Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to highlight the political entrepreneurship in the process to start and run an independent school, and to demonstrate the different types of political entrepreneurship that emerges from such processes. The “new” school system is in the intersection between the private and the public, by the public via the municipalities that fund the school whilst it is private owners who runs the school itself. Until the early 1990s, independent schools were an unknown phenomenon in Sweden. A few so-called private schools existed, but it was just about everything. With the center-right government legislation change it became possible for private owners to start independent primary and secondary schools with the right to municipal grants. (cf. the Education Act, SFS 1985:1100). With these changes, the nature of the Swedish school system was change. The changes meant that we went from a school system with only public principals to a school system with both public and private principals. This indicates a change in governing towards a governance system. This change is interesting in several ways, but I will focus here on just its consequences for political entrepreneurship.

---

1 This paper is bases on a book chapter, published in Swedish, in von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg (eds.) (2011) Politikens entreprenörer, Liber

2 The term independent schools refers to schools run by other principals than the government, municipality or county
The New School market

Earlier the government was virtually the sole producers of public service. This has changed. Today, welfare is produced by a number of providers. The entry of private producers of education has created a market situation where schools are forced to compete for students. For the local governments the governing of these systems has become more complex because of the increased complexity. The traditional hierarchical governing structure has come to be challenged by a more complex governing structure in which networks and interactivity have become important governing tools (Kjær 2004, Hedlund & Montin 2009).

The new actors also influence the politicians and the local school policy. Politicians are forced to adjust the policy after the new order. The new school system challenges the traditional view of the division between private and public. This distinction is not simple. The Swedish political scientist Lennart J. Lundqvist (1988) has developed a matrix that shows how complex the issue of private and public can be (see Table 1.1).

Table 1.1 Functional divisions between public and private (Source: Lundqvist 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table's left column shows the organizational arrangements (regulation, finance and production), while the right column shows the principal (private and public). In the case of the former school system the schools was publicly regulated and the government was the principal. The financing and production in the form of teaching was made by the public authorities. Today, the regulation is still public. But the production could be private. But it is the government, both local and central, which has overall responsibility for school quality, both independent and public. The
local governments are responsible for all pupils, both in public and independent schools. The funding however is public. The municipalities pay for students in both the public and independent schools. With regard to education - production - it can in the new school system be both private and public. These changes have created an arena for entrepreneurial actors who can take advantage of the space that the new school system has created.

A new arena for entrepreneurial actors

The entrepreneurial actors utilize the new space, both for their own purposes and to influence the already established structures. These actors are called political entrepreneurs (Sheingate 2003). The political entrepreneurs in this case uses the structures that the new policy creates and enforces an adaptation of the system's other actors. The new school system has more diversity than before, which spawned a host of new actors in the field of education. The political changes of the structure have created a marketplace where schools compete for students. This marketplace is the breeding ground for entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship can be based in the idea of creating an educational model or in economic reasons. The foundation for entrepreneurship also varies on the subject or the actual operation of the schools. In summary we can say that entrepreneurship can be about the operation or the start of the schools. The operation may in turn act on the form or content, and the start can be economically justified or by educational reasons.

The reduction in regulatory governing of the schools gives actors such as teachers and principals more scope to act. The largest scope to maneuver can be identified in the independent schools. Independent schools do not have the political system to respond to, and they are often smaller in size which may increase the staff's discretion. That the system has become more influenced by market thinking also means that school personnel play an increasingly important role, for example has a new market-oriented teacher appeared (Fredriksson 2009), mainly in the independent upper secondary schools and according to Fredriksson (2009) there is a clear connection between market-oriented local school systems and market-oriented teachers (Fredriksson 2009 p. 309).

The structure allows for action. The market model creates space for schools to market themselves to both teachers and students. Although the market thinking is less among the public school teachers the degree of market orientation in the local school system affects how public school teachers are forced to act. But there are also
differences between different types of independent schools. An important distinction is the one between independent schools which belongs to large, sometimes nationwide educational enterprises and schools that are local initiatives. This distinction is primarily reflected in school leaders' new roles. Their ability to think outside the box and act in unconventional ways increases the school's attractiveness. The Swedish school market has opened up for what Ball (2003 p. 218) calls education entrepreneurs. In a broader sense, these entrepreneurs is school staff and in a narrower sense, school leaders in the form of school principals and those who founded or started the schools.

Entrepreneurship

Joseph Schumpeter (1934/1983) was one of the first that used the concept of entrepreneurship. In more broadly terms Schumpeter meant that the essence of entrepreneurship is new ideas. More specifically, Schumpeter argued that the entrepreneurial behavior contains one or more of several elements:

- introduction of a new utility
- introduction of a new method for production
- the opening of a new market
- the consequence of a new source of raw materials
- the creation of a new industrial organization.

For Schumpeter, entrepreneurship is not necessarily tied to an individual but may consist of an organization, which in our case is schools. The essence of Schumpeter's definition of entrepreneurship is behavior not the actor. Schumpeter's point of departure for entrepreneurship was economically, and central to the economic perspective is business. Professor of entrepreneurship research Bengt Johannisson (2005) has developed the concept and states that entrepreneurship is more than putting innovations into tangible business. Through entrepreneurial activities individuals seeks confirmation and identity rather than financial gain. Entrepreneurship is not just innovation and business thinking. As the concept of entrepreneurship has increased in popularity, its meaning has become contentious. Fredrik Svensson (2008 p. 53) identifies four key characteristics of the entrepreneur and the entrepreneurship: personal, behavioral, function and process. Central in the study of entrepreneurship as a process is to isolate the first thought or idea that forms the basis for the organization itself (Smith 2008 p. 52-53). In the process perspective entrepreneurship is about innovative and dynamic processes in which
ingenuity and risk taking is central when new ideas emerge and should be translated into something that creates value (Weimer-Löfvenberg 2008 p. 20). The contemporary entrepreneurship research differs between the entrepreneur as a person and the entrepreneur as a phenomenon. In the case of the entrepreneur as a person, it is about the roles which the entrepreneur can take. As a phenomenon entrepreneurship is all about leadership and change in the structures (von Bergmann-Winberg, 2011) In order to change structures, there must be a space for the entrepreneur to act on. Schneider and Teske (1992) argue that this space is what the entrepreneur uses and further develops. The bottom line is that entrepreneurs in a political system should have a space to act on and this space can vary. It can be a political arena, but it can also be the service-producing arena (in our case the school), where the actors affect the conditions for the implementation of the service production and the political conditions for this service provision. Against this background we can now return to the context in which policy creates a new market for entrepreneurship in schools.

**Political Entrepreneurship**

My illustration of the political creation of a market for entrepreneurial behavior show that when institutional conditions changes it also change behaviors. But it could also be that the political entrepreneurs help to change institutional structures.

Entrepreneurship perspective challenges the prevailing view of institutions and institutional change (Sheingate 2003 p. 187) (see Table 1.2).

Table 1.2 The prevailing view on institutions versus the entrepreneurship view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevailing view</th>
<th>Entrepreneurship view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions reduce uncertainty</td>
<td>The entrepreneur uses the uncertainty that exists in institutions in a creative way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions reduces the complexity</td>
<td>The entrepreneur uses the complexity of the system in a creative way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions reduces the goals and objectives among stakeholders to include a single goal or purpose</td>
<td>The entrepreneur uses the heterogeneity of goals and objectives in a creative way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Entrepreneurs can shape the conditions of the policy debate: they may include various social problems and get things on the political agenda. The political entrepreneur can also invest resources in creating new policies, new actors or new forms of collective action. Entrepreneurs also have the power to consolidate their innovations so that lasting change comes about and to create opportunities within given structures (Sheingate 2003 p. 188). These given structures include the potential opportunities the law gives and also ideological beliefs. As with the legislative changes it became possible for private actors such as private companies, to start independent schools and they were also given an opportunity to monetize the business. It has also created room for actors based on specific organizational and educational visions to run an independent school. The political entrepreneurs in the school can act from either an educational purpose or economic objective. The question that remains is: Why? In the following section, the question will be answered.

**Entrepreneurship based on necessity and possibility**

Schumpeter (1934/1983) spoke of two types of entrepreneurship and made the distinction between "entrepreneurship by necessity" and "entrepreneurship by opportunity". In our example with the school, we find these types of entrepreneurship, in production as the reason for the startup and operation of the business. If we apply the thoughts to our case, entrepreneurship by necessity might be linked to teachers' professional identity. Teachers can be said to be a profession driven by a high degree of professionalism and expertise. Not be able to develop their professional identity and expertise, can for many be obstructive. Having the opportunity to develop their professional identity can be very stimulating and something it can spill over to the professional identity (Ball 2003 p. 218). The opportunity to start an independent school can become the driving force to develop their own pedagogical ideas in a different form than the public school. The opportunity to develop their ideas in an activity other than the public school can be said to be the basis for an understanding of entrepreneurship based on necessity. Entrepreneurship by necessity I here term entrepreneurship with pedagogical and organizational motive. In the case of entrepreneurship, based on opportunity, it is about to seize the opportunity that exists. In the case of independent schools they were given the opportunity in the early 1990s when the law changed so that it became possible for other than the municipality to start school. This is what policy analysts would call a "window of opportunity". The entrepreneurs use this space to
realize their ideas and visions. Entrepreneurship by opportunity is referred to entrepreneurship with economic and educational motives. Entrepreneurship in schools are expressed in production and is divided into an initial phase and an operational phase (see Table 1.3)

Tabell 1.3 Entrepreneurship in Independent Schools. (Source: Modified from Lundqvist 1988.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Prinicpal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Start Economic motive Pedagogical motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation Economic motive Pedagogical motive Organizational motive Pedagogical motive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table summarizes dimensions of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship by opportunity is all about the entrepreneur in the starting up process. The entrepreneur is then driven by a economic motive, which is to make money. This may then go into a operation motive, where entrepreneurship is reflected in a economic motive, or a pedagogical motives. The economic motive is first and foremost the opportunity to make money. The school is in this perspective primarily a business and secondly a school. If the school in the operation phase turns into a pedagogical motive is the profit motive still present, but it is combined with an educational motive, which is expressed in the school uses a specific pedagogical model. Entrepreneurship by necessity is based, in the start up process, on a pedagogical motive. In the operational phase, it turns in to either an organizational motive or an pedagogical motive. In what follows, I develop these divisions.
Entrepreneurship with pedagogical and organizational design

As I wrote earlier, there are two stages in which entrepreneurship can be identified. One is the start-up phase and the second is the operational phase. Central to the identification of entrepreneurship in the start-up phase is focused on the reasons to start the school and the type of school it is. When it comes to the actual operation of the business the entrepreneurship is expressed by either the organizational or pedagogical model. Here I focus on entrepreneurship in which the motive for the start been teaching and where the operation subject is either educational or organizational.

Pedagogical motive

In schools that started with a pedagogical motive and there the actual operation is based on a pedagogical reason, it is at many times, local teachers who have ended their employment at the public school and started a independent school. A representative of such an independent school tells us the reason for the start of the school:

> You could say that there was a dissatisfaction with the educational direction that the politicians took in upper secondary education in Sundsvall. It was taken at the time certain decisions of the comprehensive nature that we did not believe in, and we said that either we will continue the rest of our working lives with growing bitterness, or we should do something constructive, and then it became that we chose to start. It was a bold project, we understood afterwards.

The crucial point in establishing this independent upper secondary school was dissatisfaction with the direction that the public school was heading for. The public secondary school was facing a major reorganization and a number of secondary schools were being closed down. Instead of growing bitterness some of the staff chooses to start their own school in order to have the opportunity to develop a teaching idea that they had and believed in. Possibly the initiative may not be called

---

3 In my study, I conducted seven interviews, from February 2007 to November 2009, with four representatives of independent schools and three school politicians

4 Municipality in Sweden
innovative, since the school starts itself cannot be described as an innovative creation, but the driving force, the necessity that they saw in what they did. This can be linked to teachers' professionalism and professional identity. Johannisson (2005) argues that as part of entrepreneurship is a need of self-development. This quote from the interviewee can be seen as an illustration of what it is that drives some to start an independent school, which do not belong to any educational chain. Respondents are also, in the quote, developing ideas about school education:

> We have completely different conditions [than previous generations] and we will of course be working in completely different ways [in today's working life] and we mean that schools have to work in a way that reflects the reality we live in. And above all we were interested in changing the natural and social science programs, we believe that they where the least that reminded about the future.

Three key elements of entrepreneurship is all about vision, courage and drive. Only required by the entrepreneur is that he or she has an idea and can formulate a vision. In order to do that the entrepreneur should have courage - the courage to invest resources in form of time, money, and to some extent also its reputation. A entrepreneur can not be afraid to fail. The entrepreneur is also required to act - to make a reality of their ideas and bring together the elements necessary for the idea to become reality. They must also be able to handle problems and find solutions to them. Thus defined entrepreneurship in the form of action.

**Organizational motive**

We will now turn to an independent school that was started by a pedagogical motive, but where entrepreneurship in the operational phase started from an organizational motive. One of the representatives of the school describes the organizational motive as follows:

> We were nine who started the school and who went in with the application which had been sitting a couple years and thought about this, and during the first year we asked the then-staff group, which was five people, if there were someone who were interested in joining as a partner.

This current school is run as a limited company and owned by the employees. The reason for choosing this organizational solution describes the respondent as follows:

> Why we chose a limited company? It was simply because it is the best form and minimize our own risk because we did not know if this project was neck or nothing, so therefore it became a limited company.
The limited company was chosen because it is the best form if you want to reduce the risk of the individual. They also chose it so that they could offer employees the opportunity to be a partner in the business. The organizational form is thus limited company with the employees as shareholders. The choice of organizational form in this case had nothing to do with that the business would be operated at a profit. However, there is always the financial aspect of independent schools. They will run a business that merges economic, otherwise they can not continue. They are more vulnerable in that respect than the public school. The economically vulnerable position that independent schools are in also allows this to act entrepreneurially is a way to operate.

It is also about how to pack and process something that is so established as education. Profiling is also part of how the schools can work to attract students. In many cases it is not about maximizing the number of students, but profiling based on the school as a whole. The school described here has as its main focus to be preparing the students for university studies. The base of education is a social science program and a natural science program. However, it was supplemented with an aesthetic program because of what these types of programs does the school as a whole. The following quote may illustrate this:

“We now have the aesthetic program, and it is also a theoretical program, and we started that program because the competencies as an aesthetic program brings to the school in the form of teacher competence is important for the school's inner life.”

For this type of entrepreneur is the school as a whole important. Profiling of the school is not primarily about how attract students to the school but about school and learning from a holistic perspective. The programs that the school is offering is for a reason: it is programs that have a broad theoretical appropriation and is college preparatory, but they can also cross-fertilize each other. Students who attend the school will benefit from the other programs in that they affect the culture that is at the school. The social program is influenced by the fact that there is a natural science program and an aesthetic program at the school. All aim to benefit the pupils who attend the school and to stimulate better learning.

**Entrepreneurship with economic and educational motives**

Entrepreneurship can be about creating value, profit, or whether to commercialize an idea or innovation. This type of entrepreneurship is what Schumpeter calls
"entrepreneurship by opportunity". I will call this entrepreneurship with economic and pedagogical motives, and that is what we should look closely at in this section.

**Economic motives**

Central to entrepreneurship by opportunity is to utilize the space available to act as an entrepreneur. The entrepreneur will then take advantage of the space and realizes his/her idea. The following quote may illustrate the starting point for this type of entrepreneurship:

> This is a business first and foremost, and then it's a school.

Unlike the school as described in the previous section, started by pedagogical motives and operated as a limited company that does not primarily have a profit motive, the school that the interviewee run represent a motive to make money on its operations. The school is primarily a company and secondly it is a school whose mission is to conduct training. The business priorities related to education may thus be forced to be secondary because of the need to take into account business in the first place. Regarding the establishment of this type of schools market-oriented principles are used. They examine demographics and range of existing secondary schools to see if their concept fits in the education landscape in the municipality they want to enter in. A representative of such independent school explains the establishment process as follows:

> Not to have large geographical distance [between the schools], not too close and not too far away. Then we also look at the demographics, how the socio-economic structures look like in the resort. Is there a basis for us?

How thoroughly this market investigation can of course vary between companies, but it nevertheless gives an indication of how they work when they choose their locations. The market investigation is the basis for exploring the possibility to start.

Such an attitude is very rare among those who started the school based on a pedagogical idea. Those in my study that talked about profit, where all respondents from schools run by big education companies. These schools are to some extent rooted in a pedagogical idea and why they once started is based on that they wanted to develop an educational concept. Many of the schools belonging to big education companies has previously conducted training activities in forms other than as secondary schools.
Pedagogical motives

For a school that is part of a larger education company can profit be a motive for starting the business. But in the operational phase, there may be clear pedagogical reasons that combine profit and education. The following quote may illustrate this development:

Our focus is not these students who are self-sustaining in class time in core subjects, but it is these students who are tired of school, who do not want to be in school, who may need a different education. They need to get a chance to get out to a business, while we have requirements for them to cope with core subjects to be in a company, and the difference [to other schools] is that we put up our own curriculum for each student.

This education company’s decision to start the schools stems from a criticism of the current school system and in view of the practice and the ability to offer study weak students a good education on their own terms. There is a great deal of idealism in the school’s way of conducting their business. Idealism, in this case, we find in the school’s ambition to change and improve the overall school system. The activities also aim to the individual schools and that they should not become too large. It has set a ceiling of about 160 students per school. The reason for the maximum number of students is that the school places means that you cannot sustain the pedagogical model with more students. In this case it is therefore the quality of education and students' opportunities to develop versus to earn more money. One part of the school’s profile is about the teaching and the pedagogical models that the students work along. These models form the basis of the whole concept and the profiling schools, in addition to general programming. It is difficult for these contractors will be able to handle both idealism and business thinking.

Political entrepreneurship in schools and impact on policy

As I wrote initially affects the new actors on the school political arena the conduct of school policy in the communities where independent schools have chosen to establish themselves. These entrepreneurs operate in a political arena and influence the policy through their actions.

Sheingate (2003) argue that political entrepreneurs are individuals who act in such a way that their actions have an altering effect on institutions. Political entrepreneurship and its variants can be seen as catalysts for changes in beliefs about the school and the school’s role in society. The new actors on the school political
arena also influence the politicians and the local school policy. Politicians are forced to adjust the policy after the new regime. This may involve re-prioritization of resource allocation, organizational changes such as closure of public schools and the change of municipal school choice so that it becomes more attractive to students. Further changes in the priorities that the politicians are forced to is to put resources such as marketing, something the in time before the independent schools establishment was a more marginal phenomenon. School policy and local school staff are forced inwards towards its own business and think about what are the strengths of the business and then use them in marketing. In a sense one could say that independent schools establishment has helped develop business awareness which I think was the same way before. Some also believe that independent schools establishment re-painted the political map in terms of school policy in Sweden. A school politician I interviewed put it this way:

This [establishment of independent schools] have re-drawn the political map and the Swedish model where you have paid for a common welfare system, and since then, you see, no matter what background you have, you were going to the same school.

The statement refers to the school system prior to choice reforms. The increased freedom of choice makes as perceived by respondents to the melting pot that the school was before the school reform is now under threat. Children and young people from different social classes are not in contact with each other in the same way. The former school was based on the resources paid through taxes which came from the public and had its roots in the democratic society. Independent schools and their establishment were then, according to respondent, has changed the political landscape. This indicates an indirect form of political entrepreneurship that challenges the prevailing political system.

Another of the school politicians I interviewed gave further examples of the indirect impact on policy the establishment of independent schools meant:

How it affects us in our operation? It is that we are putting more resources today to market ourselves. Maybe not so much on ads and such, to invite the media to be vigilant about what we are good at and show it off.

The competition has meant that even the public schools have to devote resources to marketing themselves. This can include ads, commercials, and so called “open houses”. As the quote shows the public school also uses the media as a channel to showcase their activities. They want to newspapers and television to report on what
happens within the school and the efforts you make. Independent schools have also affected the political work of the local Education Committee. A school politician describes the situation as follows:

> It is not impossible that in a clearer way to stand up for their own actions. For it is enough so you feel it's their own schools in their schools. We can preserve the quality of ours, we can ensure that it remains strong. It is possible that the Board in a clearer way to stand up for the public schools.

This quote illustrates how independent schools influenced politicians’ work in the local Education Committee. It seems that the differences between the political parties are reduced and that the members of the local Education Committee in a different way than before is “standing up” for the public schools regardless of party affiliation. In short, it can be said that regardless of party affiliation politicians defend the public school. The establishment of independent schools can be said to have reduced the political differences. In this way we can talk about a political entrepreneurship, where independent schools establishment and activities meant that, to some extent, a change in the political rules of the game. Political parties in the committee do not let the ideological differences that exist in attitudes to independent schools have so much room. Instead, it appears that the ideological differences decreased, and energy and focus is on how the public school can be improved, thereby strengthening the local school’s competitiveness.

In the literature on governace (see eg Kooiman 2003) is interactivity highlighted as an important tool. Collaboration is a form of interactivity in which there is an exchange between the rulers and the ruled. In an interactive steering ratio there is a greater opportunity for political entrepreneurship than is currently possible. School policy is generally very politicized and at the local level even more. This means that local governments in many cases are keeping their distance to the independent schools. Collaboration and cooperation are not so special prevalent and the actors keep distance to each others. This means that the political entrepreneurship finds its limits. It would, in my view, be more opportunities to work if there were more venues and more channels into the political realm. Various forms of collaboration would be a way to get channels up to the policymakers. Political entrepreneurs are thus benefit from more governance forms of governance have an impact. This increases the entrepreneurial arena in size and there are other channels where the political entrepreneurship may seem. In a municipality where the private schools themselves
have started a network describes a representative of a private school situation as follows:

When this school started so we drew up a network of Independent schools where we, John Bauer, Praktiska Gymnasiet and Relagymnasiet\(^5\) included. We are trying to network so as to affect the municipality.

In order to influence it's about finding ways to do it. Collaboration is a form. One way for the political entrepreneur to influence is through existing structures, another way is to create these structures. By creating structures the political entrepreneurs influence the policy in the direction the entrepreneur wants.

**Summary**

To start and run independent school itself can be seen as entrepreneurship, and the new school system is also an arena in which entrepreneurial behavior may occur. Political entrepreneurship occurs as a consequence of the new school system that allows a diversity of actors and the public school and the political system are forced to adapt to the current new order. Political entrepreneurship in this context exists in two forms: first, indirectly via its impact on the political rules of the game and second directly by the schools who administer a common good. This utility can be managed either through a public principal or private principal by independent schools. Often, it is precisely this division that the political battle is about. The basis for the political battle is the view of how education should be organized and what values should be the key.

Understanding entrepreneurship requires an understanding of production, in this case education, for it is in the production person to function and behave in a certain way. Thus realized the institutional change that changes in the Education Act made possible. To illustrate the person the entrepreneur in school. Table 1.4 provide a summary.

\(^5\) Name of different independent schools.
Table 1. 4 Entrepreneurship type and content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Entrepreneur</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>School staff, school leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Innovation, risk taking, courage, decisiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Taking advantage of the opportunity and creates spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Start and operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The entrepreneur as a person is an energetic person who has the ability to succeed in what he or she does. In school, these people, in the broader sense, as school staff in general. In a more narrow sense, the contractor principals, headmaster, or the founder of the school. Entrepreneurship that behavior is all about how the entrepreneur acts. Entrepreneurs must have an idea that they dare to carry out, and they must also be a risk. The behavior must be innovative, which, according Sheingate (2003) is about to put together the already known elements in new ways. It can be about education, profiling, or anything that gives the school a special character. One must dare to win.

Entrepreneurship as a function is about people taking advantage of an opportunity and creates space to act on. From an independents school perspective it's about the people who use the opportunity that the law provided and which then creates a space to implement their entrepreneurial ideas. Entrepreneurship as a process involves the creation and the inception of an organization, but also, to some independent schools, the actual driving process. In many cases we can derive the entrepreneurial spirit to the causes of the school started. There we can find a variety of entrepreneurship. This, however, tend to hang around during the first years when there is many problems to be solved, often in a new way, because one does not have an already established structure to fall back on. The starting point is the creation and
the inception of the organization and entrepreneurs role in this process is to be proactive in the initial phase.

That there are entrepreneurs in school, there is no doubt, but the link to the political entrepreneurship may seem unclear. I believe that political entrepreneurship in the context that I examined is involuntary. These contractors have not actively sought out the policies and their purpose was not to influence the political process or policy decisions. In contrast, my empirical work has shown that their presence and ways to act indirectly, has affected policy. The independent schools are also aware of it and they want a change to happen, but this awareness and willingness is the result of their entry into the political arena. They did not come in with the intention to influence policy and is not political entrepreneurs in that regard. The desire to influence politics has come as a consequence of that they see that they actually have, and they will then actively manage these pressures, rather than for it to be random. They want to cooperate with the municipality and be able to share resources, and that requires that you get access to the political arena, for example, through various forms of collaboration and networking. The indirect effect implies that independent schools attendance and set to work putting the public school in a competitive situation, which means that politicians have to make other types of decisions than they previously had to do. In this way, the surveyed entrepreneur’s can be seen as political entrepreneurs through indirect influence.
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