

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN COMMUNITY VENTURES AND COMMUNITY RESOURCE HOLDERS: A JOINT DEPENDENCY APPROACH

Abstract

Guided by the joint dependency approach this study analyzes how emerging community ventures engage into mutually dependent relationships with community resource holders in the community to be able to mobilize the community into collective action. I conducted qualitative, longitudinal case studies of three music festivals in rural communities in Norway. By investigating the early stages of the venture formation process, I observed how different types of entrepreneurs impacted on the relationships between the community venture and community resource holders and how these relationships changed over time. High joint dependence relationships were characterized of high level of trust and goal congruence as well as few conflicts. Initially, bricoleurs, who built the venture upon existing resources and knowledge in the community, could transform their individual joint dependence relationships in the community to the venture. The constructionists aimed to introduce new activities and resources and could not build upon existing relationships in the community. Their venture struggled with mistrust and conflicts making it difficult to mobilize the community into collective action. Over time, however, the relationships between the community venture and community resource holders became more based upon joint dependence. By adapting a joint dependency as well as longitudinally approach, this study offers new insights about how the concepts of bricoleurs and constructionists may not be static but rather change over time.

Key concepts: Bricoleurs, Community entrepreneurship, Constructionists, Joint dependency, Resource mobilization, Social entrepreneurship

INTRODUCTION

The research interest on social entrepreneurship has increased considerable since 1990s and the variety of organizations categorized as social ventures have been more recognized. This study focuses on the development of a specific type of social ventures; the community venture (Teasdale 2010). Community ventures are emerging non-profit organizations with a goal of creating societal wealth within the community by mobilizing the community members into collective action (Peredo and Chrisman 2006; Haugh 2007). By communities, I refer to geographically bounded areas, such as villages, municipalities, or regions. Societal wealth is

the welfare of others and includes “economic, societal, health, and environmental aspects of human welfare” (Zahra, Rawhouser et al. 2008: 118). Community ventures have made valuable contributions to the society all over the world. Job and business creation organizations have facilitated new commercial activities and job opportunities within communities (Johannisson 1990; Johnstone and Lionais 2004). Cultural festivals and rehabilitation centers increase the quality of life and bridge and link social capital (Thompson, Lees et al. 2000; Haugh 2007; Teasdale 2010). To stimulate to collective action, however, is a challenging task and entrepreneurs who initiate this important type of venture may fail to obtain local engagement. More knowledge about the earliest stages of community venture development is needed to find the right mechanisms to support it.

To access needed resources for the development of the venture is an important and challenging part of the entrepreneurship process. Especially, entrepreneurs who are not embedded in a specific context are found to struggle with acquiring resources since they have not yet developed trust and legitimacy in key relationships with resource holders in the environment (Lauer 2005; Jack and Anderson 2002). More embedded entrepreneurs are found to draw upon existing ties in the community and can use social resources and trust developed as a member of the community. Zahra et al (2009) developed three categories of social entrepreneurs according to how they built upon their relationships in the community. Two of the entrepreneur types; the bricoleurs and the constructionists, fits well with community entrepreneurship literature, since they both were linked to developing wealth for a local community. The third entrepreneur type, the engineer, worked at a national to international scale and will not be included in this study.

Bricoleurs are highly embedded in the community and build the new venture upon existing activities and resources in the community (Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. 2009; Moss, Short et al. 2010). Constructionists are less embedded and aim to change existing structures within a community by introducing new resources and activities. The bricoleurs and constructionists will meet different challenges in engaging the local community; however, there is a lack of empirical studies on how different types of entrepreneurs may impact on the relationships between the community venture and local resource holders. Guided by joint dependency approach, this study aims to extend the community entrepreneurship literature by exploring following question: “How do different types of entrepreneurs impact on the relationships between the community venture and resource holders in the community and how do these relationships evolve over time?”

The joint dependency approach is recently developed within management studies to explain interdependent relationships between two actors. High level of joint dependence relationships between two actors are characterized of trust and reciprocity and found to enhance the performance and resource mobilization (Gulati and Sytch 2007; Villanueva, Van de Ven et al. 2010). Building upon the joint dependency approach seems especially useful when studying community entrepreneurship, since developing joint dependence relationships between the community venture and the community resource holders will be needed to mobilize the community into collective action (Corner and Ho 2010; Di Domenico, Haugh et al. 2010; Teasdale 2010).

This study uses evidence from longitudinal case studies of the initiation and early development of three non-profit music festivals in rural communities in Norway. All festivals were aiming at creating societal wealth within their local communities. I studied the process from the initial ideas were conceived until the community ventures had gained repeated support from key resource holders in the community, indicating that the venture had become fully operational. Participant observation of special events and secondary data supplemented and validated the data and increased the understanding of the process within the particular contexts. Focusing on the relationships between the community venture and the resource holders in the community as a unit of analysis made it possible to explore the role of different actors in the community ventures. The triangulation of data through using e-mails, written reports, newspaper articles, and narrative interviewing helped me discovering the earliest part of the entrepreneurship process and reduced the retrospective bias problem faced by many studies of entrepreneurial processes.

The study proceeds as follows: I provide a brief overview of community entrepreneurship and the joint dependency approach. I then describe the methods used before the results of the case-data are presented. Finally, I reflect on the potential contributions of this study in the discussion.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The community ventures and resources holders

New ventures need to form relationships with resource holders in the environment to access financial, physical, human, intangible, and other significant resources for their development

and survival (Brush, Greene et al. 2001; Pfeffer and Salancik 2003; Zott and Huy 2007). It is widely recognized that entrepreneurs rely on their personal connections and networks to access resources (Hung 2006). An emerging research stream emphasizes the role of different communication strategies used by entrepreneurs to secure external resources by performing a variety of symbolic actions (Zott and Huy 2007) or by crafting the identity of new ventures by storytelling (Lounsbury and Glynn 2001; Martens, Jennings et al. 2007). These studies provide a nuanced picture of the inherently social process of resource acquisition, but are usually one-sided and mainly consider how entrepreneurs get access to resources to pursue own goals. How the relationships between the emerging venture and its resource providers are formed to pursue collective interests remains largely unexplored.

The community entrepreneurs need to mobilize the resource holders in the community to pursue collective rather than individual interests. The emerging community venture is dependent upon engagement in the local community (Corner and Ho 2010), and to mobilize resources is characterized as collective with close involvement of community actors (Haugh 2007; Shaw and Carter 2007; Teasdale 2010). Actually, the community venture is likely to be owned and managed by the community resource holders to ensure community benefit over personal gains (Johnstone and Lionais 2004; Di Domenico, Haugh et al. 2010; Teasdale 2010). The resource holders engaged in the community venture are likely to be diverse, such as the municipality, local businesses, voluntary organizations, and other citizens, (Austin, Stevenson et al. 2006; Ridley-Duff 2008). Consequently, the community venture needs to take into account different norms and goals of the resource holders, and the entrepreneurial process may take longer time compared to commercial ventures.

Another characteristic that may distinguish community venture from commercial ventures is their non-profit character (Haugh 2007). Despite there are examples on for-profit community ventures, a non-profit form is most common to ensure the societal wealth creation. Consequently, the economic value they create will not be sufficient to pay for the needed resources and the ventures rely on noneconomic exchange, such as trust and reciprocity (Dees 2001; Austin, Stevenson et al. 2006). To develop close, joint dependent relationships with key resource holders will therefore be even more critical for community entrepreneurs than for commercial entrepreneurs. The joint dependence approach seems especially promising to explore the relationships between the community ventures and the community resource holders and will be outlined below.

The joint dependency approach

The joint dependency has recently emerged as an approach within the resource dependency theory (RDT). RDT asserts that an organization needs to engage in relationships with resource holders in the environment to access resources (Pfeffer and Salancik 2003). The organization and a resource holder is dependent upon each other if the resources controlled by the other are needed to achieve goals (Gundlach and Cadotte 1994). These interdependency increase the uncertainty since the organization is not able to control all conditions necessary for achievement of an action or outcome. The organization can decrease the uncertainty by either increasing the power of the organization related to the resource holders or the organization can increase the mutual dependence with its resource holders (Pfeffer and Salancik 2003). The joint dependency approach argues that the last strategy will frame most successful resource mobilization (Van de Ven, Sapienza et al. 2007; Villanueva, Van de Ven et al. 2010).

Joint dependence is the sum of each actor's dependence on the other in a relationship. High joint dependence of the relationship is the belief that both actors cannot acquire needed resources from other sources (Yilmaz, Sezen et al. 2005). Highly interdependent relationships are characterized of higher trust and experienced reciprocity between actors that will improve the resource mobilization and value creation of both parts (Gulati and Sych 2007; Villanueva, Van de Ven et al. 2010). First, the goals and interests of the actors in the close relationships will tend to converge. Second, conflicts and opportunistic behavior are likely to decrease in highly dependent relationships. Finally, feelings of reciprocity and trust are found to increase knowledge and information exchange (Zahra, Yavuz et al. 2006; Agterberg, Hooff et al. 2010). Villanueva et al (2010) found that increasing mutual dependence promoted the flow of resources to the new venture. Highly interdependent and embedded relationships with the resource providers motivated towards joint action to solve collective interests.

Types of community entrepreneurs

To be able to mobilize community resources, the community entrepreneurs need to develop new relationships with local resource holders. Different entrepreneurs are likely to impact differently on the characteristics of the joint dependence relationships between the emerging community venture and the resource holders in the community. Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. (2009) built upon Hayek's (1945) understanding of entrepreneurship as a localized task to conceptualize a type of entrepreneurs relying upon available resources and knowledge in the community as bricoleurs. The concept bricolage has earlier been used to explain how

entrepreneurs in resource-poor environments recombine resources at hand for new purposes (Baker and Nelson 2005). Di Dominico et al (2010) found that community ventures used unused and underused resource in the community in new ways to develop social values. Bricoleurs are likely to be highly embedded in the community and with close relationships to resource holders in the community and are uniquely positioned to see the needs within the community (Lauer 2005; Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. 2009).

Other researchers study non-bricoleurs aiming to introduce new resources and activities to the community (Shaw and Carter 2007). Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. (2009) built upon Kirzner's (1997) perspective of alertness to opportunities to conceptualize this type of entrepreneurs as constructionists. Constructionists pursue ideas which need more innovative and radical solutions. The radical idea might limit the ability to achieve legitimacy and make the mobilization of community resource holders challenging. The constructionists are likely to be less embedded in the community, and not locked into existing structures and more likely to challenge rules and norms within the environment (Lauer 2005; Mair and Marti 2006).

3. METHODOLOGY

The lack of prior studies on the relationships of community ventures calls for an in-depth and flexible qualitative research design (Flybjerg 2005; Johns 2006). Theory-building from case studies is one of the best strategies to bridge rich qualitative evidence and mainstream deductive research (Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007), and to enable the collection of multiple data at different levels in the process (Eisenhardt 1989).

Case selection

The characteristics of the cases selected are presented in table 1. The three music festivals included in this study were non-profit organizations with the aim of creating benefit for the community. A festival is an event usually arranged over a short time period at regular intervals, often over a weekend or week annually and found to have significant impact in terms of creating new activities and shaping the identity of communities (Delamere 2001; Gursoy, Kim et al. 2004). Music festivals rely upon a range of resources from local resource holders.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The festivals emerged within rural communities in Norway. Peredo (2006) argues that community ventures are less likely to appear in large communities with complex and fragmented networks, making it difficult to motivate others towards collective action. RDT holds that a resource may create a dependence relationship if it has few suppliers (Pfeffer and Salancik 2003). Because of fewer potential resource providers, the venture may be more dependent on engagement in the community within a rural context compared to an urban area (Kalantaridis and Bika 2006; Meccheri and Pelloni 2006). Moreover, the context is easier to define within a rural area, and relationships between the venture and the resource holders are more transparent because the individuals in the community are more visible. Together with an open culture, and a rather transparent Norwegian society, this has contributed to good availability of data.

The festivals are selected to replicate the two types of community entrepreneurs derived within the literature; the bricoleurs and the constructionists (Yin 2003; Domenico, Haugh et al. 2010). Two of the cases, Jazz and Rock, were launched by constructionists who introduced new knowledge and resources to their respective communities. To compare the relationships of the venture initiated by constructionists with bricoleurs, the third case, Musical, was started by bricoleurs building upon existing resources and knowledge in the local community. All communities studied are conservative and isolated that made it easier to explore the differences between the two types of entrepreneurs, since to change the existing culture and norms may be more challenging than in a more open and innovative communities.

Data collection

The time frame was from the initial idea was considered until the community venture had gained repeated support from resource providers in the community. Multiple sources were used to develop rich empirical data of high reliability (Yin 2003). I conducted face-to-face interviews with the entrepreneurs and other individuals involved in the process in the period 2006-2010, as shown in table 2. Narrative interviewing was used to obtain data from the first time the entrepreneurs heard about the venture until today (Czarniawska 1998). Semi-structured interviews ensured that essential information became selected.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

A total of 38 interviews were conducted. The interviews were carried out in the home of the informants, at their work, at the festival arena, or by telephone and lasted from half hour to

three hours. Key actors were interviewed several times and asked to tell the narrative about the activities since the previous interview until the ongoing interview. Newspaper articles, e-mail communication, and other written documents supplemented and validated the interviewed data. Participant observations at meetings and festival arrangements developed personal contacts that made it easier to gain trust among the interviewees and discover new informants. The observations were open ended; however, the focus was to identify the relationships. Field notes were taken during the observations. Together with narrative interviewing, participant observation gave access to data close to real-time (Czarniawska 1998).

Data analysis

The collected data provided both narrative accounts of the process (Pentland 1999) and factual descriptions of context, actors, and events from a large number of sources. The interviews were recorded and transcribed as a part of the data analysis process. The interview transcripts and other material were read and re-read as data was collected; emerging themes were refined as this process progressed, and was checked through repeat interviews with the main players (Yin 2003). The views of the different respondents from each case were also compared. I undertook an internal analysis of each case by writing a narrative covering the development of relationships. Furthermore, I did a cross-comparing analysis to find similarities and differences between the cases. Finally, the observations of the different types of entrepreneurs and the relationships between the venture and resource holders became identified to match theoretical concepts (Borch and Arthur 1995; Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007). As a validity check some of the festival founders have read the manuscript and confirmed the findings. Each of the three cases is summarized in the next section.

COMMUNITY VENTURE CASES

Each case is given a fictitious name, based on the music style on the festival, to preserve confidentiality. The three ventures were code-named: Jazz, Rock, and Musical.

Jazz was a 6-day jazz-music festival arranged in August every year. During the festival, amateurs were instructed and played with professional musician in courses and workshops as well as in concerts and jam sessions open for visitors. In addition, camp activities such as sightseeing, caving, and fishing were offered. The background for the festival was that the community had struggled with depopulation and stagnation and wanted to develop new

opportunities for the inhabitants and the local business. Jazz has attracted positive attention for the community from regional and national media. For instance, a national newspaper had a two page article with the headline “The jazz camp in Beiarn. Jazz success in a green valley”. New cultural activities, such as local jazz groups and more regular concerts around the year, were created. Local business generated income from the new visitors and activities. The municipality has formally evaluated their involvement and concluded that they will continue to support the festival. The major in the municipality holds: *“I think [Jazz], not at least because of the positive media attention in both Local and National newspapers and elsewhere, has strengthened the identity of the community. Yes, it contributes building our identity in a positive way”* (G1-see table 2). The festival got regular sponsoring from local businesses and the municipality and has a core group of volunteers helping to arrange the festival.

Rock was a rock-festival arranged one weekend in July every year. At the festival, rock-artists from outside the community performed out-door concerts on a river beach. The festival was enriched by the local Sami traditions and music. There was also a course for children with the chanting song of the Sami people. In addition, activities such as a sand castle competition, a volleyball competition and horse riding were offered. The background for the festival was that the community had attracted negative media attention nationwide because of some social problems. Rock reached their goal of changing the negative media focus on the community. The first festival leader expressed: *“The first year [National Television was here] [...]. The story was broadcasted at the nine o’clock news, really in prime time, and with the right focus”* (E3). By the late 2000s, the youth in this part of the country associated the community with a ‘cool festival’ and the local youths were more proud of being from the municipality. The municipality still contributed with economic support and the local businesses were increasingly involved and numerous volunteers worked for the festival.

Musical arranged 7-9 musical concerts during two weekends in May. Musical created an arena where earlier separated music groups and organizations in the community, such as school bands, choirs, music school, and theatre and dance groups, could join and create concerts together. The background for the festival was that the youth left the community for taking education, and never moved back. Musical aimed at creating positive association for the community among the youth and to develop young talents. Musical became well established in the community and attracted participants and visitors from all over the region

and the concerts used to be sold-out. The entrepreneur explained about the first year: “It was an immediate success. [...] it was 7-9 performances full booked” (E1). Some of the youth who had moved out to study came home to join the festival every year. The local businesses earned money on the increased visitors to the community and Musical created positive external attention.

THE FINDINGS

I found two main patterns that addressed the research question: one pattern explained the joint dependence relationships and the characteristics of the relationships, and one pattern illustrated how the relationships evolve over time.

Joint dependence relationships and resource mobilization

I found the pattern of joint dependence relationships across all three cases. The degree and quality of the interdependences, however, were different according to the type of entrepreneurs. The joint dependence relationships and the characteristics of the relationships for each case are presented in table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HER

The entrepreneurs of Musicals were bricoleurs. They were highly embedded in the community since they were born and grown up in the community and had close knowledge about the local needs and the conditions within the community (Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. 2009; Di Domenico, Haugh et al. 2010). As leaders of music, dance, and theatre organizations in the community, the entrepreneurs had close relationships with critical resource holders. One of the entrepreneurs asserted: “It was about bringing together an ensemble from the music, theatre, dance milieu, and the production; those have earlier been working separately.” (E2). Since the entrepreneurs built upon existing resources and knowledge, they transformed earlier dependence relationships with resource holders to the new venture. The resource holders saw the benefit they could get from engaging in the venture. The venture and key resource holders in the community became highly interdependent and had a collective interest of mobilizing the resources for the venture. The venture became formed by resources in voluntary organizations and from artists in the community and it did not need resources from the municipality or businesses in the community or any external resources (Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. 2009).

The entrepreneur of Jazz and the two entrepreneurs of Rock were constructionists and aimed to develop new activities and resources in the community. The entrepreneurs were less embedded in the community and had not developed relationships to resource holders in the community for their novel activities (Lauer 2005). They were musicians from outside the community with networks within the national music industry and introduced external resources, such as artists and technicians, for the community. To mobilize community resources, such as financial, physical, organizational, and human resources as well as legitimacy and trust, the entrepreneurs needed to convince the municipality to be owner and economic responsible for the venture. The entrepreneur of Jazz expressed: “The municipality is involved in [Jazz]. We could not have done this without them. As long as the municipality is involved, we can [arrange the festival] (F1 – see table 2). Similarly, a municipal representative in Rock explained: “Actually the festival wanted to be independent [from the municipality] all the time, but then we would not be so big so fast” (V2). The municipality was partly dependent upon the venture, since the municipality bore the economic risk. Simultaneously, the municipality did not know if the new activities of the venture would contribute positively to the community, and could stop the project if they wanted. Consequently, the joint dependence relationships between the municipality and the constructionists were not very deep.

Since the entrepreneurs wanted to introduce new resources and ideas to the community, they initially engaged only villagers who agreed with their ideas in decision making and governance of the venture. The entrepreneur of Jazz did not develop any board with members of the community to avoid involvement from the community resource holders. The entrepreneur of Jazz worked mostly with his external networks and the municipal representative in the venture explained: “I think [the entrepreneur started Jazz] for his own part, for his own benefit. He is looking for a job, because he likes this type of job. I think he wants to run it in his own auspice. [...]. It feels like this, and I have got the same feedback from others. And he really wants to develop a foundation, and to be engaged by the foundation and work more on his own.” (G2). One of the entrepreneurs of Rock said: “When we brought forth the idea, me and [the other entrepreneur] went to those who we thought wanted to be involved and who had the same [music taste]. We did not ask those people working with dance band and dance music”. (E1).

Since the entrepreneurs did not want to engage the community too much in the decision making processes and governance of the venture (Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. 2009), the constructionists struggled with developing joint dependence relationships with community resource holders. Furthermore, the community resource holders did not see the benefit of the new activities. To mobilize into a collective action became difficult and the ventures had problems with engaging volunteers and local businesses. The municipal represent in Jazz expressed: “It is a cultural clash between the [dance band] milieu [in the community] and jazz. Folk singing would have been easier [to arrange].” (E2). Rock needed to introduce volunteers from outside the community volunteers to be able to arrange the festival.

Consistent with the literature, the bricoleurs where embedded in the community and built the venture upon their existing ties to community resource holders, whilst the constructionists where less embedded in the community and needed to develop new relationships for their novel activities in the community (Lauer 2005; Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. 2009). Consequently, the constructionists will struggle more with mobilizing the resource holders than the bricoleurs (Lauer 2005; Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. 2009). Following proposition can be outlined:

Proposition 1: Community ventures initiated by “community constructionists”, who introduce new resources and knowledge to the community, are initially likely to have lower level of joint dependence relationships to community resource holders than community ventures initiated by “community bricoleurs”, who develop the community venture upon existing resources and familiar practices within the community.

Characteristics of Joint dependence relationships

I found a second pattern, the characteristics of the joint dependence relationships. Trust and conflicts were identified as typically characteristics of joint dependence relationships of the community venture. This will be presented below.

Trust

Trust is the awareness of a person or an organization about how likely it will be that another actor will behave as expected (Welter and Smallbone 2006). Entrepreneurship research has found that new ventures are likely to lack trust among potential resource providers, and the entrepreneurs need to develop an identity as a trustworthy person as well as building

relationships based on trust. Trust is also found to be needed for the community entrepreneurs to be able to mobilize resources (Johnstone and Lionais 2004).

Different degree of trust was identified according to the type of entrepreneurs. The bricoleurs built the venture upon earlier trustful relationships whilst the constructionists met some problems to mobilize resources because of lack of trust for their new activities in the community. The bricoleurs in Musicals were engaged in voluntary and cultural organizations within the community and had developed relationships based on trust and reputation through earlier arrangements of cultural events. They transformed their individual trust to the venture. One of the entrepreneurs explained: “I have been [active in the local culture life] so long time that people know that when I do something, it will come off. Trust is important” (E2).

The constructionists met mistrust for their ideas in the community. The municipality in Jazz though it was a strange idea and one of the business owners explained: “The entrepreneur met a lot of adversity in the beginning, especially from the chief administrative officer. It was important that everything went well for [the entrepreneur] the first year. It was a personal gain.” (P1). The entrepreneur of Jazz met mistrust among voluntary and cultural organizations and business owners as well. One of the volunteers said: “When a lot of questions came up, I thought that they should not be that skeptic and rather join [the venture]. It was the way the entrepreneur talked that made it difficult for the [community members] to think it was serious. [...] [In this community] you have the farming culture which is like this: you sow a seed and waiting for it to grow. It grows slowly. [The entrepreneur] talks very fast and very intense, and talks about how it will be [in the future] and about changes. And it is the laid-back culture [in the community]. It goes too fast [for them]. He’s a bit busy.” (V1). Similarly, Rock met much skepticism because of low level of trust in the relationships, and one of the entrepreneur in Rock explained: “[The community] left [Rock] no hope: ‘It will never be more than one year, you will never manage this’”. (E1)

Earlier studies support the findings above. High level of joint dependence is found to enhance trust (Yilmaz, Sezen et al. 2005; Gulati and Sytch 2007). Since the relationships between the bricoleurs’ venture and the community resource providers are based upon high level of joint dependence relationships, it is likely that the level of trust will be high as well. In contrast, the constructionists’ venture will have lower level of trust because of lower level of joint dependence relationships. Furthermore, commercial entrepreneurs who are highly embedded in the community are found to draw on social resources and trust developed as a member of

the community (Lauer 2005). Entrepreneurs from outside the community were less embedded and needed to overcome problems of distrust. Following proposition can be outlined:

Proposition 2: The venture initiated by “community bricoleurs” is initially likely to have relationships with resource holders in the community characterized of higher degree of trust than the venture initiated by “community constructionists”.

Conflicts and goal congruence

The second characteristic of joint dependence relationships identified from the cases was conflicts and goal congruence. High degree of joint dependence relationships is found to decrease the experienced level of conflicts as well as increase goal congruence between the actors. The bricoleurs built upon norms and culture in the community and the actors involved had the same goals and expectations for the venture. (Gundlach and Cadotte 1994; Johnson, Ford et al. 2000; Gulati and Sytch 2007). I could not identify any conflicts between the venture initiated by the bricoleurs and the community resource holders. In contrast, the constructionists’ ventures met a range of conflicts with resource holders in the community.

The cases illustrated that there were goal conflicts between the community resource holders and the constructionists’ ventures. For instance, the municipality in Jazz wanted to build more on existing resources and knowledge in the community whilst the entrepreneur aimed to develop new knowledge and resources in the community by introducing external resources. The municipal represent in Jazz expressed: “[The entrepreneur] see a lot of collaboration with businesses [outside the community] which I feel we lose money to. So I feel I need to take hold on, I need all the time be responsible for the community’s money. I do not want to rob money from the local culture life.” (G2). She continued: “[...] my focus is that we should use the resources we have. [...] the rafting that we needed to hire and pay [from outside the community] is not development of our resources. We have the canoes, the caves. [...]. It is closer and easier for us to arrange canoe tours and cave walks. [...]. It is a hope to get more local actors and course participants” (G2).

The bureaucratic system, budget, and rules in the municipality did also crash with the entrepreneurs’ goals and the informal structure of the venture. The municipal represent in Jazz explained: “I have tried to reduce the activity. We may have different standpoint. [The entrepreneur] really want to develop this. He has used a lot of time and efforts with his

contacts and networks and he has a lot of ideas for further development of [Jazz]. I have said to him that we have limited resources for [Jazz] and we have spent more than that calculated long time ago. We have used much more time on the project than anticipated” (G2).

Actually, there were too many conflicts and differences between Rock and the municipality to develop high level of joint dependence relationship, and after some years, Rock became a separated unit. One of the entrepreneurs explained: “After last year’s festival, the municipal chief administrative officer said that the festival was too expensive for the municipality and that they needed to cover the loss year after year and that they used too many municipal resources and work capacity on it. So we thought that it would be better to separate the festival from the municipality and develop a foundation. [...]. Now we have the economic risk, and it is much easier to develop an agreement with [the municipality].” (E1).

Both ventures met conflicts with other resource holders in the community as well. One of the entrepreneurs of Rock expressed: "It was a lot of opposition when we started, since we wanted to use the [community] name [on the festival]. [...] . [...] and local persons said: Let us be alone. [...]. Can't you choose another name?" (E1). To be a part of the municipality did also make some of the community resource holders reluctant to engage in the venture. One of the entrepreneurs of Rock explained: “[...] the work has been on a voluntary basis. It has been a mismatch [and the volunteers ask]: ‘why should we struggle for [the municipality]?’” [E1]. After Rock became separated from the municipality and a board with represents from the local businesses, voluntary organizations and villagers, and the municipality was developed, it became easier to engage volunteers and businesses in the venture: “[A regional power station] gave us a lot of money. They would not have done that if we were a part of the municipality.” (E1).

The jazz entrepreneur tried to convince the voluntary organizations, businesses, and other villagers to join the new activities of the venture, however, the community resource holders wanted to supply their ordinary activities and resources to the venture. Consequently, the entrepreneur had some problem with developing engagement, and the municipal represent in the venture explained “[...] he had already fallen out with [some villagers]. Because he wanted to decide and he may not accepted any corrections. [The entrepreneur] knows how he wants it and it is difficult to change [his ideas]. (G2).

Earlier research asserts that conflicts are likely to exist in early stages of joint dependence relationships because of different language and expectation (Gundlach and Cadotte 1994). A study on the relationships between community ventures and corporations found that the venture is likely to meet dialectical tensions leading to conflicts because of different goals and logic, ownership, governance, and accountability of the actors (Di Domenico, Tracey et al. 2009). Since the constructionists' venture is likely to have different goals and expectation than the resource holders in the community, it will be more difficult to engage the community into collective action. This lead to following proposition:

Proposition 3: Community ventures initiated by “community constructionists” are initially likely to meet more conflicts and lower degree of goal congruence with community resource holders than community ventures initiated by “community bricoleurs”.

The dynamics of joint dependence relationships

The relationships between the community venture and the resource holders were not static and, consistent with RDT, the characteristics of the relationships changed over time (Jawahar and McLaughlin 2001; Pfeffer and Salancik 2003). The dynamics of joint dependence relationships are presented in table 4.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Bricoleurs and Constructionists as dynamic constructs

The cases showed that to mobilize the community resource providers into collective action, the venture needed to develop higher degree of joint dependence relationships by developing trust and overcome conflicts with local resource holders. The constructionists engaged local powerful actors in the venture to develop trust to the community resource holders. This is consistent with earlier research that found that less embedded entrepreneurs use the institutional trust held by actors embedded in the community to access resources (Lauer 2005). They convinced the municipality to be owner, and needed to adapt to the demands and goals of the municipality to reduce the conflict level and enhance goal congruence. The municipality of Jazz persuaded the entrepreneur to invite artists who were not so “extreme jazz-musicians”. This made it easier to develop joint dependence relationships with resource holders in the community. The municipal represent in Jazz explained: "Last year, Mike Stern was a well-known name for people within [the jazz milieu], but for the villagers it was not really 'oh yeah'. [This year] more ordinary artists where invited, [...], like we see on [The

National television], [...]. And the rural community's own eccentric will come, [...]. He is seen as, 'Oh yeah, his from our community', then they will show up. The concert in [a local art gallery] last year attracted many. The villagers honor their own." (M2).

In addition, the entrepreneurs of Rock tried to develop trust to the community members by involving villagers in the board of the venture: "They engaged me because it is important to have a local. [The two entrepreneurs] are newcomers from [other places in Norway], and I am very local since the festival arena is located in my childhood village. [...] In addition, I was the headmaster of the municipal culture school." (V1). This person developed trust for the venture to the municipality and other local resource holders. The venture needed to adapt to the demands from the local actors engaged in the venture to decrease conflict level and increase goal congruence, such as using Sami traditions and music as well as arranging a course with chanting song of the Sami people.

The relationships of Musicals did also change over time. After some years, Musicals wanted to arrange an opera that needed new knowledge and resources, such as professional musicians and actors, from outside the community. Despite the bricoleurs built close, joint relationships with key resource holders in the community, they met some problems with engaging volunteers for the opera. One reason was that offering payment for external, professional artists might be a source of conflict, since the artists within the local community worked as volunteers. One of the entrepreneurs explained: "When you do cultural work, the employees or the one with special qualities do often get paid for the work, [...], whilst those poor [volunteers] who work hard they do not be appreciated in the same way. [...] And I see that in [Musicals], despite the professional artists are reasonable paid, it will easily be a conflict" (E2).

The result above is consistent with joint dependence approach suggesting that new relationships may lack trust and have higher degree of conflicts because of different language and expectation (Gundlach and Cadotte 1994). Over time, however, the actors in the relationships are likely to adapt to each other's goals and interests which facilitates goal convergence and decreases perceived conflict (Gulati and Sych 2007). This motivates resource holders to commit resources to achieve collective interests (Van de Ven, Sapienza et al. 2007). In addition, the data illustrates that over time, the venture initiated by the bricoleurs started to develop projects those needed new knowledge and resources. By combining the concepts of bricoleurs and constructionists with joint dependency approach I show that the

types of entrepreneurs are not static and will change over time because of the need to develop joint dependence relationships. Consequently, the constructionists' and bricoleurs' venture becomes increasingly more similar. Thus I propose:

Proposition 4: The venture initiated by “community constructionists” is likely to adapt to demands and interests of community resource holders to develop joint dependence relationships, and the venture initiated by the constructionists' are likely to be more similar to the venture initiated by “community bricoleurs” over time.

Increased joint dependence relationships over time

The trust relations are found to develop over time because of reputation and community involvement (Howorth and Moro 2006; Nguyen and Rose 2009). The cases showed that venture increased its position in the community through repeated exchanges and track record, and the resource holders in the community started to see the benefit the venture made in the community. Consequently, the level of joint dependence relationships between the ventures and the resource holders increased and the relationships became increasingly more based upon high level trust, goal convergence and lower level of conflicts (Howorth and Moro 2006; Gulati and Sytch 2007; Villanueva, Van de Ven et al. 2010).

The conflicts and opposition against Rock decreased when the local resource holders saw the festival changed the reputation of the community. One of the entrepreneurs explained: “We have really seen [changes] in the village [where the social problems had been]. My mom drove around [with information about the festival]. The first year, she met [a local business owner]. [...]. He was really grumpy. This was not necessary, and why. Next time she came, he said; yes, it was very good that she did something for the youth. They had been sitting on the veranda during the night and listening to the music. Next year, the second year, he came with some stickers, ashtrays, and stamps, which he had sold from his [business]. [...] He wanted to give them to the festival. [...]. And I remember in 2005 I was on the beach during the day program, and I saw a lot of people from the village [where the social problems had been]. And the villager's association [that worked against the festival in the beginning] is a part of the festival and sells food on the festival. This may be the clearest proof that the local community likes the festival” (V1).

The municipality increasingly saw the benefit the constructionists' ventures made in the community as well. The municipal represent of Jazz said: “Now when we have cut down the

project leader position, I don't think [there is any opposition against the festival]. I have not felt that we have met political opposition or other type of opposition because of the municipal engagement in the festival. The good media publicity has given [Jazz] goodwill by the politicians related to the economy. People want us to continue [arranging Jazz], I really think. One of the politicians said that he did not like this type of music and everything, however, he understood that this was good" (G2).

The literature supports the findings above. Reciprocity and trust are created because of repeated exchanges between the venture and the local stakeholders (Van de Ven, Sapienza et al. 2007). This is found to facilitate the goal convergence and minimizing the level of conflicts. The resource holders became more motivated to commit resources to achieve collective interests, and it became easier to accomplish innovative activities that departed from prior practices in the communities as well. Following proposition summarizes the assumptions above:

Proposition 5: The venture initiated by the "community constructionists" will increase their joint dependence relationships with community resource holders over time and it will be possible to accomplish the novel activities as well

The entrepreneurs' impact on the relationships

The impact of the entrepreneurs on the relationships of the community venture changed during the development of the venture. In the initial phases of development, the entrepreneurs' relationships were decisive for the relationships of the community venture. Over time local actors engaged in the venture as well as the reputation of the community venture developed joint dependence relationships between the venture and the local resource holders. There were, however, still some problems of mistrust and conflicts between the entrepreneurs and local resource holders. For instance, the entrepreneur of Jazz worked all the time to be less dependent upon the municipality. However, the municipality demanded that the entrepreneur of jazz involved the volunteers, businesses, and the municipality more in the decision making processes. The entrepreneur felt the increased involvement from the voluntary organizations as well as the municipality made it difficult to develop his ideas: "My goal is to develop an independent organization. It is so many who want to have a voice in the festival. At the artistic plan, this can kill. I feel that I need to inform a lot about what I do. All

the time I need to explain why I do it, what it is. [...]. I think it is some frustrations, and sometimes it has been very hard, I don't hide that.” (E1).

Similarly, one of the entrepreneurs of Rock had always some new ideas, however, he met some opposition in the venture: “Some people like [One in the board] tries to detain [the development of Rock]: ‘it’s good enough, why should we be bigger than we are?’” (E1). However, one of the entrepreneurs continued arguing for expanding from two to three days festival: “[...] I will try again next year. [...] It is about being dynamic. It needs to be something new. If it stagnates and you present the same, [...], you lose the interest very fast.” (E1).

This finding is supported by earlier entrepreneurship research where the role of the entrepreneur is found to be most decisive in young firms, whilst the organizational characteristics become more important for older firms (Brush, Greene et al. 1997). The following proposition can be outlined:

Proposition: “The entrepreneur’s impact on the relationships between the community venture and the community resource holders is likely to decrease over time when the venture had gained joint dependence relationships with community resource holders”

CONCLUSIONS:

Using evidence from longitudinal case studies of three music festivals in rural communities in Norway, this study increased the understanding of the resource mobilization of CVs. Building upon recent theoretical typology on community entrepreneurs; this study explores how different types of entrepreneurs affect the relationships between the community venture and the resource holders in the community. The result of this study is illustrated in figure 1.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

To be able to mobilize the community into collective action, the community venture needed to develop high degree of joint dependence relationships with local resource holders characterized by high level of trust and goal congruence and few conflicts. However, the entrepreneurs met different challenges in developing the close relationships. The bricoleurs

were highly embedded in the local community and could utilize their existing ties and trust to develop high level of joint dependence relationships between the resource holders and the venture. The venture met little conflicts with the resource holders. The constructionists where from outside the communities and less embedded in their communities and could not build upon relationships based upon trust for their novel activities and struggled with conflicts and incompatible goals which reduced the resource flow and possibility for collective action.

Over time, however, the constructionists' venture increased the joint dependence relationships with resource holders in the community because of repeated interaction, engagement of local actors in the venture, adaptation to resource holders' goals and interests, as well as the increased understanding of the benefit of the venture in the community (Van de Ven, Sapienza et al. 2007). The constructionists' venture became formed by resources and activities within the community and could over time accomplish the new activities in the community. The findings showed that the constructionists and the bricoleurs' venture may be more similar over time because of the need to develop joint dependence relationships. The entrepreneurs' impact on the relationships between the community venture and the community resource holders is most decisive early in the venturing process. Lately, when the venture has developed joint dependence relationships in the community, the entrepreneurs became less important.

This study extends the community entrepreneurship literature by giving rich empirical examples on how the relationships between the emerging community venture and its resource holders may be affected by different types of community entrepreneurs. (Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. 2009). As illustrated, the constructionists struggled more than the bricoleurs in mobilizing the resource holders in the community because of lack of trust and high degree of conflicts between the community venture and local resource holders. Building on the joint dependence approach as well as using longitudinal data, however, made it possible to illustrate that the concepts of bricoleurs and constructionists may not be static. The need to engage the community in the venture makes the constructionists' more similar to the bricoleurs' venture. Simultaneously, the bricoleurs venture may lately in the venturing process introduce new resources and activities from outside the community, and will meet some of the challenges of lower level of trust and more conflicts for their novel activities. Consequently, further research should make some efforts in developing more dynamic concepts of entrepreneur types. Furthermore, I recommend longitudinal studies for other researchers who want to study

relationships of community venture. Finally, further research should include the community context when studying community entrepreneurship.

In addition, this study illustrated the need for comparing different levels of analysis when studying relationships. This study focused on the relationships between the venture and the resource holders. However, I also showed that the individual relationships between the entrepreneurs and the resource holders may be different from the venture's relationships over time. Despite there were joint dependence relationships between the venture and the resource holders, the constructionists still tried to work independently and met conflicts with resource holders. Consequently, further research may need to separate between and compare different levels of analysis when studying joint dependence relationships.

I suppose that mobilizing of resources of the community venture represents a unique context for exploring the joint dependency approach. To develop joint dependent relationships with community members is decisive for community ventures to be able mobilize the community into collective action. Furthermore, the limited financial capacity to pay for resources makes the venture dependent upon developing trustful relationships based upon low level of conflicts with local resource holders. Because of little empirical research within the joint dependence approach, this study may serve as good examples of the ideas within the joint dependence approach. I illustrated that high level of joint dependence relationships between the community venture and resource holders within the community were characterized by high level of trust and goal convergence and few conflicts (Zahra, Yavuz et al. 2006) (Neergaard and Uihøi 2006). This again facilitated the mobilization of resources into collective action (Van de Ven, Sapienza et al. 2007). Furthermore, by doing a longitudinal study this study illustrated that joint dependence relationships are changing over time, and that the individual background of the entrepreneur will be most decisive in the earliest phases of development than later. This study recommends future research on the joint dependence approach to do longitudinal studies of relationship development.

Music festivals need relatively large amounts of resources from the community to get started, and they impact the lives of most community members either directly or indirectly. Moreover, the cases occurred in a national context with a well-developed welfare system and a strong public sector. Simultaneously, the resourcefulness of the community will impact on the relationships (Domenico et al 2010). The result is, therefore, not directly transferable to other contexts. Additional cases from different contexts are needed to provide more robust results.

For instance, the results from this study could be compared with studies of the relationships of community ventures in more innovative or resource full communities.

The research has some practical implications as well. Since high level of trust and low level of conflicts are found to be characterized of high level of joint dependence relationship, the emerging community venture may use strategies to increase trust and solve conflicts. It may be even more important than for business entrepreneurs to build trustfully relationships, since the business entrepreneurs can give money back for the resource providers offers.

There is a need for different management style according to the motivations and knowledge of the entrepreneurs, the community context, and the opportunities being pursuit. Entrepreneurs who aim to introduce new activities to the community need to take into account that it will take time to develop joint dependence relationships. Entrepreneurs should keep the goal of maximizing social wealth and develop a board with represents from different parts of the community (Zahra, Gedajlovic et al. 2009).

REFERENCES:

- Agterberg, M., B. V. D. Hooff, et al. (2010). "Keeping the Wheels Turning: The Dynamics of Managing Networks of Practice." *Journal of Management Studies* **47**(1): 85-108.
- Austin, J., H. Stevenson, et al. (2006). "Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different or Both?" *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*: 1-22.
- Baker, T. and R. E. Nelson (2005). "Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage." *Administrative Science Quarterly* **50**(3): 329-366.
- Borch, O. J. and M. B. Arthur (1995). "Strategic networks among small firms: Implications for strategy research methodology " *Journal of Management Studies* **32**(4): 419-441.
- Brush, C. G., P. G. Greene, et al. (2001). "From initial idea to unique advantage: The entrepreneurial challenge of constructing a resource base." *Academy of Management Executive* **15**(1): 64-78.
- Brush, C. G., P. G. Greene, et al. (1997). *Resource configurations over the life cycle of ventures*. Entrepreneurship Research Conference, Babson, Babson College.
- Corner, P. D. and M. Ho (2010). "How Opportunities Develop in Social Entrepreneurship." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* **34**(4): 635-659.
- Czarniawska, B. (1998). *A narrative approach to organization studies*. London, Sage.
- Dees, J. G. (2001). The Meaning of "Social Entrepreneurship". *Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership*: 1-5.
- Delamere, T. A. (2001). "Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes toward the social impacts of community festivals, part II: Verification of the scale." *Event Management* **7**: 25-38.
- Di Domenico, M., H. Haugh, et al. (2010). "Social Bricolage: Theorizing Social Value Creation in Social Enterprises." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* **34**(4): 681-703.
- Di Domenico, M., P. Tracey, et al. (2009). "Social Economy Involvement in Public Service Delivery: Community Engagement and Accountability." *Regional Studies* **43**(7): 981-992.
- Domenico, M. D., H. Haugh, et al. (2010). "Social Bricolage: Theorizing Social Value Creation in Social Enterprises." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* **March**: 1-23.

- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). "Building Theories from Case-Study Research." Academy of Management Review **14**(4): 532-550.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. and M. E. Graebner (2007). "Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges." Academy of Management Journal **50**(1): 25.
- Flybjerg, B. (2005). "On misunderstandings in connection with case-studies." Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya(4): 110-120.
- Gulati, R. and M. Sytch (2007). "Dependence asymmetry and joint dependence in interorganizational relationships: effects of embeddedness on a manufacturer's performance in procurement relationships." Administrative Science Quarterly **52**(1).
- Gundlach, G. T. and E. R. Cadotte (1994). "Exchange Interdependence and Interfirm Interaction: Research in a Simulated Channel Setting." Journal of Marketing Research **31**(4): 516-532.
- Gursoy, D., K. Kim, et al. (2004). "Perceived impacts of festivals and special events by organizers: an extension and validation." Tourism Management **25**(2): 171-181.
- Haugh, H. (2007). "Community-Led Social Venture Creation." Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice **31**(2): 161.
- Hayek, F. A. (1945). "The Use of Knowledge in Society." The American Economic Review **35**(4): 519-530.
- Howorth, C. and A. Moro (2006). "Trust within Entrepreneur Bank Relationships: Insights from Italy." Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice **30**(4): 495-517.
- Jawahar, I. and G. McLaughlin (2001). "Toward a descriptive stakeholder theory: An organizational life cycle approach." Academy of Management Review **26**(3): 397.
- Johannisson, B. (1990). "Community entrepreneurship - cases and conceptualization." Entrepreneurship & regional development **2**: 71-88.
- Johns, G. (2006). "The essential impact of context on organizational behavior." Academy of Management Review **31**(2): 386-408.
- Johnson, C., R. Ford, et al. (2000). "Emotional reactions to conflict: Do dependence and legitimacy matter?" Social forces **79**(1): 107.
- Johnstone, H. and D. Lionais (2004). "Depleted communities and community business entrepreneurship: revaluing space through place." Entrepreneurship and Regional Development **16**(3): 217-233.
- Kalantaridis, C. and Z. Bika (2006). "Local embeddedness and rural entrepreneurship: case-study evidence from Cumbria, England." Environment and Planning A **38**(8): 1561-1579.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1997). "Entrepreneurial Discovery and the Competitive Market Process: An Austrian Approach." Journal of Economic Literature **35**(1): 60-85.
- Lauer, S. R. (2005). "Entrepreneurial Processes in an Emergent Resource Industry: Community Embeddedness in Maine's Sea Urchin Industry*." Rural Sociology **70**(2): 145-166.
- Mair, J. and I. Marti (2006). "Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight." Journal of World Business **41**(1): 36-44.
- Meccheri, N. and G. Pelloni (2006). "Rural entrepreneurs and institutional assistance: an empirical study from mountainous Italy." Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal **18**(5): 371 - 392.
- Moss, T. W., J. C. Short, et al. (2010). "Dual Identities in Social Ventures: An Exploratory Study." Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice: 1-26.
- Neergaard, H. and J. P. Ulhøi (2006). "Government Agency and Trust in the Formation and Transformation of Interorganizational Entrepreneurial Networks." Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice **30**(4): 519-539.
- Nguyen, T. V. and J. Rose (2009). "Building trust--Evidence from Vietnamese entrepreneurs." Journal of Business Venturing **24**(2): 165-182.
- Pentland, B. T. (1999). "Building Process Theory with Narrative: From Description to Explanation." The Academy of Management Review **24**(4): 711-724.
- Peredo, A. M. and J. J. Chrisman (2006). "Toward a theory of community-based enterprise." Academy of Management Review **31**(2): 309-328.

- Pfeffer, J. and G. R. Salancik (2003). The external control of organizations: a resource dependence perspective. Stanford, Calif., Stanford Business Books.
- Ridley-Duff, R. (2008). "Social enterprise as a socially rational business." International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research **14**(5): 291-312.
- Shaw, E. and S. Carter (2007). "Social entrepreneurship: Theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes." Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development **14**(3): 418-434.
- Teasdale, S. (2010). "How Can Social Enterprise Address Disadvantage? Evidence from an Inner City Community." Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing **22**(2): 89 - 107.
- Thompson, J. L., A. Lees, et al. (2000). "Social entrepreneurship - a new look at the people and the potential." Management decision **38**(5): 328-338.
- Van de Ven, A. H., H. J. Sapienza, et al. (2007). "Entrepreneurial pursuits of self- and collective interests." Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal **1**(3-4): 353-370.
- Villanueva, J., A. H. Van de Ven, et al. (2010). "Resource mobilization in entrepreneurial firms." Journal of Business Venturing In Press, Corrected Proof.
- Welter, F. and D. Smallbone (2006). "Exploring the Role of Trust in Entrepreneurial Activity." Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice **30**(4): 465-475.
- Yilmaz, C., B. Sezen, et al. (2005). "Joint and interactive effects of trust and (inter) dependence on relational behaviors in long-term channel dyads." Industrial marketing management **34**(3): 235-248.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). Case study research: design and methods. Thousand Oaks, California, Sage.
- Zahra, S. A., E. Gedajlovic, et al. (2009). "A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges." Journal of Business Venturing **24**(5): 519-532.
- Zahra, S. A., H. N. Rawhouser, et al. (2008). "Globalization of social entrepreneurship opportunities." Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal **2**(2): 117-131.
- Zahra, S. A., R. I. Yavuz, et al. (2006). "How Much Do You Trust Me? The Dark Side of Relational Trust in New Business Creation in Established Companies." Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice **30**(4): 541-559.
- Zott, C. and Q. N. Huy (2007). "How Entrepreneurs Use Symbolic Management to Acquire Resources." Administrative science quarterly **52**(1): 70-105.

Table 1: The characteristics of the cases

	Musicals	Jazz	Rock
Entrepreneur type	Bricoleurs	Constructionists	Constructionists
Aim	Increase the attractiveness of the community among the youth	Develop new activities and opportunities for the inhabitants	Change the negative reputation of the community
Community size	5400 inhabitants	1200 inhabitants	3000 inhabitants
Venture started	2001	2005	2003

Table 2. Persons interviewed and observations (number of interviews and observations in parenthesis)

	Code	Jazz	Rock	Musical
Entrepreneurs (E)	E1	The entrepreneur (5 and e-mails)	The third festival leader after E3 (2)	Bandmaster of the school band (2)
	E2		Leader of the public project to change the focus on prostitution activities in the community	Leader of the board (2)
	E3			Choreographer. Employed in Regional theatre group (1)
	E4			Dance instructor (2)
Municipality (G)	G1	The major (2)	The major (1)	The major (1)
	G2	Municipal represent in Jazz (4)		Employee in the public administration (1)
Villagers and voluntary organizations (V)	V1	Technical assistant. Teacher in the municipal music school and the primary school (1)	The festival leader the first and second year. Headmaster in the municipal culture school (2)	Organizer at the festival arena (1)
	V2	Technical assistant. Teacher in the primary school (1)	The festival leader after M1(1)	
	V3	Leader LEC (e-mails)	Board leader when SKI became separated from the municipality. (1)	
	V4	Organizer at festival arena. Employed in the primary school (1)	Safety and guard responsible (1)	
	V5	First Camp host (e-mails)	Media spokesperson. From the prostitution	

		village (1)	
Business owners	V6 Second Camp host (1)		
	B1	Owner of camp ground and local business	
External actors	EX1 Music responsible. International known jazz musician living in the region (1 and e-mails)	Leader of the regional business park (1)	
	EX2 Technical responsible. Living in the region centre (1 and e-mails)		
	EX3 Regional Jazz centre (e-mails)		
Number of interviews	17	11	10
Observations, meetings, and events	P1 Participated at the festival (2 times)	Participated at the festival (1 time)	Participated at meetings (1 time)
	P2 Participated at meetings (6 times)	Participated at meetings (1 time)	

Table 3: The characteristics of joint dependence relationships

	Musicals	Jazz	Rock
Joint dependence relationships	E1 was director of the community school band, and explained: “The local school band arranged a similar project we started [Musicals] with. Actually, I tried the music we worked with the first year [in the local school band]. [...] And we decided to continue this [project], but I couldn’t lead this alone.”	G2 expressed: “[...] the interest of the rural community is not jazz music. It is a paradox that 500 go to a dance on the quay and only a few come to the jazz concert”	V1 explained: “All of us worked with engaging people. We were a festival board on 8-10. We did most of the work ourselves. It was not easy to engage volunteers the first year.”
Trust	E1 explained: “I felt that I was established in the community and had good knowledge about the actors and audiences. [...]. I had developed a network and was established as a master. Most people knew who I was.”	G2 said about E1: “His (E1’s) idea was too ambitious so people shook their head. They thought it was impossible to accomplish”	V2 explained: “It was skepticism to the festival the first year. It was bad that we used the [community name] and it would be a drinking spree. Both the businesses and the villagers [were skeptical].”
Conflicts	No conflicts discovered	The entrepreneur of jazz had problem with developing engagement. G2 had an explanation for that: “It was a culture conflict. I was there [on a meeting with organizations and associations in the community]. I think I had the same understanding of the meeting, that he oriented and had set up the conditions rather than involving us	(V5) told: “After the festival last year there were some writings in our local news paper [...] about the use of resources. And [a local politician] had developed an arithmetic problem for how much resources were used [on Rock]. It is necessary to take into account that it is not world’s richest

		in it. They perceived it more like information and not an invitation to come along.” G2 told: “It will affect my budget so I will have a piece of the effects. I have thought the idea was very good, it was manageable and suitable. [...] My message has been that I need to know that it [balance economically] [...]. I have told that I like your ideas and think you have done a good work, but there and there and there it need to be an economic solution. I need to see that it work out”	municipality.” V2 explained: "We earned money on alcohol sale, and that was not a municipal task. It was too much balance between what was a municipality's responsibility and not."
--	--	---	--

Table 4: The dynamics of joint dependence relationships

	Bricoleurs and Constructionists as dynamic constructs	Increased joint dependence relationships over time	Role of the entrepreneur
Musicals	To arrange a new type of festival that needed to introduce knowledge from outside the community was a risky task and (E1) explained: “When we were planning to arrange [the Elk opera] last year, nobody could guarantee that it would be popular among the people. [...]. [One of the entrepreneurs] waged his livestock on this. It could have been a reality for [the entrepreneur], since he had the responsibility for it. You see how vulnerable it is.”	The entrepreneurs of Musicals worked to improve their relationships based upon trust and E1 explained: “Trust is important. We have created trust with those engaged. We have made it fair related to everything we have said in the projects. Everything we have said has been real. Trough this, you develop trust. [...]. We keep the agreements and have very concrete tasks, we do not give the people more expectations, we join the presented conditions and then we develop trust with those who this concern”	
Jazz	E1 said: “And the experience we did last year was that although we had a world name, it did not actually affect [the number of visitors]. [...]. [...] especially the local [visitors] [...] do want Norwegian name on the poster, known name. This year is actually a result of that”.	G1 said: “I have registered that more of the ordinary villagers participate. They have nice concert experiences and think that this is important for [the community]. We are dependent upon local foundation since we use many municipal resources. The foundation and legitimacy has increased. E1 asserted: “We have got more activities, for instance, the Guest House have arranged clubs with music and the choirs have used [A Jazz artist] as a	G2 said: “If he got an idea he wants to carry it out regardless if we say no or we say it is a bad idea. It has been some ideas we have thought have been very bad, that he had accomplished anyway.”

		theme. She (the jazz artist) was here. It is going very slowly, however, [Jazz] spreads some new things within the community.	
Rock	E1 explained: “That is the problem, if they have not heard about [the artist] it is not that interesting. People want something they have heard about. So we need to give a mix of [music] the people have heard about and combine it with [music] we know they will like”.	V1 explained: “[...] and another thing is the politicians, there it is agreement about that the festival is good and important for [the community] across party line. I helped the major to write a speech he held in [the capital of Norway] this autumn, on a seminar about changing a bad reputation [of a community]. In addition, the festival make the youth proud of being from [the community].” V1 continued: “It is because the local community has been more and happier with the festival, and does a voluntary job. It was in the beginning we really needed volunteers from outside the community.”	E1 said: “Yes, [I choose the artists], with suggestions from the others. I have ambitions. I refuse very many things. I have argued much in the board and among important persons [when they ask]: ‘but why do we not have that [band]’. I say as an explanation: ‘If we have that and that band the other bands will not come. Then the cultural council will not give us money and will think we do not need public support since we can earn money on it ourselves. The cultural council wants to support festivals who do innovative things and supply breath and scale”

Figure 1: Successful resource mobilization of community ventures

