergence and evolution in the three chosen industry sectors – marine, audio visual, tourism, revealed remarkable similarities considering that they emerged in different stages over the century. The natural resources based industry has a long history of centuries, the tourism industry emerged with limited evolution primarily from the 1960s onwards; the audio-visual sector blossomed in the 1990s. The main pattern leading to success was that of significant state involvement and ownership, followed by social entrepreneurship in the form of co-operatives or non-profit organisations, followed eventually by private for-profit ownership. Many of the initial stages of emergence and evolution were led by incomers due to the low entrepreneurship capital, especially psychological capital and low social legitimacy of entrepreneurship in the community, and in the earlier period the low levels of formal education.

Incubation

By the late 19th century, the western seaboard and in particular what was to become the Galway Gaeltacht suffered from poverty, lack of development and an overall lack of hope. At the same time the Celtic Revival led primarily by the better-off, well-educated classes in Dublin recognised the importance of the Gaeltacht areas as the well of the old Gaelic culture key to Ireland's future. The Congested Districts Board was established by the British government in 1891 largely in response to civil unrest regarding land reform. Lack of parliamentary success in obtaining legal and political independence led to *de-facto* self-government in the form of various self-help organisations such as the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society (IAOS), the Gaelic Athletic Association; and for cultural and linguistic matters the Gaelic League. There seemed to be a need for a cultural revolution before political or economic reform could take place. Matthews (2003) argues that these organisations used tradition as a stimulus for innovation and change. Other national Dublin-based, non-profit bodies, or in today's terms, social enterprises, more closely related to economic / industrial development included the Irish Industrial Development Association (established 1906), Inghinidhe na hÉireann ('the daughters of Ireland'), 1901; the Irish

Central Bureau for the Employment of Women (1903) and The Society of United Irishwomen (1910). The IAOS was centrally involved in administering some of the schemes funded by the Congested Districts Board (CDB), and in establishing the Raiffeisen Co-operative Banks. The Gaelic League led initiatives similar to the workers' education schemes in other countries such as Denmark and Nova Scotia, Canada, but with more emphasis on language and culture rather than on subjects more directly relevant perhaps to economic development – such as science, technology and business. The IAOS and the Gaelic League both operated in Gaeltacht areas, as did some of the other social enterprises listed above. At local Gaeltacht level, many of the initiatives were led by the local shopkeeper, the schoolteacher and parish priest – as happened in other rural areas at the turn of the 20th century. The CDB itself established and managed many fish processing plants, textiles workshops and other industrial training centres, largely managed by incomers rather than by local people, despite complaints that local talent was available for the jobs (Royal Commission, 1908). Other than these state or voluntary activities, the business structure was based primarily on 'own-account' or self-employed tradespeople and the small-farm based family. There were a handful of formal organisations – mainly larger merchants and one or two factories in the city area.

The human capital of the area was very low. The 1901 census records an average level of illiteracy of 60 percent in the Galway Gaeltacht (CDB, 1903); up to 42 percent of the population in certain areas were Irish monolingual illiterate – in a country where most formal business was conducted through English. Other than the traditional institutions of family and parish, there were very few other organisations in the Galway Gaeltacht; the national self-help organisations listed above often found it difficult to establish branches in the area. Gerschenkron (1966) proposes that craft guilds instilled some of the pre-requisites for entrepreneurship and innovation, namely quality craftsmanship; honesty in business dealings, and strategic organisation-based co-operation, a situation that did not exist in the Galway Gaeltacht. Many of the incomers employed by the CDB to run CDB funded industries did not speak Irish thus lessening their potential impact. Given the poverty levels, any earned income was spent on improved nutrition and living standards rather than invested in entrepreneurship; no 'capitalists' came forward to invest in the area (CDB, 1914), hardly surprising given the overall lack of development.

Obstacles to entrepreneurship were not merely financial. The long history of colonisation, and of emigration had led to a poverty of the spirit, with the more able having emigrated to England or to North America, and those who stayed behind lacking the necessary psychological capital. The leader of the IAOS co-operative self-help movement Horace Plunkett, a Protestant, complained that Roman Catholics – the majority religion in Ireland and in the Galway Gaeltacht – was 'apathetic, thriftless and almost non-industrial' (Plunkett, 1904). The CDB also often reported this general apathy, lack of hope and ambition, and lack of interest in improvements (CDB 1891 – 1923 Annual Reports). But there is also evidence of complaints about the CDB officials' resistance to local knowledge and difficulties integrating with the local community (Royal Commission, 1908; Synge, 1966), perhaps compounding the local community's lack of faith in the London and Dublin-based Government. In one way the Galway Gaeltacht was a more severe microcosm of a national problem, judging by Plunkett's (1902) address at the 1902 Cork International Exhibition and comments on Roman Catholics.

The CDB baseline report of 1891 gives quantitative evidence of the lack of organisation-building entrepreneurship in the Galway Gaeltacht (CDB, 1892). In summary, in an area with a population of 52,155, there were 131 fairs or markets per annum and just under 2,000 boats, and 16 freshwater fisheries for leisure anglers, but only one fish curing station and one bank or loan fund. In response to the question about 'whether any organised effort has been made to develop the resources or improve the condition of the people' (CDB, 1892-1897; Morrissey, 2001) six of the 10 area reports state 'none'. Three of the reports list social entrepreneurship efforts by wealthy women in knitting, basket making and boat making. Three also list an emigration scheme; one mentions an Industries Fund; another an

effort to buy out crossline fishermen. The character of the people is described mainly as hardworking and industrious but also suspicious of innovation, lacking motivation, easily discouraged, and looking to Government for help. What is striking about the reports is the near lack of a business infrastructure beyond family run small scale merchants / shopkeepers, who were often the fulcrum of the village or townland in terms of buying farm produce and selling food and household wares.

The CDB Annual Reports (1891 – 1923) report on the various initiatives funded by them – either managed directly or by non-profit organisations such as the Community Development Agricultural Banks, the Parish Committee or organisations such as the Beekeepers' Associations. When not run by the CDB's own 'instructors' or 'instructresses', the textiles workshops were sometimes run by the parish priest or by a wealthy private woman in the spirit of social entrepreneurship. These term instructor illustrates that these were viewed as training initiatives rather than for-profit businesses. The CDB Industrial Loan Fund Applications for the years 1901 to 1922 provided loans ranging from from £1 for individuals to buy carpentry tools up to knitting machines and tools for motor engine repair, and in one or two instances for equipment for factories. By 1922 organisation building was still quite under-developed. The Parish Committees, largely made up of local clergymen; resident landlords or their agents; and other local leaders excluding the local trader (who would benefit directly from the disbursements of the Committee), were accused of doing good work with zeal but were not good at record keeping (CDB, 1914). The Agricultural Raiffeisen Banks were initially successful but ultimately failed within two to three to decades. Various reasons suggested include lack of savings in a subsistence agricultural area; weak management; social networks so strong that there was an unwillingness to take action against defaulters; and lack of involvement of local leaders more acceptable to the local community (priests and schoolmasters, rather than landlords etc). Loans were also seen as a conduit for Government grant-aid rather than as an investment in the local area (Guinnane, 1994). Essentially the Banks failed to achieve the social legitimacy required to flourish.

In summary, by the time of the dissolution of the CDB on the founding of the Free State (later the Republic of Ireland) in 1923, there were a few notable traders in the area, as well as craft workshop based boatbuilders, but most organisation-building effort was led by incomers or outsiders. The Pioneers and early fledglings were mainly social or public entrepreneurs. The area was still a pre-industrial landscape with few of the necessary environmental conditions conducive to a high level of entrepreneurship capital. A 1930s report commissioned by the Civil Service Gaeltacht (Economic and Development) Committee gives an indication of the state attitude towards Gaeltacht development. The authors were of the opinion that 'the manufacture of goods mainly for profit must be excluded as far as possible; the industrialisation of the Gaeltacht in the modern sense does not enter into the scheme; industrial expansion in the individualist sense does not enter into the scheme' (NAD, 1933, 11). Preserving the well of the Irish language seemed to be more important than improving the socio-economic situation of Gaeltacht residents – an attitude not confined to only this report or only to state documents. Throughout the early 20th century there was very little second level education provision in the Galway Gaeltacht, with most children able to afford such education leaving the area or availing of scholarships, especially for the training of Irish language teachers in line with Government policy of reviving the language through the education system (Jones, 2006; Kelly, 2002). In terms of social capital no significant new organisations emerged in the Galway Gaeltacht. At national level although there were more banks per capita the sector was considered sluggish (Ó Gráda, 1988). There seems to have been adequate capital available but low income tax rates encouraged a rentier behaviour rather than risk taking (Lee, 1989; Ó Gráda, 1988). However the Galway Gaeltacht remained disadvantaged by comparison. The area continued to be under-developed in terms of industrial development, itself lagging behind European standards, with much of the development led by the state rather than by the private sector. In 1929, a special brand name – Gaeltarra Éireann ('Gaelic Products of Ireland') – and a Round Tower logo were introduced by the Department of Fisheries to develop Gaeltacht textiles. The fact that it Gaeltacht industries were managed by the Department of Fisheries rather than the

Department of Industry and Commerce reflects how under-developed the area was and how far it was from genuine industrialisation. The Gaeltacht Services Industrial Loan Fund accounts for 1935-37 lists minor loans primarily for horses and carts; turf delivery boats; looms and textile equipment; and major loans for a ferry service and a granite quarry. No major organisation building entrepreneurial activity had yet emerged. Analysis of national data reveal few new formal enterprises registered nationwide, let alone in the Galway Gaeltacht (Department of Industry and Commerce, 1923 – 1935). Companies Registered in the Free State (later the Republic of Ireland) under the Companies Consolidation Act, 1923 to 1925 amounted to an average of fewer than 10 per county per annum. Business continued to operate largely on a sole trader type basis.

A series of state departments continued to manage state-owned textiles and fishery 'industries' up to the late 1950s, at which stage it established Gaeltarra Éireann as a state-owned subsidiary to run the industries (mainly textile) previously run directly by a state department. The staff was based in Dublin, but transferred to the Gaeltacht within a decade. Gaeltacht education standards improved with the establishment of more second level schools in line with the national policy of free second level education introduced in 1967. The psychological capital at national level was deemed by New York based consultants to be very low – emigration had drained the country of its 'most vigorous and ambitious youth'; there was a reluctance to accept 'the hazards inherent in changed practices upon which expansion depends'; there was an overall 'anti-materialist philosophy and an asceticism that oppose[d] material aspirations to spiritual goals' (IBEC Technical Services Corporation, 1952, 80). The Galway Gaeltacht lagged further behind.

Emergence and Take-Off

By the late 1960s, local frustration bubbled over into the Gaeltacht Civil Rights movement which challenged the community leadership of the time – largely represented by parents, the clergy and the school masters. Led mainly by the first substantial cohort of local university graduates, as well as some language enthusiasts moving into the area, and inspired by the various civil rights movements in Northern Ireland, Continental Europe and the USA, the movement's agitations included putting forward a representative for the national elections, and broadcasting an Irish-medium pirate radio station. It campaigned for jobs, and for a more democratic Gaeltacht Authority. Out of the campaign emerged the co-operative movement supported by Gaeltarra Éireann which a few years earlier in 1966 had been given the legal entitlement under the Small Industries Scheme to grant-aid private for-profit and/or non-profit entrepreneurs. The co-operative movement was a practical action rooted in middle class idealists who engaged fully with the marginalised Gaeltacht community. Their main activities of the co-operatives were the provision of group water schemes and other social services to local communities. Some of the incoming Gaeltacht Civil Rights leaders were to become managers of some of the more successful co-operatives. By 1980 Gaeltarra Éireann was disbanded and replaced by Údarás na Gaeltachta – the Gaeltacht Authority – with a democratically elected board.

Despite this flurry of collective effervescence, low psychological capital still prevailed throughout the 1960s and even up to the 1980s (Ó hAoláin, 2006, 2007) with officially commissioned reports referring to the Connemara man 'resigned to his fate, lacking in optimism; and survey respondents uncommitted to stating whether they were willing or unwilling/unfit to take up industrial employment if it were available (Symes, 1965, 31). While Gaeltarra Éireann set about developing advance industrial estates, another officially commissioned researcher was of the opinion that 'no industrialist in his right mind' would want to invest in the area given the lack of infrastructure (Mac Aodha, 1971, 29). Local young people saw nothing but emigration for them, despite local opportunities (Ó hAoláin, 2006), and were amazed to see industrial estates sprout up in remote bog locations. Factory tours were organised for their benefit. Gaeltarra's new Gaeltacht headquarters were located not too far from Galway city due to the limited availability of phone lines.

While the national industrialisation policy concentrated on overseas inward investment, Gaeltarra Éireann and later Údarás na Gaeltachta recognised, partly as it had no alternative option, that bottom-up indigenous enterprise development was the key to success. Nevertheless it also continued to focus on job creation via inward investment and this strategy did indeed 'industrialise' the local community in terms of providing industrial employment and management experience. The main industries to emerge in the area were in construction-related activities – quarrying, building, window and door manufacture, plumbing, furniture, and marine-related activities such as fish processing, and boatbuilding. Most of the pioneers of significance were either Údarás na Gaeltachta subsidiaries or joint-ventures primarily between it and outside investors. Apart from providing utility services for their own communities, the Co-operatives were involved mainly in fish processing, textiles, heritage and tourism. Some of the Údarás managers running the aforementioned subsidiaries and joint-ventures, and some of the co-operative managers went on to buy out the businesses and run them on a private basis. In many cases these managers were incomers rather than people born and reared in the area, many moving to the area motivated by their public service careers or their community development and language preservation visions. It would take a full generation after the Gaeltacht Civil Rights movement and the 1960s-70s emergence of industrialisation and organisation-building entrepreneurship, for local people to gain the necessary entrepreneurship capital to take the leadership positions.

The Three Communities

The following section outlines the similarities and contrasts between the three Communities chosen for specific case study analysis, namely marine resources, tourism and audio-visual services. The social and public entrepreneurs are identified in the three Communities, and their roles as Pioneers in developing new Populations are discussed. Social and public entrepreneurs are defined as those individuals and groups who established new organisations on behalf of public bodies or on behalf of community groups. While the new organisations had or have a profit motive, the entrepreneurs leading their establishment were not personal shareholders at that stage, but employed by the public body or the community group.

Pioneers

The Pioneers are defined as the initial organisations or individuals establishing a new form or organisation which later spawns Early Fledglings and eventually a new Population of enterprises. The Pioneers in Galway Gaeltacht entrepreneurship in general were the state bodies and the incoming investors. The Pioneers in the oldest Community – marine resources were state organisations – the CDB running curing stations, and establishing marketing depots and distribution channels. Such was the scale of the job required it is understandable that the CDB had difficulty finding private entrepreneurs to strategically build the sector. Throughout the first half of the 20th century the relevant Government Departments continued to develop the curing and marketing activities. In the second half of the century the individual trawler owners developed the trawler fishing, while Gael Linn, a Dublin based voluntary language promotion organisation developed an oyster farm and fish processing plant. In response to local agitation about lack of local ownership it was eventually transferred to a newly formed locally owned (but incomer-managed) co-operative specifically established to take over the fishing rights and activities hitherto managed by Gael Linn. Meanwhile Gaeltarra Éireann pioneered the aquaculture industry. In the mid 1970s, it established the first commercial shellfish hatchery in Ireland as a wholly owned subsidiary; it developed a salmon and trout farming research centre in conjunction with the state owned Electricity Supply Board; and the local National University of Galway established a shellfish research laboratory. Later in 1979 a co-operative established a fish farm. It was the early 1980s before any privately owned fish farms were established. From the 1970s to the year 2003, there were a total of 95 new fishfarm startups a cause for celebration in such a remote area.

In the case of the Tourism industry, while gentry tourism for hunting and fishing was well developed through the local large estate owners, the newest form of tourism organisation which emerged at the beginning of the 20th century was that of the Irish college. These are educational summer camps at which teenagers learn Irish, living with local families for a few weeks during the summer. The first of these, was established in 1910 by a group of middle class language enthusiasts whose motivation was language preservation rather than profit making. Coiste na bPáistí (the Children's Committee), a 1930s middle class trade-unionist movement with branches throughout the country raised voluntary contributions to send children to the Gaeltacht, their contributions matched by state funding. By the late 1960s a number of other groups of language enthusiasts, some based outside the Gaeltacht were also bringing teenagers into the Gaeltacht to Irish colleges. By the 1970s, many of the Gaeltacht co-operatives had entered the market as early fledglings – with limited levels of success. It was later that private individuals bought out some of the Irish colleges to run them as private concerns, one expert being of the opinion that the privately owned and run colleges have a higher success rate than those run by the local co-operatives nor community groups (Ó Finneadhá, 2006). It must be stated that this particular organisational form is subsidised by the Government as part of its educational and language policy. None is entirely self-sufficient, with approximately 22 percent of income coming from state grant aid for teaching and for accommodation.

Throughout the 20th century, the Irish Tourist Board, and later Údarás na Gaeltachta had encouraged private sector enterprise but was disappointed by the results. The former complained in the 1960s about the lack of private enterprise, and of uptake of its grant-aid. By the 1970s and 1980s, Gaeltarra Éireann and later Údarás na Gaeltachta were supporting the co-operatives and other community groups in various cultural or sporting projects such as heritage centres; museums; water pursuits as well as infrastructural projects such as restaurants or holiday homes. A number of private entrepreneurs established relatively short-lived tourism services; the lack of overall infrastructure perhaps hampering their market growth. Gaelsaoire, an Údarás subsidiary tourism marketing company, eventually proved ineffective. Údarás na Gaeltachta is now seeking co-investors to develop a number of large-scale flagship tourism destinations around which it hopes to see smaller private enterprises emerge. It also supports a large number of voluntary community-run and community-focussed festivals. Despite supporting other marine-based tourism ventures and requiring the co-operatives to develop tourism activities, no Population of any significance has emerged to date. Nevertheless, from 1970 to 2003, there were 97 tourism start-ups, mainly resaurants and cafés (32), tourism development groups (18) and hotels / other accommodation (17). Many of these were community owned and relatively short-lived, suffering from liability of newness in an environment insufficiently supportive in terms of infrastucture or market.

In the case of the Audio Visual sector, the key Pioneer was Údarás na Gaeltachta which invested heavily in a television production training courses in the late 1980s; and the Irish government which established the Irish-medium television broadcaster, TG4 in 1996. This was partly the result of the Gaeltacht Civil Rights campaign of the 1970s and the national agitation (1970s – 1980s) for an Irish medium broadcaster. In 1986, in quite a prescient move, Údarás and the national television broadcaster also established a joint venture production company, whose first manager was at that stage an Údarás employee. Within two decades he had completed a management buyout and the company is now entirely privately owned. A new Population of privately owned independent television production companies has emerged and evolved in the area. In total from the 1970s to the year 2003 there were 63 new foundings mainly made up of the production companies but also post-production, and subtitling / translation.

Stages of Emergence and Growth

In summary it is striking, but perhaps unsurprising how central the state's public bodies, and the local state-funded co-operatives have been in developing the first two Communities, or industry sectors. Large-scale long-term development was required at the

time these two Communities were developing; entrepreneurship capital was particularly low, especially in the earlier marine resources community. The high number of incomers leading the developments is also a reflection of that low entrepreneurship capital in the local population. By contrast while the audio-visual Community, which emerged in the late 1980s to mid 1990s, is ultimately dependent on the state owned and funded broadcaster, privately owned television production companies emerged sooner after the Pioneer. This is probably related to the higher level of formal education required in the sector, as well as higher human, social, and financial capital in the area in the 1980s and 1990s, compared to earlier decades.

In the first two cases the social / public entrepreneurs had to gain socio-cultural legitimacy in the local community. They also had to gain cognitive legitimacy in the sense that these new organisational forms were new and there was no established, well-understood way of managing and developing them. Both the fish farms and the Irish colleges are now accepted as part of the regional 'brand' and identity; yet employment in the latter Population remains seasonal / part-time. It is disappointing how little variation has occurred in terms of spawning new organisational forms – such as adult linguistic tourism, or marine tourism enterprises, or value-added fish processing - which could improve the employment situation and develop new markets. In the audio-visual sector, legitimacy has been gained, the local community aspires to working in the sector, and third level training is available. Relatively little variation has happened with most of the independent production companies relying mainly on TG4 for commissions; few developing other markets in Ireland or abroad. New private sector Pioneers in adult linguistic tourism are slowly emerging, facing legitimacy challenges in creating a new cultural tourism product.

Legitimacy of Entrepreneurship

The lack of entrepreneurship capital (in the sense of organisation building) in Ireland throughout the 20th century is well documented (Industrial Policy Review Group, 1992; Lee, 1989). The Galway Gaeltacht unsurprisingly records high levels of scepticism for private as well as social/public entrepreneurs. The CDB encountered resistance to innovation; the IAOS Agricultural Banks failed after a decade or two. They were operating in relatively unsupportive environments given the power of the local shopkeeper and the levels of poverty in the area. The first Irish colleges were established by outsiders or incomers, rather than locals or returned locals. In the 1950s, three local men endeavouring to establish a seaweed processing plant encountered resistance from their community (Ó Catháin, 2006). In the second half of the 20th century, Gaeltarra had difficulty fostering entrepreneurship and industrialising the area; so much so it commissioned sociological and ethnographic research to see how the reluctance and resistance could be overcome (Kane, 1977; Symes, 1965). Locals were cynical about the potential longevity of new factories, and reluctant to take on management roles. The co-operative movement which followed the Gaeltacht Civil Rights movement continues to suffer weaknesses largely ascribed to lack of focus, and weak management skills, and reluctance to form strategic alliances with neighbouring co-operatives (Breathnach, 1986). While the co-operative movement developed well in the dairying regions elsewhere in Ireland, it was slow to develop in the Gaeltacht. By the late 1970s the Gaeltacht co-operatives were still seen as yet another state provider rather than as self-help organisations in which the community could be the leading actor in its own future (Johnson, 1997). The culture of dependency (Comharchumann Forbartha na nOileán, 1979) was slow to change to a culture of empowered self-determination.

The co-operatives were, and to a great extent still are, focussed on the special purpose of community development and the generation of employment – of any kind (Breathnach, 1986; Ó Conchubhair, 2006). But they were and still are, functionally diffuse, in that they are generalists rather than specialists – some providing a number of services from community water schemes, to agriculture, to handcrafts and textiles, to tourism services. Many were at times substantial employers in their areas but once that initial purpose had been addressed and more opportunities were available elsewhere or locally, their initial special purpose was no longer central.

Individual entrepreneurs encountered scepticism when sharing their ambitious ideas with their community, or found it difficult to engage successfully with the public agencies. There was some reluctance in the tourism sector to associate the language with financial profit, with some frowning upon private entrepreneurs in that and the audio-visual sector who built successful profit-making enterprises (Ní Bhrádaigh, 2008; Ó Foighil, 2006).

Such was the scale of development required that only state-supported initiatives could succeed. Poverty and disadvantage needed to be directly alleviated before people could move beyond short-term horizon multiple-source-of-income activities. Heroes and role models needed to gradually develop within the local community. Lack of human capital and strong inward-looking social capital with little outward-linking capital made it difficult for the local community to build new organisations. This was compounded by low psychological capital resulting from socio-economic and linguistic marginalisation. Preservation of the language was seen to be at odds with modernisation. Emigration drained the area of the more ambitious and perhaps more entrepreneurial people. It was easier for incomers to be the entrepreneurs. The technical skills required for industrialisation needed to be matched by the softer skills so important for entrepreneurship.

Schumpeter's creative destruction would 'unfold through decades or centuries' (1943, 83) rather than in a few years. In the meantime the state would have to act as the incubator, encouraging entrepreneurial organisation-building in the community, so that in time private entrepreneurs could have available to them the necessary resources to marshal together to achieve their visions. A number of public sector employees prided themselves on their intrapreneurship, or entrepreneurial behaviour within their organisations. A number of co-operative managers, mainly incomers, led the spinout of some of the co-operative's activities. Public or social entrepreneurship had to precede private entrepreneurship, the former finding it easier to gain legitimacy and the necessary network and support than the latter. While the state agencies had the technical skills to industrialise the area, they had neither the soft skills, the understanding of the local community and the necessary entrepreneurial capital in the local community to foster indigenous local entrepreneurship. Industrialisation via inward investment developed the necessary skills and financial capital to eventually provide the seedbed for locally owned and established enterprises (Ó hAoláin, 2007). It must also be remembered that the concept of indigenous entrepreneurship was not part of national Government policy until the early 1990s (Industrial Policy Review Group, 1992).

Conclusion

Patterns of entrepreneurship in terms of organisation building, pioneering of new business activities, business ownership and enterprise growth and development were tracked using quantitative and qualitative data. Rooted in the theoretical frameworks of corporate demography, organisation evolution and entrepreneurship capital, an interesting finding was the importance of social entrepreneurship in developing the necessary entrepreneurship capital for private entrepreneurship in terms of true organisation building activity rather than self-employed multiple-income activity. Physical and human capital issues were addressed but the more soft support-related social and psychological capital proved to be key issues. Developing organisation-building entrepreneurship (rather than self-employed, multiple income source entrepreneurial behaviour) in a peripheral historically disadvantaged community takes more than one generation. While physical and human capital weaknesses are addressed in terms of infrastructure and education, and financial capital can be provided through grant aid and employment income, social capital and psychological capital are also important factors in fostering entrepreneurship in the community.

Implications for Policy

The long-term focus of the research draws attention to the challenges faced by policy makers and those implementing policies. Hindsight and reflection on historical evidence

validates many of the statements made by policy makers at the turn of the 20th century – for example in terms of the levels of resignation and hopelessness in the community (CDB 1892-1897). Those same issues arose again throughout the early to mid 20th century, with Gaeltarra Executives frustrated at the lack of soft skills, social and psychological capitals necessary for entrepreneurship, even when financial support was offered. While physical industrialisation took place from the 1960s onwards, psychic industrialisation (in terms of community attitudes and psychological capital) did not emerge until the 1980s. By then the state bodies understood better the importance of the softer cultural and psychological issues but found it difficult to break through the web of dejection and resignation. The long term focus also illustrated the pattern of the state leading entrepreneurship in each Community for up to two decades before community- and privately-owned enterprise could emerge. Gerschenkron's (1966) pre-requisites of industrialisation, in terms of guilds, self-organisation and formal organisation-building needed state leadership. The research also illustrated that public service provided good incubation for many subsequent entrepreneurs. Providing public servants, particularly in enterprise development agencies with a temporary safety net of the option to return to public service may encourage them into private entrepreneurship.

A conventional wisdom which has been challenged in this paper is the opinion that the state often interferes with successful entrepreneurship development through its policies and regulations. In a disadvantaged area, the scale of development challenge is so enormous that state intervention is required. In addition while infrastructural and institutional supports such as education may be required, the psychological capital factors may need particular attention. Given the historical distrust of entrepreneurs, perhaps the legitimacy of private entrepreneurship is best preceded by public and social entrepreneurship in preparation for private entrepreneurship. In all three Communities (marine resources, audio-visual, and tourism) the Pioneers or 'kick-starters' were public or social entrepreneurs. In the first two, the state acted as a large scale Pioneer developing the aquaculture industry and the television production, ultimately resulting in a high level of successful private enterprise. In the last case (tourism), the state did not follow the same pattern, and development has not been as successful in terms of new enterprise foundings or growth. In the marine and tourism sectors the community co-operative or voluntary sectors featured strongly as Pioneers or early fledglings, while the audio-visual sector features many small scale independent production companies motivated more by artistic and/or linguistic values than profit-making (Ní Bhrádaigh, 2008).

Lessons learned from the marine and audio-visual sectors could be applied to addressing the tourism sector. Údarás na Gaeltachta has still not found suitable co-investors to develop large-scale strategically-important tourism enterprises in the region, nor in the other Gaeltacht regions. The financial and political support is available, local private wealth and business acumen are available; a better understanding of how to develop tourism not detrimental to the fragile linguistic situation exists; yet the hope and vision for, and legitimacy of, a viable tourism sector does not seem to exist in the local community. Soft supports in terms of encouragement, promotion of successful role models, training and mentoring may be as powerful as hard financial support. In the last 20 years, staff of enterprise development agencies usually come from a business, commerce or economics background and the approach taken to fostering entrepreneurship would be largely managerial with a relatively short-term focus of five to 10 years. There is also the short-term political pressure of job creation. However in a peripheral or disadvantaged area, more patience, and a more thorough understanding of deep-seated cultural norms and attitudes are required. Gaeltarra Éireann was quite far sighted in employing at one stage both an anthropologist and a sociologist to assist in its industrial development agenda.

While hard-support in the form of factory facilities or grant-aid is an important factor, the soft supports of training, mentoring, networking, at the individual level; and career aspiration, legitimacy of entrepreneurship, and role models at community level are perhaps more important. Development agencies may need to establish the pioneering start-ups with the long term view of fostering privately-owned spin-offs and ultimate transfer of the publicly

or socially owned / motivated enterprises into private ownership. Working in, or with, the initial pioneering organisations allows potential entrepreneurs to gain the necessary experience, networks, and role models. A peripheral community apprehensive about embracing innovation due to low entrepreneurship capital may legitimise community-owned social enterprise sooner than individual for-profit entrepreneurs. It may be advantageous for policy makers to collaborate with educators and researchers in developing a deeper understanding of how potential, nascent and current entrepreneurs in peripheral areas can be successfully supported.

While Gaeltacht people are of the same ethnic background as the rest of the Irish nation, and although some might query the relevance of comparison with indigenous (popularly inferred as non-White, unmodernised) communities, the challenges faced by these indigenous communities' leaders in developing community- and privately-owned enterprises are very similar to those encountered in the Gaeltacht (Dana & Anderson, 2007). The historical similarities of colonialism, marginalisation and language loss are very similar. Perhaps these indigenous communities are in the same situation the Gaeltacht community was in up to the 1960s in terms of entrepreneurship capital, and its constituent parts, especially human, social, and psychological capital.

References

- Akutagawa, Michie (1986) 'A Linguistic Minority under the Protection of its Own Ethnic State: A Case Study in an Irish Gaeltacht' in Mac Eoin, Gearóid, Anders Ahlqvist & Donncha Ó hAodha (eds) *Third International Conference on Minority Languages: Celtic papers*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.
- Aldrich, H.E. (1995) 'Entrepreneurial Strategies in New Organisational Populations', in Bull I. & Thomas, H. & Willard, G. *Entrepreneurship: Perspectives on Theory Building*, Pergamon Elsevier Science Ltd., Oxford, pp 91-106.
- Aldrich, Howard E. & Martha Martinez (2003) 'Entrepreneurship as a Social Construction', in Acs, Zoltan A. & David B. Audretsch (eds) *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 359 - 399.
- Aldrich, Howard E. & Martin Ruef (2006) *Organisations Evolving*, 2nd edition, Sage Publications, London.
- Aldrich, Howard, U. Staber, C. Zimmer, & J.J. Beggs (1990) 'Minimalism and Organisational Mortality: patterns of disbanding among US trade associations: 1900 – 1983', in Singh, J.V. *Organisational Evolution: new directions*, Sage Publications, California.
- Audretsch, David B. & Max Keilbach (2004) "Does Entrepreneurship Capital Matter?" *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Volume 28, Issue 5, September, Fall, 419 - 429.
- Audretsch, David, B., Max C. Keilbach & Erik E. Lehmann (2006) *Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Austin, James, Howard Stevenson & Jane Wei-Skillern (2006) 'Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both?' *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol XXX January, 1 – 22.
- Baron, J.N., Burton, M.D. & Hannan, M.T. (1999) 'Engineering Bureaucracy: the Genesis of Formal Policies, Positions and Structures of High Technology Firms', *Journal of Law, Economics and Organisations*, 15: 1-41.
- Baum, J.A.C. & Singh, J.V. (eds) (1994) *Evolutionary Dynamics of Organisations*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Becker, Gary S. (1964) *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*, National Bureau for Economic Research, Columbia University Press, Chicago.
- Beugelsdijk, Sjoerd (2007) 'Entrepreneurial Culture, Regional Innovativeness and Economic Growth', *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, Vol 17, pp 187 – 210.
- Beugelsdijk, Sjoerd & Ton van Schaik (2005) 'Differences in Social Capital between 54 Western European Regions', *Regional Studies*, Volume 39, Issue 8, pp 1053 – 1064.

- Breathnach, Proinnsias (1988) 'Popular perception of official development policies in the west of Ireland' in Byron, Reginald (ed) *Public Policy and the periphery: problems and prospects in marginal regions*, Queen's University Belfast pp 153-160.
- Brooks, Arthur C. (2009) *Social Entrepreneurship: a modern approach to social value creation*, Prentice Hall, New York.
- Brüderl, Josef & Peter Preisendörfer (1998) 'Network Support and the Success of Newly Founded Business', *Small Business Economics*, Volume 10, pp 213 – 225.
- Bull, I. & Willard, G. (1995) 'Towards a Theory of Entrepreneurship', in Bull I. & Thomas, H. & Willard, G. *Entrepreneurship: Perspectives on Theory Building*, Pergamon Elsevier Science Ltd., Oxford, pp 1–16.
- Burt, Ronald S. (2002) 'The Network Entrepreneur' in Swedberg, Richard (ed) *Entrepreneurship: the Social Science View*, Oxford University Press, pp 281 – 307.
- Butler, John Sibley & Cedric Herring (1991) 'Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship in America: toward an Explanation of Racial and Ethnic Group Variations in Self-Employment', *Sociological Perspectives*, Vol 34, No 1, pp 79 - 94.
- Bygrave, William & Maria Minniti (2000) "The Social Dynamics of Entrepreneurship," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Volume 24, Issue 3, Spring, 25-36
- Carroll, G.R. & Hannan, Michael T. (2000) *The Demography of Corporations and Industries*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- CDB (Congested Districts Board) (1891 – 1923) *Annual Reports*, Dublin.
- CDB (Congested Districts Board) (1892 - 1897) *Base Line Reports*, Dublin (Mick's Collection, Trinity College Dublin).
- Comharchumann Forbartha na nOileán (1979) *Community Education Project, Submission for Grant Aid to Van Leer Foundation*, Leitir Móir.
- Commins, Patrick (1988) 'Socio-economic development and language maintenance in the Gaeltacht', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, lxx, pp 11 – 28.
- Dana, Léo-Paul & Robert B. Anderson (eds) (2007) *International Handbook of Research on Indigenous Entrepreneurship*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Davidsson, Per & Benson Honig (2003) 'The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs', *Journal of Business Venturing*, volume 18, pp 301-331.
- Delacroix, J. & Carroll, G.R. (1983) 'Organisational Foundings: an Ecological Study of the Newspaper Industries of Argentina and Ireland', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28: 274-291.
- Denvir, Gearóid (2002) 'The Linguistic Implications of Mass Tourism in Gaeltacht Areas, *New Hibernia Review / Iris Éireannach Nua*, Volume 6, No 3, (Autumn / Fómhar), pp 23 - 43.
- Department of Industry and Commerce (1923 – 35) *Companies Registered in the Free State under the Companies (Consolidation) Act 1923 – 1935*, Dublin.
- Durkheim, Emile (1971) *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London (translated by J.W. Swain, originally published in French in 1912).
- Fennell, Desmond (1976) 'Organising Connacht for Economic and Social Growth', *Administration*, Vol 24, No 3, 337 – 349.
- Florida, Richard L. (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class and How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*, Basic Books, New York.
- Fowler, Bridget (1997) *Pierre Bourdieu and cultural theory: critical investigations*, Sage, London.
- Freeman, J. (1990) 'Ecological Analysis of Semiconductor Firm Mortality' in Singh, J.V. *Organizational Evolution: new directions*, Sage Publications, London, pp53 –77.
- GEM Wales (2007) *Wales Executive Summary Report*, National Entrepreneurship Observatory for Wales, Cardiff & Glamorgan.
- Georgellis, Yannin & Howard J. Wall (2000) 'What Makes a Region Entrepreneurial? Evidence from Britain', *Annals of Regional Science*, Volume 34, Issue 3, pp 385 – 403.
- Gerschenkron, Alexander (1966) 'The Modernization of Entrepreneurship' in Weiner, Myron (ed) *Modernization: The Dynamics of Growth*, Basic Books, New York (reprinted in Swedberg, Richard (2000) (ed) *Entrepreneurship: the social science view*, Oxford University Press, Oxford pp 129 – 138.
- Government of Ireland (1926) *Gaeltacht Commission: Report*, Oifig an tSoláthair, Dublin.

- Granovetter, Mark (1995) 'The Economic Sociology of Firms and Entrepreneurs', in Portes, Alejandro (ed) *The Economic Sociology of Immigration*, Russell Sage Foundation, LOCATION (reprinted in Swedberg, 2000)
- Hannan, M.T., Ranger-Moore, J. & Banaszak-Holl, J. (1990) 'Competition and the Evolution of Organisational Size Distribution', in Singh, J.V. (1990) *Organisational Evolution: new directions*, Sage Publications, California.
- Hindley, Reg (1990) *The Death of the Irish Language: a qualified obituary*, Routledge, London.
- Hmieleski, Keith M. & Jon C. Carr (2007) 'The Relationship between Entrepreneur Psychological Capital and Well-Being', *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Babson, Boston.
- Hulgård, Lars & Roger Spear (2006) 'Social Entrepreneurship and the mobilisation of social capital in European social enterprises' in: Nyssens, Marthe with Sophie Adam & Toby Johnson (ed) (2006) *Social Enterprise; at the crossroads of market, public policy, and civil society*, Routledge, London, pp 75 – 108.
- IBEC (1952) An Appraisal of Ireland's Industrial Potentials, IBEC Technical Services Corporation, New York.
- Industrial Policy Review Group (1992) *A Time for Change: industrial policy for the 1990s*, Department of Industry and Commerce, Stationery Office, Dublin ('The Culliton Report')
- Jack, Sarah L. & Alistair R. Anderson (2002) 'The Effects of Embeddedness on the Entrepreneurial Process', *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol 17, pp 467 – 487.
- Jensen, Susan M. & Fred Luthans (2006) 'Relationship between Entrepreneurs' Psychological Capital and Their Authentic Leadership', *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol XVIII, No 2, Summer, 254 – 273.
- Johnson, Maureen (1979) The Co-operative Movement in the Gaeltacht, *Irish Geography*, Volume 12, pp 68 – 81.
- Johnson, Nuala C. (1992) 'Nation-building, language and education: the geography of teacher recruitment in Ireland, 1925 – 1955', *Political Geography*, Vol 11, No 2, March, pp 170 - 189.
- Johnson, Nuala C. (1993) 'Building a nation: an examination of the Irish Gaeltacht Commission Report of 1926', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 19, 2: 157-68.
- Johnson, Nuala C. (1997) 'Making Space: Gaeltacht policy and the politics of identity', in Graham, Brian (ed) *In Search of Ireland: a cultural geography*, Routledge, London.
- Jones, Valerie (2006) *A Gaelic Experiment: the preparatory system 1926 - 1961 and Coláiste Moibhí*, The Woodfield Press, Dublin.
- Kane, Eileen (1977) *The Last Place God Made: Traditional Economy and New Industry in Rural Ireland, Vols 1 – 4*, HRA Flex Books, Inc, New Haven.
- Keane, Michael J., Mary Cawley & Mícheál S. Ó Cinnéide (1983) Industrial Development in Gaeltacht Areas: the work of Údarás na Gaeltachta, *Cambria*, Vol 10, No 1, pp 47 – 60.
- Kearns, Kevin C. (1974) 'The Resuscitation of the Irish Gaeltacht', *Geographical Review*, Vol 64, No 1 (January), pp 82 – 110.
- Kelly, Adrian (2002) *Compulsory Irish: Language and Education in Ireland, 1870s - 1970s*, Irish Academic Press, Dublin
- Kenny, Ivor (1972) 'The Future of the Gaeltacht', *Administration*, Volume 20 (3), 3 – 15.
- Lee, J.J. (1989) *Ireland 1912–1985: Politics and Society*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lee, Sam Youl, Richard Florida & Zoltan A. Acs (2004) 'Creativity and Entrepreneurship: a Regional Analysis of New Firm Formation', *Regional Studies*, Volume 38 Issue 8, pp 879 – 891, November.
- Licht, Amir N. & Jordan I. Siegel (2006) The Social Dimensions of Entrepreneurship, in Casson, Mark, Bernard Yeung, Anuradha Basu & Nigel Wadeson (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 511 – 539.
- Luthans, Fred, Carolyn M. Youssef & Bruce J. Avolio (2007) *Psychological Capital: Developing the Human Competitive Edge*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Luthans, Fred, Stephen M. Norman & Susan M. Jensen (2007) 'The Value of the Psychological Capital of Immigrant Entrepreneurs', *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, Vol 1, No 2.

- Mac an Iomaire, Peadar (1983) 'Tionchar na Tionsclaíochta ar Ghaeilge Chonamara Theas' *Teangeolas*, 16, Earrach / Spring, pp 9 – 18.
- Mac Aodha, Breandán (1971) *The Galway Gaeltacht Survey 1968-69*, Social Sciences Research Centre, University College Galway, Galway.
- McManus, Patrick (2004) *Definition of the Social Economy in Northern Ireland: finding a way through*, Social Economy Network, Belfast.
- Marino, Alessandro (2006) 'The Role of Financing in Ensuring Growth', In: Perrini, Francesco (ed) (2006) *The New Social Entrepreneurship: What Awaits Social Entrepreneurial Ventures?*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp 65 – 80
- Mathews, P.J. (2003) *Revival: The Abbey Theatre, Sinn Féin, the Gaelic League and the Co-operative Movement*, Field Day Monographs, Cork University Press in association with Field Day, Cork
- Morrissey, James (2001) *On the Verge of Want*, Crannóg Books, Dublin
- Mottiar, Z. & Jacobson, D (2002) 'The Importance of place, space and culture in the development of an industrial agglomeration in Ireland: the furniture industry in Co Monaghan', in Theile, K. & Ó hÓgartaigh, C. (eds) *International Business Education: International New Enterprise Development*, Shaker Verlag, Aachen
- NAD (National Archives, Dublin) (1933) *Report to the Gaeltacht (Economic and Development) Committee*, p 11 (File S7447).
- Nenadic, Stana (1990) 'The life-cycle of firms in late nineteenth century Britain' in Jobert, Philippe & Michael Moss (1990) *The Birth and Death of Companies: an historical perspective*, Parthenon Publishing Group, Carnforth.
- Ní Bhrádaigh, Emer (2008) 'TG4@10: an léargas fiontraíochta,' (TG4@10: the entrepreneurship view), In: O'Connell, Eithne, John Walsh & Gearóid Denvir (eds) *TG4@10: Deich mBliana de TG4*, Cló Iar-Chonnachta, Indreabhán, 137 – 154.
- Nyssens, Marthe with Sophie Adam & Toby Johnson (ed) (2006) *Social Enterprise; at the crossroads of market, public policy, and civil society*, Routledge, London.
- Ó Catháin, Pádraic (2006) Personal Interview.
- Ó Cinnéide, Mícheál S. & M.J. Keane (1988) 'Local Socio-Economic Impacts associated with the Galway Gaeltacht', Social Sciences Research Centre, NUI Galway.
- Ó Cinnéide, M., M.J. Keane, & M. Cawley (1985) 'Industrialisation and Linguistic Change among Gaelic-Speaking Communities in the West of Ireland', *Language Planning and Language Problems*, Vol. 9, No. 1, Spring.
- Ó Conchubhair, Morgan (2006) Personal Interview.
- Ó Conghaile, M. (1988) *Conamara agus Árainn 1880 – 1980: Gnéithe den Stair Shóisialta*, Cló Iar-chonnachta, Béal an Daingin, Conamara.
- Ó Finneadhá, Séamas (2006) Personal Interview, 14 February.
- Ó Foighil, Mícheál (2006) Personal Interview.
- Ó Giollagáin, Conchúr, Seosamh Mac Donnacha, Fiona Ní Chualáin, Aoife Ní Shéaghda & Mary O'Brien (2007) *Staidéar Cuimsitheach Teangeolaíoch ar Úsáid na Gaeilge sa Ghaeltacht: Príomhthátaí agus Moltaí / Comprehensive Linguistic Study of the Use of Irish in the Gaeltacht: Principal Findings and Recommendations*, An Roinn Gnóthaí Pobail, Tuaithe agus Gaeltachta, Baile Átha Cliath.
- Ó Gráda, Cormac (1988) *Ireland before and after the Famine: explorations in economic history, 1800-1925*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Ó hAoláin, Pádraig (2006) Personal Interview, 7 September.
- Ó hAoláin, Pádraig (2007) Formal Response to Ní Bhrádaigh (2007) 'Developing Entrepreneurship in a Marginal Region' paper delivered at the Conference of the Irish Academy of Management, Belfast, 3 – 5 September.
- Ó Murchú, Máirtín (1970) *Urlabhra agus Pobal / Language and Community*, Comhairle na Gaeilge, Dublin.
- Ó Tuathaigh, M.A. Gearóid (1990) *The Development of the Gaeltacht as a Bilingual Entity*, Institiúid Teangeolaíochta Éireann, BÁC.
- Perrini, Francesco (ed) (2006) *The New Social Entrepreneurship: What Awaits Social Entrepreneurial Ventures?*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

- Plunkett, Sir Horace (1902) Opening Address at the Industrial Conference held in connection with the Cork International Exhibition of 1902, 22 – 24 October, Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Available in Special Collections, UCD, Ref 44.Q.18).
- Plunkett ([1904] 1983) *Ireland in the New Century*, Irish Academic Press, Dublin.
- Portes, Alejandro (1998) 'Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications to Modern Sociology', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Volume 24, pp 1 – 24.
- Putnam, Robert, Robert Leonardi & Raffaella Y. Nanetti (1993) *Making Democracy Work*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Ram, M. & Deakins, D. (1995) *African-Caribbean Entrepreneurship in Britain*. University of Central England, Birmingham.
- Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland (1908) *10th Report, Counties Galway, Mayo and Roscommon*, Dublin.
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. ([1943] 1987) *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, Allen & Unwin, London.
- Scottish Executive (2007) *A Social Enterprise Strategy for Scotland*, Edinburgh.
- Shane, Scott (2003) *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: the Individual – Opportunity Nexus*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Singh, J.V. (1990) *Organisational Evolution: new directions*, Sage Publications, California.
- Smith, Adam ([1904] 1976) *An Inquiry into the Nature of the Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Methuen & co, London.
- Steyaert, Chris & Daniel Hjorth (eds) (2006) *Entrepreneurship as Social Change: a third new movements in entrepreneurship book*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Stinchcombe, A.L. (1965) 'Social Structure and Organisations', in March, J.G. (ed) *Handbook of Organisations*, Rand Mc Nally & Co. Chicago, pp 142-193.
- Swendsen, Gunnar Lind Haase & Gert Tinggaard Swendsen (2004) *The Creation and Destruction of Social Capital: Entrepreneurship, Co-operative Movements and Institutions*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Symes, David G (1965) *The Population Resources of the Connemara Gaeltacht: An Analysis of the Employment Potential; a memorandum to the Board of Gaeltarra Éireann*, Department of Geography, University of Hull. miscellaneous series, 3, (Galway County Library, Island house, Cathedral Sq., Mary Kavanagh, 1996)
- Synge, John Millington (1966) *Collected Works II: Prose*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Teasdale, Paul & Jessica Minty (2004) *Scottish Economic Statistics: Analysis of Firm Closure and Survival*, Scottish Executive, Edinburgh.
- Tucker, D.J., Singh, J.V. & Meinhard, A.G. (1990) 'Founding Characteristics, Imprinting and Organisational Change', in Singh, J.V. *Organisational Evolution: new directions*, Sage Publications, California, pp 182 - 200.
- Tripathy, Dwijendra (1990) 'Birth, growth and death of firms in a proto-industrial economy – the experience of the Ahmedabad textile industry', Jobert, Philippe & Michael Moss (eds) *The Birth and Death of Companies: an historical perspective*, Parthenon Publishing Group, Carnforth
- van de Ven, A.H. (1995) 'The Development of an Infrastructure for Entrepreneurship', in Bull I. & Thomas, H. & Willard, G. *Entrepreneurship: Perspectives on Theory Building*, Pergamon Elsevier Science Ltd., Oxford, pp 39 - 63.