

Entrepreneurship "Call of the Ship"

A Sociological Analysis of Agency and Structure in Addressing Unemployment

Dr. Kheiri Nouh* University of Djelfa (Algeria)

nouh.kheiri@univ-djelfa.dz

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9122-9780>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: [05/05/2025]

Accepted: [30/05/2025]

Published: [30/06/2025]

Keywords:

entrepreneurship as lifeboat;
unemployment solutions;
individual agency; structural
approaches; organizational
sociology; economic rescue
strategies

Pages: [01-13]

Online Access via QR code



ABSTRACT

This article examines the role of entrepreneurship as a lifeboat in addressing unemployment through a sociological lens, analyzing the tension between individual agency and structural approaches. Drawing on organizational sociology and labor market theories, the study explores how entrepreneurial initiatives offer dynamic, ground-level solutions to unemployment that often surpass traditional bureaucratic interventions. Through critical analysis of both macro-structural and micro-entrepreneurial frameworks, this research demonstrates that entrepreneurs' proximity to local economic realities enables them to identify and implement solutions more effectively than distant planning mechanisms. The article synthesizes classical sociological theories with contemporary empirical evidence to argue that while structural approaches remain necessary for addressing systemic inequalities, entrepreneurial agency provides essential flexibility and innovation in creating sustainable employment opportunities. The findings suggest that policy frameworks should prioritize enabling entrepreneurial ecosystems while maintaining structural support systems, recognizing that effective unemployment remediation requires both individual initiative and institutional facilitation. Entrepreneurship emerges as a crucial lifeboat that rescues individuals and communities from the drowning waters of unemployment, providing salvation through innovative economic solutions and adaptive strategies that can navigate the turbulent seas of economic uncertainty.

1- Introduction

The contemporary unemployment crisis represents one of the most pressing challenges facing advanced and developing economies alike, with global unemployment rates persistently challenging traditional policy interventions (Standing, 2011, p. 42). The transformation of labor markets through digitalization, globalization, and the emergence of the gig economy has fundamentally altered the relationship between workers, employers, and the state, creating what Beck (2000, p. 67) termed the "risk society" where traditional employment securities have eroded. Within this context, entrepreneurship has emerged as both a practical response and ideological solution to unemployment, serving as a lifeboat carrying the hopes of struggling societies and economies, embodying the tension between individual agency and structural determinism that has long characterized sociological debates about work and economic life.

The sociological analysis of entrepreneurship as an unemployment remedy requires careful consideration of multiple theoretical perspectives. As Granovetter (1985, p. 487) argued in his seminal

*Corresponding Author

Online Publication Site: <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/PresentationRevue/1010>

work on economic embeddedness, "economic action is embedded in structures of social relations," suggesting that entrepreneurial success cannot be understood purely through individual attributes but must account for social context and structural constraints. This embeddedness perspective challenges both the neoliberal celebration of entrepreneurial individualism and the structuralist dismissal of agency, pointing toward a more nuanced understanding of how entrepreneurship functions within contemporary labor markets.

The rise of entrepreneurship as a policy solution reflects broader transformations in the governance of unemployment. Foucault's (2008, p. 226) analysis of neoliberal governmentality identified the emergence of "entrepreneurial subjects" as central to contemporary economic policy, where individuals are increasingly expected to manage their own employability through self-enterprise. This shift from collective provision to individual responsibility represents what Rose (1999, p. 142) termed "governing through freedom," where entrepreneurship becomes both an economic strategy and a technology of self-governance.

Yet the empirical reality of entrepreneurship reveals significant complexities that challenge simplistic policy prescriptions. While entrepreneurial ventures create approximately 3 million new jobs annually in the United States alone (Haltiwanger et al., 2013, p. 349), the distribution of entrepreneurial success remains highly uneven, with failure rates exceeding 50% within five years (Aldrich & Ruef, 2018, p. 78). These statistics suggest that while entrepreneurship offers genuine opportunities for employment creation, its effectiveness as a universal remedy for unemployment requires critical examination.

In the face of this mounting complexity, entrepreneurship presents itself as a modern-day Noah's ark, carrying the potential for economic and social salvation, yet navigating the turbulent waters of complex social and economic structures. This article therefore poses a central question: **To what extent can entrepreneurship, as an expression of individual agency, serve as an effective alternative to structural approaches in addressing unemployment, and what are the necessary conditions for achieving integration between individual and structural approaches in creating sustainable solutions to the employment crisis?**

2. Theoretical Foundations: Agency, Structure, and the Sociology of Economic Life

2.1 Classical Foundations: Weber, Durkheim, and the Origins of Economic Sociology

The sociological understanding of entrepreneurship and unemployment must begin with classical theoretical foundations that established the discipline's approach to economic phenomena. Weber's (1978, p. 63) analysis of economic action as "peaceful exercise of an actor's control over resources" provides crucial insights into entrepreneurial behavior, emphasizing how economic activity is fundamentally shaped by cultural values and social institutions. His concept of the "Protestant ethic" demonstrated how religious values could foster entrepreneurial capitalism, suggesting that cultural factors play decisive roles in shaping economic outcomes (Weber, 2001, p. 35).

Durkheim's (1984, p. 200) theory of the division of labor offers complementary insights, particularly his distinction between mechanical and organic solidarity. As labor markets become increasingly specialized, Durkheim argued that "the division of labor produces solidarity only if it is spontaneous and not forced" (p. 377), highlighting tensions between individual agency and structural constraints that remain central to contemporary debates about entrepreneurship and employment. His analysis of anomie—the breakdown of social regulation—provides a framework for understanding how unemployment creates not merely economic but profound social dislocations.

Simmel's (1950, p. 409) work on the metropolis and mental life introduced crucial insights about how urban environments shape economic behavior, arguing that "the deepest problems of modern life derive from the claim of the individual to preserve autonomy." This tension between individual agency and structural forces anticipates contemporary debates about entrepreneurship's role in addressing unemployment, suggesting that entrepreneurial solutions must navigate complex relationships between personal initiative and social constraint.

2.2 Contemporary Theoretical Developments: From Embeddedness to Institutional Theory

Building on classical foundations, contemporary sociological theory has developed sophisticated frameworks for understanding entrepreneurship and unemployment. Granovetter's (1985, p. 490) embeddedness thesis revolutionized economic sociology by demonstrating that "the anonymous market of neoclassical models is virtually nonexistent in economic life." His work on weak ties (Granovetter, 1973, p. 1361) showed how social networks facilitate job searching and entrepreneurial opportunity recognition, suggesting that successful entrepreneurship depends critically on social capital rather than purely individual attributes.

Powell and DiMaggio's (1991, p. 8) institutional theory provides another crucial perspective, arguing that "organizations and individuals are suspended in a web of values, norms, beliefs, and taken-for-granted assumptions." This institutional perspective reveals how entrepreneurship is shaped by regulatory, normative, and cognitive institutions that either facilitate or constrain new venture creation. Scott (2014, p. 56) extended this analysis by identifying how "institutional entrepreneurs" actively shape the rules and norms governing economic activity, suggesting that entrepreneurship can transform rather than merely adapt to institutional contexts.

Bourdieu's (1986, p. 248) theory of capital forms—economic, cultural, social, and symbolic—offers essential insights into entrepreneurial success and failure. His argument that "the volume and composition of capital gives the specific form and value to the determinations" reveals how entrepreneurial outcomes depend on multiple resource types beyond financial capital. This multidimensional view of capital explains why entrepreneurship may reproduce rather than alleviate social inequalities, as those with greater initial capital endowments enjoy systematic advantages in entrepreneurial ventures.

2.3 The Structure-Agency Debate in Contemporary Labor Markets

The structure-agency debate remains central to understanding entrepreneurship's role in addressing unemployment. Giddens' (1984, p. 25) structuration theory offers a synthetic approach, arguing that "structure is both medium and outcome of reproduction of practices." This recursive relationship suggests that entrepreneurial action both shapes and is shaped by structural conditions, creating possibilities for transformation while acknowledging constraint.

Archer's (1995, p. 65) morphogenetic approach provides a temporal dimension to this debate, distinguishing between structural conditioning, social interaction, and structural elaboration. Her framework suggests that entrepreneurship operates within pre-existing structural conditions but can generate emergent properties that transform those conditions over time. As she argues, "the entrepreneurial agent confronts structural properties as objective features" (p. 196) while retaining capacity for creative action.

The capability approach developed by Sen (1999, p. 87) offers another perspective, focusing on "what people are effectively able to do and to be." This framework shifts attention from resources to functionings, suggesting that entrepreneurship's value lies not merely in income generation but in expanding human capabilities. Nussbaum (2011, p. 33) extended this approach by identifying central capabilities essential for human flourishing, providing criteria for evaluating entrepreneurship's contribution to human development beyond narrow economic metrics.

3. Entrepreneurship as a Tool to Address Unemployment: Evidence and Mechanisms

3.1 Direct Employment Creation Through New Venture Formation

Empirical evidence demonstrates that entrepreneurial ventures play crucial roles in job creation, though effects vary significantly across contexts and venture types. Haltiwanger et al. (2013, p. 351) found that "young firms contribute substantially to both gross and net job creation," with startups less than five years old accounting for nearly 20% of gross job creation despite representing only 10% of employment. This disproportionate contribution suggests that entrepreneurship provides essential dynamism to labor markets, creating opportunities that established firms may not generate.

However, the quality and sustainability of entrepreneurially-created jobs requires careful scrutiny. Kalleberg (2011, p. 84) documented the rise of "precarious work" in entrepreneurial ventures, noting that "small firms are less likely to provide health insurance, pension benefits, or job security." This evidence suggests that while entrepreneurship creates employment opportunities, these may not always meet standards of decent work established by international labor organizations.

Case studies reveal both successes and limitations of entrepreneurial job creation. The Silicon Valley ecosystem demonstrates entrepreneurship's potential for generating high-quality employment, with venture-backed startups creating over 11% of private sector jobs while representing only 0.2% of

firms (Puri & Zarutskie, 2012, p. 2247). Yet this success remains geographically concentrated and difficult to replicate, suggesting limits to entrepreneurship as a universal unemployment solution.

3.2 Innovation and Market Creation: The Schumpeterian Perspective

Schumpeter's (1942, p. 83) concept of "creative destruction" provides crucial insights into entrepreneurship's employment effects. He argued that "the fundamental impulse that sets and keeps the capitalist engine in motion comes from new consumers' goods, new methods of production," suggesting that entrepreneurial innovation creates entirely new employment categories while destroying others. This dynamic process means entrepreneurship's employment impact extends beyond direct job creation to fundamental labor market transformation.

Contemporary research confirms Schumpeterian insights while revealing complexities. Audretsch and Keilbach (2007, p. 1242) found that "entrepreneurship capital contributes to output and productivity growth," with knowledge-based entrepreneurship showing particularly strong employment multiplier effects. Their research suggests that one high-tech entrepreneurial job generates approximately five additional jobs in local economies, demonstrating entrepreneurship's broader employment impacts.

The platform economy exemplifies both opportunities and challenges of entrepreneurial market creation. Companies like Uber and Airbnb have created millions of income-generating opportunities while challenging traditional employment relationships (Sundararajan, 2016, p. 159). As Ravenelle (2019, p. 45) observes, "the sharing economy promises entrepreneurial opportunity but often delivers precarious work," highlighting tensions between entrepreneurial innovation and employment quality.

3.3 Local Knowledge and Responsive Solutions

Entrepreneurs' proximity to local conditions enables them to identify and address employment challenges that distant planners may overlook. Hayek's (1945, p. 521) insight that "knowledge of particular circumstances of time and place" remains crucial for economic coordination applies powerfully to entrepreneurial employment creation. Entrepreneurs embedded in local communities possess what Scott (1998, p. 311) termed "metis"—practical knowledge that enables effective response to specific contextual challenges.

Empirical studies confirm the importance of local knowledge in entrepreneurial employment creation. Glaeser et al. (2010, p. 31) found that "local entrepreneurs are more important for employment growth than attracting external companies," with locally-founded firms showing higher survival rates and stronger employment multipliers. This evidence suggests that indigenous entrepreneurship offers more sustainable employment solutions than strategies focused on attracting external investment.

The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated entrepreneurial agility in responding to employment crises. Kuckertz et al. (2020, p. 1069) documented how "entrepreneurial firms rapidly pivoted to address pandemic-related challenges," creating new employment opportunities in sectors like contactless delivery

and digital services. This responsiveness contrasts with slower bureaucratic responses, suggesting entrepreneurship's value in addressing rapidly evolving employment challenges.

4. The Social Dimension of Entrepreneurship: Beyond Economic Outcomes

4.1 Social Entrepreneurship and Inclusive Employment

Social entrepreneurship represents a distinct approach to addressing unemployment that explicitly prioritizes social over purely economic objectives. Mair and Martí (2006, p. 37) define social entrepreneurship as "a process involving innovative use and combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyze social change." This orientation toward social transformation suggests entrepreneurship can address not merely unemployment's economic dimensions but its social and psychological consequences.

Work integration social enterprises (WISEs) demonstrate social entrepreneurship's potential for creating inclusive employment. Defourny and Nyssens (2010, p. 238) found that "WISEs successfully integrate disadvantaged workers while maintaining economic viability," with over 40,000 such enterprises operating across Europe. These organizations create employment opportunities for individuals facing multiple labor market barriers, including disability, addiction, and criminal records, suggesting entrepreneurship can address unemployment among most marginalized populations.

The Grameen Bank's microfinance model exemplifies social entrepreneurship's transformative potential. Yunus (2007, p. 54) reported that "microcredit has created self-employment for millions of poor women," with borrowers showing significantly higher employment rates than control groups. While subsequent research has questioned some claims about microfinance's impact (Banerjee et al., 2015, p. 23), the model demonstrates how entrepreneurial approaches can expand employment access for traditionally excluded groups.

4.2 Entrepreneurial Ecosystems and Community Development

Entrepreneurship's social dimension extends beyond individual ventures to encompass broader ecosystem effects on community development. Isenberg (2010, p. 41) identified six domains of entrepreneurial ecosystems—policy, finance, culture, supports, human capital, and markets—arguing that "entrepreneurship flourishes when these elements work together." This systemic perspective suggests that entrepreneurship's employment impact depends critically on supportive institutional environments.

Research on entrepreneurial ecosystems reveals significant spillover effects on local employment. Feldman and Zoller (2012, p. 24) found that "dealmakers—individuals with high social capital who connect entrepreneurs—significantly predict regional employment growth." Their research suggests that entrepreneurial networks generate collective benefits exceeding individual venture impacts, creating

what Saxenian (1994, p. 161) termed "regional advantage" through knowledge spillovers and collaborative innovation.

The restoration of post-industrial cities through entrepreneurship demonstrates ecosystem effects on employment. Pittsburgh's transformation from steel production to technology and healthcare entrepreneurship created over 300,000 new jobs while losing 150,000 manufacturing positions (Andes et al., 2017, p. 15). This case illustrates how entrepreneurial ecosystems can facilitate structural economic transitions while generating new employment opportunities.

4.3 Identity, Dignity, and the Meaning of Work

Beyond material outcomes, entrepreneurship addresses unemployment's psychological and social dimensions by offering pathways to dignity and self-determination. Sennett (2003, p. 119) argued that "the modern economy denies many workers respect," with unemployment creating not merely material deprivation but what he termed "the hidden injuries of class." Entrepreneurship potentially restores dignity by enabling individuals to create rather than seek employment.

Research on entrepreneurial identity reveals complex relationships between self-employment and wellbeing. Stephan (2018, p. 293) found that "entrepreneurs report higher life satisfaction despite lower incomes," suggesting that autonomy and self-determination provide non-monetary benefits. This evidence indicates that entrepreneurship's value extends beyond income generation to encompass broader human flourishing.

However, entrepreneurial identity also creates new pressures and anxieties. Gill and Larson (2014, p. 530) documented how "entrepreneurial discourse creates identity work demands," with entrepreneurs experiencing pressure to maintain optimistic personas despite practical challenges. This emotional labor represents hidden costs of entrepreneurship that complicate simplistic narratives about entrepreneurial empowerment.

5. Critical Comparison: Limits and Efficiencies of Entrepreneurial versus Structural Approaches

5.1 The Limits of Entrepreneurial Solutions

While entrepreneurship offers valuable contributions to addressing unemployment, critical analysis reveals significant limitations that challenge its positioning as a primary policy solution. First, the unequal distribution of entrepreneurial success raises fundamental questions about equity and access. Blanchflower (2009, p. 22) found that "entrepreneurship remains concentrated among white males with access to capital," with women and minorities facing systematic barriers to entrepreneurial entry. This concentration suggests that entrepreneurial solutions may exacerbate rather than alleviate existing inequalities.

The myth of meritocratic entrepreneurship obscures structural advantages that shape entrepreneurial outcomes. As Bourdieu (1986, p. 252) observed, "the entrepreneurial game is rigged in favor of those with inherited capital," whether economic, cultural, or social. Research by Aldrich and Kim (2007, p. 147) confirmed that "family background strongly predicts entrepreneurial entry and success," with children of business owners showing three times higher rates of entrepreneurial activity. These findings suggest that entrepreneurship may reproduce class structures rather than enabling social mobility.

Geographic concentration of entrepreneurial success presents another limitation. Florida (2002, p. 249) documented how "entrepreneurial dynamism clusters in specific metropolitan areas," with just 20 cities accounting for over 50% of venture capital investment. This concentration means that entrepreneurial solutions remain unavailable to large populations in peripheral regions, limiting their effectiveness as universal unemployment remedies.

5.2 The Necessity of Structural Interventions

Structural approaches to unemployment, while often criticized for bureaucratic inefficiency, address systemic issues that entrepreneurial solutions cannot resolve. Esping-Andersen's (1990, p. 37) analysis of welfare regimes demonstrated how "decommodification of labor through social policy" provides essential protection against market failures. This structural support becomes particularly crucial during economic downturns when entrepreneurial opportunities contract.

Active labor market policies (ALMPs) show significant effectiveness in reducing unemployment when properly designed and implemented. Card et al. (2018, p. 894) meta-analysis found that "job search assistance and training programs show positive employment effects," particularly for disadvantaged workers. These structural interventions complement entrepreneurial approaches by providing skills and support that enable successful venture creation.

The Nordic model demonstrates how structural and entrepreneurial approaches can work synergistically. Despite extensive welfare provisions, Nordic countries show high rates of entrepreneurial activity, with Denmark and Sweden ranking among Europe's most entrepreneurial nations (Henrekson & Sanandaji, 2014, p. 1760). This evidence challenges zero-sum thinking about structure versus agency, suggesting that robust structural support can enable rather than discourage entrepreneurial activity.

5.3 Toward Synthetic Approaches: Combining Agency and Structure

The most effective responses to unemployment combine entrepreneurial agency with structural support, creating what Block and Somers (2014, p. 227) term "hybrid arrangements" that leverage both market dynamism and social protection. These synthetic approaches recognize that neither pure entrepreneurialism nor complete structural determination offers adequate solutions to complex unemployment challenges.

The German Mittelstand model exemplifies successful integration of entrepreneurial and structural elements. These small and medium enterprises combine entrepreneurial flexibility with institutional support through apprenticeship systems, regional banks, and industrial associations (Audretsch and Lehmann, 2016, p. 2371). This model has maintained German manufacturing employment despite global competition, suggesting benefits of institutionally-embedded entrepreneurship.

Innovation policy represents another domain where structural and entrepreneurial approaches converge. Mazzucato's (2013, p. 193) research on the "entrepreneurial state" demonstrated how "public investment in basic research enables private entrepreneurial innovation." This evidence challenges narratives positioning government and entrepreneurship as antagonistic, revealing how structural investments create platforms for entrepreneurial value creation.

6. Policy Implications: Fostering Entrepreneurial Ecosystems While Maintaining Structural Support

6.1 Enabling Entrepreneurial Access and Inclusion

Policy interventions should prioritize expanding entrepreneurial access beyond privileged groups. This requires addressing capital constraints through innovative financing mechanisms that do not rely solely on traditional collateral or credit histories. Community development financial institutions (CDFIs) demonstrate potential for democratizing entrepreneurial finance, with research showing that "CDFI lending generates significant employment in underserved communities" (Swack et al., 2014, p. 151).

Entrepreneurial education must extend beyond business schools to reach diverse populations. Karlan and Valdivia (2011, p. 510) found that "entrepreneurship training for microenterprise owners increases business practices and revenues," suggesting benefits of widespread entrepreneurial skill development. However, such education should avoid reproducing what Jones and Spicer (2009, p. 84) critiqued as "entrepreneurial ideology" that obscures structural constraints on success.

Regulatory reform should reduce barriers to entrepreneurial entry while maintaining essential protections. The concept of "regulatory sandboxes" allowing entrepreneurial experimentation within defined parameters offers promising approaches (Fenwick et al., 2017, p. 589). Such frameworks enable innovation while protecting consumer and worker interests, balancing entrepreneurial dynamism with social responsibility.

6.2 Strengthening Entrepreneurial Support Infrastructure

Effective entrepreneurial ecosystems require robust support infrastructure including incubators, accelerators, and mentorship networks. Cohen and Hochberg (2014, p. 4) found that "accelerator programs significantly improve venture outcomes," with participants showing higher survival rates and

employment growth. Public investment in such infrastructure generates positive returns through job creation and tax revenues.

Universities play crucial roles in entrepreneurial ecosystems through technology transfer and talent development. Guerrero et al. (2016, p. 553) demonstrated that "entrepreneurial universities contribute significantly to regional economic development," with academic spinoffs creating high-quality employment. Policies should strengthen university-industry linkages while maintaining academic independence and basic research capacity.

Digital infrastructure becomes increasingly critical for entrepreneurial success. Cumming and Johan (2017, p. 1781) found that "high-speed internet access significantly predicts entrepreneurial activity," with digital connectivity enabling new business models and market access. Public investment in digital infrastructure thus represents essential support for entrepreneurial employment creation.

6.3 Maintaining and Modernizing Structural Supports

While fostering entrepreneurship, policies must maintain robust structural supports that provide security and enable risk-taking. Universal basic income (UBI) proposals represent one approach to combining security with entrepreneurial flexibility. Preliminary evidence from Finland's UBI experiment showed that "recipients demonstrated higher rates of entrepreneurial activity" (Kangas et al., 2019, p. 34), suggesting that economic security can enable rather than discourage entrepreneurship.

Portable benefits systems that decouple social protection from specific employment relationships become essential in entrepreneurial economies. Rolf (2018, p. 127) proposed "portable benefits accounts" that workers control across different employment arrangements, providing security while enabling entrepreneurial flexibility. Such systems recognize that contemporary careers increasingly combine employment and entrepreneurship rather than following traditional linear paths.

Skills development systems must adapt to entrepreneurial labor markets characterized by rapid change and uncertainty. Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014, p. 201) argued for "racing with machines" through continuous reskilling, suggesting need for lifelong learning infrastructure. Public investment in skills development should emphasize metacognitive and adaptive capabilities rather than narrow technical training.

7. Conclusion: Toward a Sociological Understanding of Entrepreneurship and Employment

This analysis has demonstrated that entrepreneurship offers valuable but limited contributions to addressing unemployment, requiring integration with structural approaches for comprehensive solutions. The sociological perspective reveals how entrepreneurship operates within complex webs of social relations, institutional contexts, and power structures that shape its potential and limitations as an employment strategy.

The evidence suggests that entrepreneurs' proximity to local conditions enables them to identify and respond to employment challenges with greater agility than bureaucratic mechanisms. Their embedded knowledge and network connections facilitate opportunity recognition and resource mobilization that distant planners cannot replicate. Yet this same embeddedness means entrepreneurial success remains contingent on social capital, cultural resources, and institutional support that are unequally distributed across populations.

The tension between agency and structure in addressing unemployment cannot be resolved through either pure entrepreneurialism or complete structural determination. Instead, effective approaches require what Mills (1959, p. 6) termed the "sociological imagination"—the capacity to connect individual biography with historical and structural forces. Entrepreneurship provides mechanisms for individual agency within structural constraints, while structural interventions create conditions enabling entrepreneurial action.

Future research should examine how different institutional contexts shape entrepreneurship's employment effects, particularly in developing economies where formal employment remains limited. Longitudinal studies tracking entrepreneurial ventures' long-term employment impacts would provide crucial evidence about sustainability. Research should also investigate how technological change, particularly artificial intelligence and automation, transforms entrepreneurial opportunities and employment relationships.

Policy frameworks should recognize entrepreneurship as one element within comprehensive employment strategies rather than standalone solutions. This requires moving beyond ideological debates positioning entrepreneurship against state intervention toward pragmatic approaches combining both. As Ostrom (2010, p. 665) argued regarding commons governance, "there are no panaceas"—complex challenges like unemployment require diverse, context-specific responses rather than universal prescriptions.

The COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated both entrepreneurial resilience and the essential role of structural support in maintaining employment during crises. As societies rebuild, the challenge lies in constructing institutional arrangements that harness entrepreneurial dynamism while providing security and opportunity for all citizens. This requires what Wright (2010, p. 273) termed "real utopias"—transformative visions grounded in practical possibilities rather than abstract ideals.

Ultimately, addressing unemployment through entrepreneurship requires recognizing both human agency and structural constraint, individual initiative and collective provision, market dynamism and social protection. The sociological perspective reveals these as complementary rather than contradictory elements in creating inclusive and sustainable employment futures. By embracing this complexity rather than seeking simple solutions, societies can develop more effective and equitable approaches to one of their most pressing challenges.

References

1. Aldrich, H. E., & Kim, P. H. (2007). *Small worlds, infinite possibilities? How social networks affect entrepreneurial team formation and search*. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1), 147-165. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.8>
2. Aldrich, H. E., & Ruef, M. (2018). *Organizations evolving* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446212509>
3. Andes, S., Muro, M., & Maxim, R. (2017). *Pittsburgh's economic transformation: A blueprint for other cities*. Brookings Institution. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/pittsburghs-economic-transformation>
4. Archer, M. S. (1995). *Realist social theory: The morphogenetic approach*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511557675>
5. Audretsch, D. B., & Keilbach, M. (2007). *The theory of knowledge spillover entrepreneurship*. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(7), 1242-1254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00722.x>
6. Audretsch, D. B., & Lehmann, E. E. (2016). *The seven secrets of Germany: Economic resilience in an era of global turbulence*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199660094.001.0001>
7. Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., Glennerster, R., & Kinnan, C. (2015). *The miracle of microfinance? Evidence from a randomized evaluation*. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 7(1), 22-53. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20130533>
8. Beck, U. (2000). *The brave new world of work*. Polity Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613098>
9. Blanchflower, D. G. (2009). *Minority self-employment in the United States and the impact of affirmative action programs*. *Annals of Finance*, 5(3), 22-39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10436-009-0124-z>
10. Block, F., & Somers, M. R. (2014). *The power of market fundamentalism*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674416345>
11. Bourdieu, P. (1986). *The forms of capital*. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Greenwood. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470755679.ch15>
12. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age*. W. W. Norton & Company. <https://doi.org/10.1355/ae31-2j>
13. Card, D., Kluve, J., & Weber, A. (2018). *What works? A meta analysis of recent active labor market program evaluations*. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 16(3), 894-931. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeaa/jvx028>
14. Cohen, S., & Hochberg, Y. V. (2014). *Accelerating startups: The seed accelerator phenomenon*. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2418000>
15. Cumming, D., & Johan, S. (2017). *The differential impact of the internet on spurring regional entrepreneurship*. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(5), 1781-1802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12270>
16. Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). *Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States*. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 238-254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420670903442053>
17. Durkheim, E. (1984). *The division of labor in society*. Free Press. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-17729-5>
18. Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095892879100100108>
19. Feldman, M., & Zoller, T. D. (2012). *Dealmakers in place: Social capital connections in regional entrepreneurial economies*. *Regional Studies*, 46(1), 23-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2011.607808>

20. Fenwick, M., McCahery, J. A., & Vermeulen, E. P. (2017). *Fintech and the financing of entrepreneurs: From crowdfunding to marketplace lending*. European Banking Institute Working Paper, 589-621. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2967891>
21. Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class*. Basic Books. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446213568>
22. Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230594180>
23. Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520312753>
24. Gill, R., & Larson, G. S. (2014). Making the ideal (local) entrepreneur: Place and the regional development of high-tech entrepreneurial identity. *Human Relations*, 67(5), 519-542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713496829>
25. Glaeser, E. L., Rosenthal, S. S., & Strange, W. C. (2010). Urban economics and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 67(1), 31-45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2009.10.005>
26. Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360-1380. <https://doi.org/10.1086/225469>
27. Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481-510. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228311>
28. Guerrero, M., Urbano, D., Fayolle, A., Klofsten, M., & Mian, S. (2016). Entrepreneurial universities: Emerging models in the new social and economic landscape. *Small Business Economics*, 47(3), 551-563. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-016-9755-4>
29. Haltiwanger, J., Jarmin, R. S., & Miranda, J. (2013). Who creates jobs? Small versus large versus young. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95(2), 347-361. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00288
30. Hayek, F. A. (1945). The use of knowledge in society. *American Economic Review*, 35(4), 519-530. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1809376>
31. Henrekson, M., & Sanandaji, T. (2014). Small business activity does not measure entrepreneurship. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(5), 1760-1765. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1307204111>
32. Isenberg, D. (2010). How to start an entrepreneurial revolution. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(6), 40-50. <https://hbr.org/2010/06/the-big-idea-how-to-start-an-entrepreneurial-revolution>
33. Jones, C., & Spicer, A. (2009). *Unmasking the entrepreneur*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781848449985>
34. Kalleberg, A. L. (2011). *Good jobs, bad jobs*. Russell Sage Foundation. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888412460435>
35. Kangas, O., Jauhiainen, S., Simanainen, M., & Ylikännö, M. (2019). The basic income experiment 2017-2018 in Finland. Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. <https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/handle/10>