WIRTSCHAFTS
UNIVERSITÄT
WIEN VIENNA
UNIVERSITY OF
ECONOMICS
AND BUSINESS

EFMD
EQUIS
ACCREDITED

ePub^WU Institutional Repository

Pascal Dey and Hanna Schneider and Florentine Maier

Intermediary Organisations and the Hegemonisation of Social Entrepreneurship: Fantasmatic Articulations, Constitutive Quiescences, and Moments of Indeterminacy

Article (Accepted for Publication)
(Refereed)

`http://epub.wu.ac.at/`

Intermediary Organisations and the Hegemonisation of Social Entrepreneurship: Fantasmatic Articulations, Constitutive Quiescences, and Moments of Indeterminacy

Pascal Dey, Hanna Schneider, Florentine Maier

Abstract

The rapid rise of alternative organisations such as social enterprises is largely due to the promotional activities of intermediary organisations. So far, little is known about the affective nature of such activities. The present article thus investigates how intermediary organisations make social entrepreneurship palatable for a broader audience by establishing it as an object of desire. Drawing on affect-oriented extensions of Laclau and Mouffe's poststructuralist theory, hegemonisation is suggested as a way of understanding how social entrepreneurship is articulated through a complementary process of signification and affective investment. Specifically, by examining Austrian intermediaries, we show how social entrepreneurship is endowed with a sense of affective thrust that is based on three interlocking dynamics: the articulation of fantasies such as 'inclusive exclusiveness', 'large-scale social change' and 'pragmatic solutions'; the repression of anxiety-provoking and contentious issues (constitutive quiescences); as well as the use of conceptually vague, floating signifiers (moments of indeterminacy). Demonstrating that the hegemonisation of social entrepreneurship involves articulating certain issues whilst, at the same time, omitting others, or rendering them elusive, the article invites a counter-hegemonic critique of social entrepreneurship, and, on a more general level, of alternative forms of organising, that embraces affect as a driving force of change, while simultaneously affirming the impossibility of harmony and wholeness.

Keywords

Affect, discourse, fantasy, hegemony and counter-hegemony, intermediary organisations, Laclau and Mouffe, social entrepreneurship

Introduction

Organisation studies are witnessing a renewed interest in alternatives to purely profit-driven forms of organising (e.g., Parker, Cheney, Fournier, & Land, 2014; Schneiberg, 2013). Social entrepreneurship (henceforth SE) is one of the most hotly debated amongst these alternatives. Notwithstanding on-going academic debates over the lack of an agreed-upon definition and the under-theorised (Dacin, Dacin, & Tracey, 2011) and pre-paradigmatic (Nicholls, 2010) state of SE research, an undoubtedly conspicuous feature of SE is its persuasiveness. In light of its eminently positive evaluative accent, it is not surprising that SE has hardly been subjected to critical scrutiny (with the exception of e.g., Barinaga, 2013; Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Hjorth, 2013). The persistent exaltation of SE has created a status quo where important questions about how SE emerged as such a positive 'thing' are disregarded. Addressing this gap, we home in on intermediary organisations – also referred to as promotion agencies, incubators or 'field building actors' (Nicholls, 2010) – as pre-eminent actors in defining the meaning of SE. Whilst it is well known that intermediaries foster SE through different forms of support, such as legal help, business planning, money or legitimacy (Dey & Lehner, forthcoming), there is a scarcity of knowledge regarding the affective underpinning of this process. The aim of this article is to create sensitivity for the way in which intermediaries render SE affectively compelling by establishing it as an object towards which desire can flow.

With this aim in mind, we ask the following research questions: (1) How do intermediaries articulate SE? And (2) why do some articulations become hegemonic while others remain marginal? In addressing these questions, we draw inspiration from a strand of theorising that combines Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) poststructuralist work on hegemony with theories of affect based on the psychoanalysis of Jacques Lacan (Glynos, 2001, 2008; Glynos, Klimecki, & Willmott, 2012; Stavrakakis, 1999, 2008). Whilst

Laclau and Mouffe's seminal work attends to how meaning is articulated through signifying chains, an affective perspective offers novel insights into why a particular articulation becomes compelling (or not).

The contribution this article tries to make is threefold: First, empirically demonstrating how hegemonisation is predicated on the simultaneous manufacturing of meaning and affect helps develop a more circumspect comprehension of why alternative forms of organising such as SE become palatable to a broader audience. Second, the theoretical conjunction of poststructuralist theory of hegemony and psychoanalytic theories of affect provides a framework of critical analysis that challenges SE's sense of objectivity by illuminating how seemingly inviolable articulations are necessarily limited and partisan. Third, an affect-oriented framework invites alternative articulations of SE that transcend the prevailing hegemony.

For the remainder of this paper we proceed as follows: We first present our conceptualisation of hegemonisation as a complementary process of signification and affective investment. Then, we explain our methodology and the Austrian context in which our investigation took place. This is followed by the presentation of results in which we discuss, first, the three articulations of SE enacted by Austrian intermediaries, and, second, the affective dynamics that have rendered one of these articulations hegemonic. In concluding, we accentuate the political purchase of our findings by engaging with the possibility of counter-hegemonic critique.

Social Entrepreneurship: Hegemony, Signification and Affect

Existing research reveals that the meaning of SE differs from scholar to scholar. For instance, SE has been conceived of as a type of organising that expedites social change through powerful new ideas (Waddock & Post, 1991), that develops a more sustainable

economy by combining philanthropic motives with business acumen (Brown, McDonald, & Smith, 2013), or that transcends the creed of profit-maximisation by offering a more ethical way of doing business (Shaw & de Bruin, 2013). This polymorphousness is indicative of SE's ontological 'emptiness' (Jones & Spicer, 2009), which is to say that SE, like any other concept, has no essence, but gains a sense of objectivity through a particular stabilisation of meaning. The question that arises here is how intermediaries achieve to enforce a closure of meaning that elevates a specific understanding of SE to a hegemonic status, whilst fending off alternative interpretations.

Laclau and Mouffe's theory of hegemony

Laclau and Mouffe's work on hegemony offers an entry point for the above question. Hegemony, a concept that was propelled to prominence via Gramsci's (1971) *Prison Notebook*, and that has since been widely used in organisation studies (e.g., Maielli, 2015; van Bommel & Spicer, 2011), designates domination based on wilful consent rather than coercion. It is a form of power whose success depends upon people's acceptance of it. Laclau and Mouffe follow Gramsci in many of his key points, but take issue with his Marxist 'class essentialism'. They advance a poststructuralist understanding of hegemony as the ability to dominate a field of discursivity by arresting the infinite play of difference. Hegemony thus encompasses the ability to render a particular meaning temporarily stable, while simultaneously excluding alternative meanings. So conceived, hegemony controls what can be legitimately thought and said, which Laclau refers to as the 'field of intelligibility'. Technically speaking, hegemony requires the establishment of links between floating signifiers around one or a small number of nodal points. Floating signifiers are signifiers whose meaning is not yet defined by their differential positions. They are ambiguous because they are 'incapable of being wholly articulated to a discursive chain' (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001, p. 113). Nodal points are privileged signifiers

4

around which floating signifiers are grouped. They 'arrest the flow of difference' (ibid., p. 112) by lending unambiguous meaning to floating signifiers. The fixation of meaning occurs when signifying chains based on logics of equivalence and difference are established. Chains of equivalence connect signifiers that are presented as similar; chains of difference separate signifiers that are presented as dissimilar. Through this fixation of meaning, hegemony eventually creates common sense. As Mouffe (2008, p. 27) explains, '[w]hat is at a given moment accepted as the 'natural order', jointly with the common sense that accompanies it, is the result of sedimented hegemonic practices'.

By implication, the establishment and perpetuation of hegemony involves the regular deployment of an articulation 'in everyday discourses (educational, governmental, familial, media, etc.), throughout time and space' (Bowman, 2007, p. 19). These discursive reiterations involve linguistic (speaking and writing) as well as non-linguistic practices and comprise 'the entire material density of the multifarious institutions, rituals and practices through which a discursive formation is structured' (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001, p. 109).

If one refers to a particular meaning as hegemonic, this means that it has been objectified as part of common sense by its repeated usage. It further means that alternative meanings have been successfully repressed (at least temporarily). Importantly, hegemony is never complete for it is always challenged by 'an 'outside' that impedes its full realization' (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001, p. 18). Indeed, a situation in which only one single meaning remains would suggest the use of violence rather than hegemony, which necessarily comprises one or several – more or less prominent, waning or budding – counter-hegemonies. In light of the struggles accompanying hegemony, we henceforth speak of *hegemonisation* instead of hegemony in order to stress the fragility and processual aspect of the phenomenon.

5

The importance of affect in the context of hegemonisation

One of the critiques levelled against Laclau and Mouffe was that they only looked at how articulations stabilise particular meanings, while failing to address the level of affect[i] (Lash, 2007), i.e., how articulations prompt enchantment (Stavrakakis, 2008).

Probably the most insightful contribution to an affect-based understanding of hegemonisation has been put forward by Lacanian scholars, notably Glynos (2001, 2008), Glynos et al. (2012), and Stavrakakis (1999, 2008). On the basis of theoretical cues from Jacque Lacan's (1977, 1988) writing on lack, fantasy and desire, they conceptualise affect as the mechanism that confers its force on a given discourse by rendering it an object with which individuals can identify. Affect is not located in the extra-discursive sphere, but immanent to language and epitomised in how language works to re-establish a sense of fullness that, according to Laclau, was lost in early childhood, upon entering the symbolic sphere.

More specifically, Lacan uses the term desire to refer to the affective energy that is created by the will to avoid experiencing lack (i.e., the 'irreducible negativity of human experience'; Stavrakakis, 1999, p. 107), and to re-encounter a state of harmony and fullness. Fantasy, in turn, gives desire direction by offering a concrete image that stands in for the constitutive lack. In other words, fantasies represent that part of discourse which makes reality palatable by sketching out a future state of harmony (Glynos et al., 2012). Fantasies are mostly conveyed through beatific narratives (Glynos, 2008) which point toward an idealised scenario that promises a future state of fullness. Forming a defence against the impossibility of ever re-experiencing fullness, beatific narratives offer a 'modicum of relief' (Stavrakakis, 2008, p. 284), or what Glynos (2008, p. 287) calls 'foundational guarantees', by fending off the anxiety associated with this impossibility. This idealised scenario is often accompanied by a corresponding disaster scenario (the

horrific side of fantasy), which mostly takes the form of an obstacle that needs to be overcome to attain the state of fullness.

In this study we generally speak about affect, instead of using the more specific concept of fantasy since only one of the three affective dynamics identified in our investigation is based specifically on fantasies (see below for details).

Methodology

We have, for the purpose of this article, developed a methodological procedure that allows us (1) to identify all intermediary organisations in Austria, (2) to investigate the material density of hegemonisation, (3) the signifying chains created by intermediary organisations, and (4) the affective dynamics that support hegemonisation.

Identification of intermediary organisations

Intermediaries were defined as organisations whose main purpose is to provide services and support – such as awards, training, loans, workspace or networking opportunities – targeted specifically at SE. Intermediaries were detected via a media analysis based on the WISO Press database, which comprises the full texts of all major Austrian newspapers and magazines[ii] from 1992 onward. All articles containing the term 'social entrepreneurship' were screened for mentions of intermediary organisations. This led to a preliminary sample of eight intermediaries, which was then cross-validated by three SE experts, who had been engaged in SE education and awards in Austria for years. They identified one further intermediary organisation (BDV), which resulted in a total of nine intermediaries (see Table 1).[iii]

Full name	Abbreviation	Main activity related to SE	Year of Inception
Ashoka Austria	Ashoka	Fellowship stipend	2011
Essl Social Prize	Essl	Award	2008

7

good.bee	good.bee	SE financing	2008
Impact Hub Vienna	Hub	Working space, SE training	2010
Social Business Day	SBD	Networking event	2010
Social Impact Award	SIA	Award, workshops	2009
Trigos Prize for Social Entrepreneurship	Trigos	Award	2012
Pioneers of Change	PoC	Training programme	2010
BDV Austria	BDV	Umbrella organisation for work integration social enterprises	1985

Table 1: List of Austrian intermediary organisations

Assessing the material density of hegemonisation

The second step involved grasping the material density of hegemonisation (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001), i.e., the practices through which a particular articulation is reiterated in various contexts with the effect of increasing its hegemonic strength. In doing so, we focused on mass media occurrences and affiliates of intermediaries.

The number of affiliates highlights an intermediary's ability to conjoin various actors around a common set of ideas and values (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). Affiliates were defined as individuals or organisations that participated in an intermediary's competitions, trainings or networking events; that received or applied for stipends; or that made use of a shared workspace. It was not deemed necessary for affiliates to self-identify as social entrepreneurs or social enterprises, or for them to meet a particular definition of SE. All affiliates between 2008 and 2012 were included in our inquiry.

Additionally, we established how often each intermediary was mentioned in the Austrian mass media. This information was instrumental for grasping how particular understandings of SE entered public discourse, with the effect of mainstreaming certain meanings while excluding alternatives. Intermediaries' occurrences in mass media were identified via the abovementioned WISO Press database. Our analysis only included news

articles dealing explicitly with SE or terms from its semantic field[iv] and was again limited to the years between 2008 and 2012.

Analysing signifying chains

The third step of our investigation involved the analysis of signifying chains intermediaries articulated by establishing logics of equivalence and difference. Websites were used as sources of textual data because they communicate intermediaries' understanding of the subject matter to a broader audience (Lamertz, Heugens, & Calmet, 2005). All websites contained information on the intermediaries' activities, their understandings of SE, their partnering organisations, as well as examples of successful SE. By February 2013, a corpus comprising 100'348 words had been retrieved, including all relevant passages from the intermediaries' websites, except for sections with externally provided content. The second and third author identified all passages that explicitly dealt with SE or terms belonging to its semantic field.[iv] They coded the entire corpus independently and then discussed their findings until a consensus was established. The next step consisted of identifying the signifying chains articulated by intermediaries. Here the focal attention was on how intermediaries either related SE with or disassociated it from particular signifiers, with the effect of creating a sense of objectivity. These signifying chains were then discussed by all three authors. Eventually, three articulations of SE were identified, which will be presented in the results section below.

Analysing affect

Fourthly, we re-read the aforementioned textual material with an eye toward identifying the affective dynamics that render each of the three articulations compelling (or not). We started out by looking for fantasies, conceived of as text sequences that invest SE with 'properties that far exceed its concrete materiality' (Stavrakakis, 2008, p. 285), and that

9

endow the subject matter with a sense of coherence and wholeness. Specifically, we identified fantasies by looking at text passages that pointed at (1) idealised scenarios of fullness and harmony (the beatific side of fantasy; Glynos, 2008), which can often be found in passages that describe the future direction of SE, and (2) potential obstacles to realising fullness (the horrific side of fantasy; ibid.). Throughout the analysis we came across passages which, albeit not conjuring fantasies, struck us by how they endowed SE with a sense of affective thrust. A subsequent process of abductive reasoning allowed us to make sense of this unexpected observation by developing an expanded understanding of affective dynamics supporting hegemonisation, which, in the results section below, will be referred to as 'constitutive quiescences' and 'moments of indeterminacy' respectively.

The Austrian Context

To put our empirical investigation into perspective, a brief socio-political contextualisation appears to be in order. Austria is a country with a relatively strong welfare system. Welfare services are mainly financed and delivered by the public sector, with private non-profit organisations playing an auxiliary or complimentary role. Neoliberal technologies of governance – such as conditional unemployment benefits and performance-based service contracting – have been introduced since the 1990s, but are far less widespread than in prototypically liberal countries. Austria used to be, and still is, a leader in universal social security provision.

The value Austria places on solidarity and equality may be a reason for the relatively late ascendency of SE. Indeed, it was only after 2006, the year when Muhammad Yunus won the Nobel Peace Prize, that the English term 'social entrepreneurship' garnered wider interest across Austria. It is thus not surprising that

eight out of the nine analysed intermediary organisations were founded after 2006 (see Table 1).

Despite the late arrival of SE in Austria, the idea as such has historical antecedents. One antecedent reaches back to the co-operative movement of the 19th century. Good.bee, the social finance branch of a co-operative bank, offers a case in point. Another historical root can be traced back to philanthropically minded industrialists of the 19th century, such as the Krupp and the Mautner-Markhof family. The Essl Social Prize and the Trigos award both comprise elements of this tradition. A more recent influence of SE is the 'alternative' movement dating back to the 1970s and 1980s, which experimented with 'greener' and more humane ways of doing business. Its influence is most visible in Pioneers of Chance (PoC), a training institution for soon-to-be 'pioneers of change'. A last influence has its roots in the 'experimental labour market policies' of the 1980s, which tried to re-integrate long-term unemployed workers into the labour market. This included the creation of work integration social enterprises led by professional social workers and managers. BDV offers an exemplary case of this tradition. Together, these diverse legacies informing SE make Austria an apt field for exploring how different meanings of SE vie for dominance. In presenting our findings, we first discuss the three major articulations of SE in succession, and, in a second step, compare these articulations in order to unveil the affective dynamics which render one of them hegemonic.

Articulations of Social Entrepreneurship

A common feature of all articulations of SE is that they specify (a) the characteristics of the social entrepreneurial subject, (b) what problems SE aims to overcome and what ideals it intends to realise, and (c) the means to solve those problems and realise those ideals. We will adhere to this tripartite structure in presenting the hegemonic and the two

marginal articulations. Verbatim quotations that were English in the original are set in italics. A tabular overview of the three articulations, with additional sample quotes, is provided in the appendix.

The hegemonic articulation: Social entrepreneurship as everyday heroism based on pragmatic solutions

Seven out of the nine intermediary organisations were involved in the hegemonic articulation of SE: Hub, SIA, good.bee, Trigos, SBD, Essl, and Ashoka. On an aggregated level, these intermediaries are affiliated with 883 individuals or organisations, thus rallying 77% of all affiliations connected to SE intermediaries in Austria. The hegemonic articulation further accounts for 94% of all mass media occurrences of SE and similar terms. Viewed together, these numbers are indicative of the material density of the hegemonic articulation, offering a tentative glimpse at the practices of dispersion through which the hegemonic articulation is repeated in different contexts with the effect of being endowed with a sense of objectivity.

The social entrepreneurial subject: Inclusive exclusiveness.

In academic literature, SE is often couched in an elitist discourse based on the heroic figure of the individual entrepreneur who is driven by a passion to instigate social change (Dacin et al., 2011). The hegemonic articulation is partly in accord with this rendition, as SE is delineated as an endeavour instigated by outstanding individuals:

> Many people work to achieve positive societal change. But that does not make every socially
> engaged person a social entrepreneur. Social entrepreneurs have the goal to find and implement
> innovative entrepreneurial solutions for pressing social problems. (Ashoka)

SE is portrayed here as an exclusive endeavour that relies on the motivation of rare individuals to solve social problems via innovative solutions. Whilst this emphasis on the

exceptional individual is in line with academic literature, it is interesting to observe that the hegemonic articulation of SE at the same time counter-balances the elitist rendition with an imagery of SE as an endeavour to which everyone has access. This logic of inclusiveness is paradigmatically displayed in the following extract:

> We work for a world where everybody can be a *changemaker*, a world where every individual has the freedom, the trust and the support to contribute to solving societal challenges. (Ashoka)

Inclusiveness is emphasised by downplaying the importance of skills, talent or previous entrepreneurial experience, and instead highlighting the willpower of potential social entrepreneurs: 'We only have to want to do it!' (Essl). Similarly, the risks implied in becoming a social entrepreneur are mostly glossed over, which makes the prospect of becoming a social entrepreneur appear straightforward, insomuch that it is difficult to reject it.

Paradoxically, becoming a social entrepreneur appears to be an inclusive endeavour (everyone can take part, all you need is willpower) and a highly exclusive prospect at the same time. However, as Glynos and Howarth (2007) remind us, apparently inconsistent statements, instead of undermining each other, can reinforce the affective thrust of an articulation. That is, inclusiveness works affectively to re-establish an understanding of SE which claims that everyone can, and indeed should, become a social entrepreneur. On the other hand, depicting social entrepreneurs as extraordinary individuals accentuates the uniqueness of SE, thus establishing the prospect of becoming a social entrepreneur as a desirable life trajectory.

Problems and ideals: Overcoming pressing problems through social change. The hegemonic articulation presents SE as a force for solving problems in society.

> [T]here is hardly a social problem in this world that has not already been solved by at least one Ashoka Fellow who has thereby changed the world for the better. (Essl)

13

As we can notice in the above excerpt, social change is presented as the hallmark of SE. The hegemonic articulation stresses that social change is inherently connected to SE, and that the changes brought about by SE are of great magnitude. The grand scope and iconic nature of social change can be surmised from accounts claiming that SE helps to solve '*the most pressing social and ecological issues of our time*' (SIA) or, more forthrightly, the 'problems of mankind' (Ashoka). So conceived, social change epitomises a fantasy of fullness: a harmonious future state that is close enough to be realistically hoped for. SE thus provides the link between the ideal of the better future and its current impediment (i.e., pressing social problems) by asserting that no matter how complex the latter might be, they can, eventually, be overcome.

While social change is one of the most frequently used signifiers of the hegemonic articulation, the term remains ill defined. For instance, it is often not specified whether social change is an incremental (i.e., addressing market failures through innovative products and services), institutional (i.e., readjusting existing market structures) or disruptive activity (i.e., aiming 'squarely at systems change', Nicholls & Murdock, 2012). In spite of being the ideal towards which SE gravitates, social change remains ambiguous, i.e., not fully defined by its differential position. The same applies to the kinds of problems SE grapples with, which are variously referred to as 'social' or 'societal problems', 'most pressing problems of our time', 'ecological problems', or sometimes just '*issues*' or 'challenges'.

The vagueness of the exemplary signifiers discussed here does not jeopardise SE's affective thrust, but rather strengthens it. Two dynamics are at play here. First, signifiers such as 'social change' – while lacking definite meaning – command affective thrust because they represent a positively connoted aspect of western common sense. Second, when it comes to already positively connoted signifiers, vagueness of meaning has an

idealising function (Fotaki, 2010): The hegemonic articulation of SE empties signifiers such as 'social change' of their specific meaning, just like an axiom that does not define the terms that it works with (Toscano, 2006). This eventually increases signifiers' scope of identification, because they lend themselves to various interpretations and affective investments. In Laclau's (2005, p. 40) words, vagueness is the condition of signifiers' 'political efficacy – as their function is to bring to equivalential homogeneity a highly heterogeneous reality'.

The means of social entrepreneurship: Pragmatic solutionism. There are notable differences between how the ideal of SE and the means to attain it are articulated: Whereas the notion of social change remains vague, one finds detailed descriptions of the means that SE employs to achieve social change. Broadly speaking, the means of SE pertain to commercial income, co-operation, managerial professionalism, innovation, and scaling.

Commercial income is portrayed as a crucial element for solving problems 'that the state cannot solve alone with its means' (good.bee). Contending that government funding for social services is becoming increasingly scarce, SE is articulated as an activity that complements governments' ability to finance welfare. Within this constellation, social entrepreneurs emerge as elite actors due to their ability to generate commercial income and become financially self-sufficient. By stressing the emancipatory potential of commercial income that government funding or charitable donations ostensibly lack, SE is elevated to a status of superiority. Importantly though, commercial income is depicted as important and preferable over donations and subsidies, but not as mandatory: 'All social entrepreneurs have in common that they generate income *where it is possible'* (Ashoka; emphasis added). This semantic openness keeps SE palatable for those who

would be ill at ease with dogmatic commercial views, or who are considering the use of hybrid funding models.

Semantic openness is also evident in the way the signifier 'co-operation' is used. The hegemonic articulation stresses that social entrepreneurs co-operate with all sorts of actors, regardless of the sector they work in. Not surprisingly, a crucial role is attributed to the co-operation between social entrepreneurs and intermediaries, which are positioned as pre-eminent actors that forge ties between nascent social entrepreneurs and other important actors, thus helping the former to advance their vision. Frequent references to the high level of support that social entrepreneurs purportedly receive provide a 'foundational guarantee' (Glynos, 2008) for the success SE.

Managerial professionalism is conceived of as the application of generic rational organising tools and skills. The basic contention is that managerial tools and skills can be acquired easily, and within a short time, e.g., via offers by intermediaries that are tailored to the needs and requirements of nascent social entrepreneurs. As one intermediary puts it, intermediaries '*give them [social entrepreneurs] just what they need, without having to waste time in sessions that do not interest them*' (Hub).

In a similar vein, innovation is presented as a key to SE's success, and mainly envisioned as a means for increasing efficiencies. Innovation thus comprises the ability to offer new problem solutions, which substitute ossified structures with more efficient ones. In this way, the articulation is consonant with the canon of business management, which purports that today's pressing problems cannot be resolved via old approaches.

The signifier 'scaling', finally, offers an explanatory link between small-scale solutions and comprehensive social change. It involves the replication of successful solutions beyond their initial context, so as to create global impact. The rating criteria of the Essl social prize are exemplary in this regard: 'How many people does the selected

16

project reach today, and how many will it reach in one and in five years? How many additional countries will be targeted?'

As has been shown, the hegemonic articulation places SE within a matrix of problems that are addressed with pragmatic tools to develop new solutions. Bluntly put, SE is about 'men and women who see a problem, find a new solution, and implement it themselves' (Ashoka). SE thus organises intricate social circumstances within a logic that promotes pragmatism: 'See an issue you've identified and get a solution you are passionate about' (Hub). Yet, unlike philosophical pragmatism, which is quite generally interested in whatever works, what we find here is a specific type of pragmatic 'solutionism' (Morozov, 2013) which stresses solutions that are embedded in the logics of business and technology.

Despite its ostensible objectivity and soberness, solutionism unleashes affective thrust. Solutionism is inherently fantasmatic in the way it suggests that we are already well underway towards the ideal of an inclusive society, and that we know what to do despite the elusiveness of the goal. Contending that problems must be addressed through the piecemeal application of pragmatic solutions evokes a utopia in conceivable reach: '*Another world is not just possible, it's already happening*' (Hub).

Marginal articulations of social entrepreneurship

All fields of discursivity entail the possibility of alternative articulations at their core (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). In our case, two alternative articulations were identified, which were promulgated by BDV and PoC respectively.

Social entrepreneurship as government-sponsored work integration. BDV was established in the late 1980s as an instrument of labour market integration. BDV is part of the European Network of Work Integration Enterprises and a prototypical example of this

form of organisation. As the concept of SE was largely unknown in Austria when BDV was founded, it has only recently put SE on its agenda. BDV accounts for less than 5% of all analysed articles dealing with SE and similar terms. At the same time, BDV is affiliated with 180 organisations (some of which have as many as 600 employees). These numbers equal 16% of all affiliations in our sample, which underscores the importance of work integration social enterprises in the Austrian labour market policy.

In sharp contrast to the hegemonic articulation, which associates SE with a wide variety of activities, BDV's rendition of SE is far more narrow, exclusively focusing on a particular type of organisation:

> Social enterprises integrate people into the labour market. They provide employment, social-pedagogic support, counselling and training for people who have been unemployed for many months.

Limiting the scope of SE to work integration social enterprises evidently has an immediate effect on how the problem, the ideal as well as the means of SE are conceived. Although SE is credited with the ability to establish a better future, BDV offers a down-to-earth and modest account of SE's ability to precipitate change. For instance, BDV suggests that social entrepreneurs 'try to support [difficult-to-place people] in (re-)entering the labour market' or are 'making an effort to fulfil their mandate for social integration by providing quality employment with living wages'. Tentative formulations such as 'trying' and 'making an effort' indicate that the link between SE and social change is not a matter of course. Even though a more inclusive society marks the aspired ideal, SE is presented merely as one particular puzzle stone which helps to reach this goal: 'Work is an important building block for participation in our society. Social enterprises therefore want to create high quality and secure jobs'. This modest account of social change is corroborated by the absence of any scaling intentions and the complete

lack of references to individual acts of heroism. BDV associates SE with innovation and commercial income, but unlike the hegemonic articulation does not use these signifiers to elevate SE to a superior status. For instance, commercial income is described as a necessity for becoming eligible for government funding.

What is of particular interest here is how BDV establishes a chain of equivalence with government. BDV is granted an active voice in formulating social and labour market policies, which social enterprises eventually implement and get financing for. In this way, government is constructed as the most important co-operation partner (at times in a relationship of critical lobbying) and as indispensable financier. This equivalence chain with government is not compatible with the liberal common sense that sees government as an impediment to both society and the economy. The articulation of BDV thus has limited affective thrust due to the way it embraces a signifier that is increasingly regarded as anathema to efficiency and flexibility.

Another aspect that stands in contrast to the self-confident optimism radiated by the hegemonic articulation (and the marginal articulation of spiritual post-capitalism, see below) is that the impetus of SE is limited to a specific set of problems, which all pertain to the labour market: unemployment, precarious working conditions, and inequality more generally. This focus limits the affective thrust of SE, as it dispenses with the fantasy of SE being the pre-eminent operator in establishing a harmonious society where major problems are solved for good.

Social entrepreneurship as spiritual post-capitalism. Pioneers of Change was established in 2010. Its goal – as the name suggests – is to support people in becoming 'pioneers of change'. PoC is driven by a commitment to holistic sustainable development. Only slightly more than 1% of all media occurrences dealing with SE and similar terms are related to PoC. Also, the number of PoC's affiliates is small, amounting to 7% of all

affiliations in the field. These parameters indicate that the articulation's material density is rather low.

The articulation enacted by PoC shares some commonalities with the hegemonic articulation, notably in regard to how it depicts SE as an inclusive endeavour in which everyone can take part: 'Generally, *Pioneers* are no 'super hero(in)es' [In German: 'Superheld*innen' – explicitly including male, female and transgender persons] but people who bravely use their talents and visions for feasible activities'. Another commonality pertains to the enthusiastic rendition of SE's potential, and the notion that the key to reaching the ideal is already available today. For instance:

> Together we are powerful! Through Pioneers of Change we support the current of change: we condense and solidify it. In this way a sustainable network emerges, which brings the possibilities of the future into the here and now. Each year more initiatives are established – on the way towards a sustainable and peaceful world.

This excerpt illustrates how the establishment of a network of 'pioneers' leads to the beatific ideal of a sustainable and peaceful future. The articulation by PoC deviates from the hegemonic articulation in two important ways. First, the articulation by PoC identifies capitalism as a root cause of many of today's most pressing ills. Establishing a chain of difference that places SE in an antagonistic relationship to capitalism, PoC represents the only articulation alluding to the need for a post-capitalist reality:

> If we, as humanity, want to survive on this only planet that was given to us, we need three things: a revocation of egoism, a holistic view, and the courage to change. The realisation that capitalist values of profit and growth are the wrong tools for achieving that is gaining ground far too slowly.

To overcome the problem (capitalism), PoC suggests that radical measures are necessary, notably the undoing of values of inflated profit and growth that form the lynchpin of capitalism. PoC articulates SE as the leverage for what Nicholls and Murdock (2012) call disruptive change, i.e., change that aims at altering existing structures.

Secondly, the articulation by PoC suggests that disruptive change can be instigated by means of altering people's state of consciousness.

> […] the programme stimulates balanced development into a 'whole person', with healthy social
>
> relationships and the involvement and appreciation of all levels of being.

While management skills are deemed important components of PoC's training, they are not considered sufficient to achieve disruptive change. PoC maintains that individuals should embark upon a reflective journey of self-discovery and mindfulness. Disruptive change hence presupposes that people learn to discover their 'true selves', and then inspire others to put faith in their authentic potential. In contrast to the hegemonic articulation, which views comprehensive social change as being based on the replication of successful solutions, the articulation by PoC suggests that such change is mostly the result of personal inspiration and spiritual enlightenment:

> Our examples motivate others to become active themselves. […Pioneers of Change] are authentic
>
> role models that bring an atmosphere of departure for alternative paths into society.

The articulation thus works fantasmatically by making the individual's spiritual journey the origin of collective well-being (Driver, 2005).

Affective Dynamics of Hegemonisation

Addressing our second research question, we now offer a comparison between the three articulations of SE, in order to throw the affective dynamics that support hegemonisation into sharper relief (see Table 2). At first glance, there are considerable overlaps between the three articulations. For instance, all three articulations share the belief that SE can contribute to social change, and that innovation is an important means towards that end. However, from what has been presented above, important differences become palpable. These differences are often subtle, a matter of degree rather than kind.

	Hegemonic Articulation	Marginal Articulations	
	Everyday Heroism based on Pragmatic Solutions	Government-sponsored Work Integration	Spiritual Post-Capitalism
Fantasmatic articulations	• *The SE community is an illustrious circle in which nonetheless everybody is welcome to participate.* • *SE enables a better world in which serious problems are eliminated.* • *Social change will be enabled by applying managerial and technical solutions.* → Affect pertains to how SE is related to common-sense notions of pragmatism. → Conflating the future with what is already available creates a sense of security.	→ The close relationship with government is at odds with prevailing beliefs about how to make social change.	→ The idea of spiritual self-discovery as key to reach a post-capitalist ideal is at odds with prevailing beliefs about how and what kind of social change should be accomplished.
Constitutive quiescences	• *Descriptions of problems to be addressed by SE do not touch upon contentious issues.* → Sanitised view of SE that is hard to disagree with.	→ Conceding that SE is not omnipotent eventually hampers affective thrust.	→ Pinpointing market capitalism as the major obstacle in the way towards establishing a harmonious society violates conventions of how far change can or should go.
Moments of Indeterminacy	• *The precise meaning of the problems that SE will solve, and the sort of social change that SE will achieve are perpetually suspended* → The use of positively connoted floating signifiers make SE eligible for various readings and affective investments.	→ The precise definition of SE limits the scope of identification, and the affective appeal of the articulation.	→ Within the wider web of signification, the goal of social change towards a sustainable and peaceful world becomes filled with left-wing and new-age content, thus becoming attractive only for a narrow audience.

Table 2: Affective dynamics of hegemonisation

Fantasmatic articulations: Creating harmony and fullness

The pacifying force of fantasy is particularly pronounced in the hegemonic articulation of SE, which combines a sense of urgency ('most pressing problems of our time') with the possibility of harmony (existing problems will be solved). SE is depicted as a pragmatic and hands-on activity in which everybody is able to participate; everyone is invited to become part of the illustrious circle of social entrepreneurs who work for large-scale social change. By equalling SE with pragmatic solutionism, a signifying chain is established, which purports that the basic technical and managerial tools to establish an ideal future are at hand. Contending that adherence to what is already available today permits us to attain the desired future has the effect of retroactively downplaying contradictions and predicaments of the status quo.

In the putatively harmonious reality advanced by the hegemonic articulation, there is little credibility for the sort of disruptive change advanced by PoC. Indeed, comparing the hegemonic articulation with the articulation by PoC, we can see that the latter fails to gain traction, both in terms of its material density (media occurrences and number of affiliates) and affective thrust. One reason why the articulation by PoC has little affective thrust is that, by putting notions of spirituality and post-capitalism centre stage, it goes too far beyond the boundaries of common sense. The chain of equivalence between SE and spiritual growth disconnects SE from orthodox beliefs about how social change is engendered. Placed squarely in contradiction to rationalist ideas about innovation, scaling and managerial professionalism in the hegemonic articulation, spirituality forms a fantasmatically charged term that only strikes a chord with a select audience. Specifically, PoC's articulation fails to establish itself as a broader object of desire because it violates prevailing ways of thinking in the Austrian business world, politics and academia. The same can be said about PoC's post-capitalist ideal. For the vast majority of people,

23

alternative social structures are impossible to imagine (Fisher, 2009), which also holds

true for Austrians. A similar problem can be traced in the articulation by BDV, which

forges a chain of equivalence between SE and government. This articulation dampens the

affective thrust of SE by relating the subject matter to an actor who is rapidly losing

credibility as an arbitrator of welfare, and is increasingly seen as a liability to the efficient

provision of social services. At any rate, we can conjecture that the more an articulation

of SE deviates from the normative presumption of common sense, the smaller its chances

are of becoming a valid object of desire (Hall & O'Shea, 2013).

Constitutive quiescences: Repressing contentious and anxiety-provoking issues

A peculiar feature of the hegemonic articulation is that it avoids spelling out the precise

causes of today's most pressing ills. Turning a blind eye on issues such as power or class,

the hegemonic articulation advances a rather frictionless image of change.

Our abductive reasoning has brought into focus that the ability to exclude certain

issues from being articulated is a constitutive element of hegemony. As Rickert (2007, p.

57) reminds us: 'every discursive field has an element that must drop out of the field […]

to create the appearance of consistency'. The important point here is that, although all

three articulations are replete with absences (i.e., things which could have been said, but

which were not said), not every absence has affective thrust. We shall refer to such

absences with affective significance as constitutive quiescences. They are not about the

exclusion of possibilities that 'were logically possible in a certain situation' (Laclau,

1990, p. 31), but about excluding possibilities that potentially undermine an articulation's

affective thrust.

Comparing the hegemonic articulation to the two marginal ones, one notices that

the former refrains from discussing complex structural causes and ambivalences of

reality. By focusing on pragmatic solutions, the hegemonic articulation eschews macro-

level dilemmas, complexities and antagonisms that form part of the political and economic system and that may lurk behind the acknowledged 'social problems' or 'ecological issues'. This tendency to avoid agonistic debates engenders a reality that Mouffe (2005) calls post-political. Post-political does not mean that a given articulation denies political aims such as justice, peace or equality. Instead, post-political refers to the claim that political aims can be reached without engaging in antagonistic struggle. In that way, an image of social change is created which is so devoid of agonistic debates that it becomes literally impossible to disagree with SE.

In comparison, PoC identifies capitalism as an obstacle that stands in the way of attaining an ideal state, thus stressing a contentious aspect of reality. BDV, while not addressing root causes, dampens the affective thrust of its articulation by referring to the modest scope of SE. Various aspects that restrict the potential of SE are revealed, for example dependence on government funding that does not allow much flexibility: 'In the future, social enterprises need labour market policies with enough freedom to be able to react quickly to new fields of work and required qualifications' (BDV).

Taken together, unlike the hegemonic articulation, which predominantly focuses on the sunny side of SE, the two marginal articulations display aspects of SE that are either contentious or anxiety-provoking and therefore decrease their affective thrust.

Moments of indeterminacy: Making sense without meaning
Whilst conducting our analysis, we were struck by the elusiveness of some of the signifiers associated with SE, not least because conceptual imprecision has repeatedly been deemed an impediment to the advancement of SE as an academic field (Martin & Osberg, 2007). This observation triggered abductive reasoning, which led us into bodies of literature that we had not considered. For instance, Rear and Jones (2013) argue that hegemonisation works best on floating signifiers that are inherently ambiguous. By a

similar token, Tønder and Thomassen (2005, p. 105) suggest that the 'condition of possibility of hegemony is that the elements being articulated into a chain of equivalence are relatively unfixed and floating'. The broader implication of this is that the affective thrust of SE is not merely the result of fantasmatic articulations that stabilise certain meanings of the term, but that affect also emanates from the use of floating signifiers that defy meaning.

We call the affective usage of floating signifiers 'moments of indeterminacy'. Moments of indeterminacy thus make SE eligible for various readings and affective investments. A moment of indeterminacy, as Giroux (2006, p. 1229) maintains, 'allows for different courses of action while maintaining a semblance of unity'. Moments of indeterminacy are particularly noticeable in the hegemonic articulation's usage of 'social change', but also apply to signifiers such as 'innovation' and 'co-operation'. Such signifiers possess a remarkable intuitive component: The reader simply seems to get their meaning. Moments of indeterminacy hence work to support consensus and avoid conflict by establishing the perception of 'understanding without knowing' (Alexander, 2008).

In contradistinction to the hegemonic articulation, the two marginal articulations have far fewer moments of indeterminacy. At first glance, the articulation enacted by PoC entails vague terms, notably the ideal of a sustainable and peaceful world. Yet, when looking at the signifying chains *in toto*, the articulation loses much of its vagueness, as PoC fills it with terms from the leftist repertoire (e.g., 'non-violence', 'solidarity') and from new-age jargon (e.g., 'new consciousness'). Thus, as a general rule, any increase in specificity risks to disturb the hegemonic potential of an articulation, since it decreases the ability to establish a 'compromise equilibrium' (Gramsci, 1971) by winning the consent of diverse groups of people. This tendency seems most obvious in the articulation by BDV, which offers an unambiguous understanding of SE as work integration. Such a

narrow semantic focus attenuates the affective thrust of SE, making it palatable for a select group of people only.

Concluding Reflections

The starting point of this article lay in the observation that the progressive nature of SE has mostly been taken for granted. However, by asserting that the semblance of SE's progressive essence is a contingent achievement, we have taken a close look at how intermediary organisations manage to establish a particular version of SE as eminently compelling. On the basis of affect-oriented extensions of Laclau and Mouffe's poststructuralist work, hegemonisation was suggested as a sensitising concept to explore the ways in which SE is endowed with a sense of objectivity and affective thrust, using Austria as a case in point.

At this point, a limitation of our study needs to be addressed: We have built our database around actors and texts that explicitly use the term 'social entrepreneurship'. Obviously, this directs our analysis away from actors and texts that engage in practices of social change but do not use the 'social entrepreneurship' label. They may be using alternative terms such as 'green business', 'bottom of the pyramid', 'solidarity economy', or 'co-operatives'. Each of these terms has distinct connotations. It is thus possible that, when focusing on another term, different dynamics of hegemonisation could be discovered.

While, in an empirical sense, our findings are limited to the Austrian context, in a conceptual sense they contribute new perspectives on how a particular understanding of SE becomes hegemonic through the interweaving of signification and affective investment. Undoubtedly, these insights are relevant for conceptual as well as political reasons.

Conceptually speaking, our results at once confirm and complement Gramsci's understanding of hegemony by demonstrating that common sense is not only a result of hegemonisation, but also one of its essential preconditions (Hall & O'Shea, 2013). The hegemonisation of SE crucially depends on how firmly articulations are embedded in prevailing common sense. If articulations move away too far from common sense, they appear counter-intuitive or simply incomprehensible. This is evident from how familiar the hegemonic articulation of SE sounds, while marginal articulations begin to appear strange, ridiculous, or old-fashioned when veering away too far from common sense.

Moreover, in contrast to our initial supposition, our results show that the effectiveness of the hegemonic articulation of SE is in no small part due to intermediaries' ability to suspend signification. Testifying to the Lacanian dictum that a system of meaning cannot be reduced solely to its positive elements (Byrne & Healy, 2006), we have demonstrated that constitutive quiescences and moments of indeterminacy unleash affective force in two distinct, but often related ways: by veiling the constitutive impossibility of full harmony, and by keeping options for interpretation open (Fotaki, 2010). The significance of these two affective dynamics in hegemonisation cannot possibly be overestimated as their operation runs counter to extant research, which exclusively associates hegemony with the articulation of positive meaning whereby 'unfixed elements [are transformed] into partially fixed moments' (Torfing, 1999, p. 101). To be speculative for once, we would suggest that these two affective dynamics are of importance in most, if not all processes of hegemonisation. We welcome further research in organisation studies to investigate this point, and thus examine in more detail the precise dynamics of constitutive quiescences and moments of indeterminacy.

From a political perspective, our investigation compels us to consider the directions which our critical engagement with SE, and alternative forms of organising

28

more generally, could take. Within the theoretical scheme advanced in this article, two options become available. The first option is anti-hegemonic: to engage in on-going denaturalising of SE and alternative forms of organising with an eye towards keeping the field of signification open, rather than steering towards a definite meaning. The problem with such an ethos of non-closure (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) is that even if one tries to keep the field of signification open, this will not prevent other actors from trying to dominate the discursive field.

The second option, which we personally favour, is counter-hegemonic. Here the aim is not merely to undermine the seeming objectivity of hegemony but rather to participate in the formulation of an alternative hegemony. Our advice for establishing counter-hegemonic articulations of SE and alternative forms of organising would be to emulate political tactics that have proven effective in deploying affect as a crucial factor of success. This is what Mouffe (2014b) had in mind when averring that left-wing politics has much to learn from right-wing populism:

> The success of right-wing populism […] is because the terrain of affect and passion has been abandoned by left parties: 'No, that's the domain for right-wing populism. We need to speak of arguments.' And all the deliberative theories insist: 'Rational arguments, rational arguments. We don't have anything to do with those passions.' (Mouffe, 2014a).

We hasten to add that organisation studies scholars involved in such counter-hegemonic endeavours should abstain from using affect simply to veil the irreducible negativity of SE and alternative forms of organising through fantasies. Rather, they should affirm lack and embrace precariousness. Our affect-oriented conceptualisation further suggests that we must not discard 'rational arguments' too readily. The question is rather how counter-hegemonic articulations can combine good reasons with affective thrust. We suggest a two-pronged approach: First, even though it will necessarily remain incomplete and contestable, a counter-hegemonic articulation should conjure an enticing positive vision

(e.g., democracy, justice, good life, human decency). Secondly, in alignment with such ideals, it should be made clear that they will always remain elusive, and that the road towards approximating them will remain forever arduous. This implies moving beyond the levelheaded realism we have encountered in the articulation by BDV as well as the fantasmatic accounts enacted by the hegemonic articulation and PoC. Affect should be retained as a driving force, because without it there would be no desire for change. At the same time, organisation studies scholars interested in, as well as practitioners working in and with SE and alternative forms of organising, should no longer adhere to illusionary promises of fullness. They should desire change whilst appreciating antagonisms, conflicts and contingency (Byrne & Healy, 2006).

To conclude, we are mindful of the fact that our study, ironically, has to some extent strengthened the hegemonisation of SE. However, we would like to repeat that critique must not be confined to the endless deconstruction of prevailing hegemonies (read anti-hegemonic critique), since this would bring grist to the mill of their further hegemonisation. Instead, the sort of counter-hegemonic critique we deem worthwhile actively participates in re-articulating SE and alternative forms of organising. Such critique acknowledges that, although these organisations will never reach their ultimate goal, it is nonetheless urgent to make steps towards it.

References

Alexander, J. (2008). Iconic consciousness: The material feeling of meaning. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 26*, 782-794.

Barinaga, E. (2013). Politicising social entrepreneurship: Three social entrepreneurial rationalities toward social change. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 4*(3), 347-372.

Bowman, P. (2007). *Post-Marxism versus cultural studies. Theory, politics and intervention*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Brown, M. L., McDonald, S., & Smith, F. (2013). Jungian archetypes and dreams of social enterprise. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 26*(4), 670-688.

Byrne, K., & Healy, S. (2006). Cooperative subjects: Toward a post-fantasmatic enjoyment of the economy. *Rethinking Marxism, 18*(2), 241-258.

Dacin, T., Dacin, P., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science, 22*(5), 1203-1213.

Dey, P., & Lehner, O. (forthcoming). Registering ideology in the creation of social entrepreneurs: Intermediary organizations, 'ideal subjects', and the promise of enjoyment. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Dey, P.,, & Steyaert, C. (2012). Social entrepreneurship: Critique and the radical enactment of the social. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *8*(2), 90-107.

Driver, M. (2005). From empty speech to full speech? Reconceptualizing spirituality in organizations based on a psychoanalytically-grounded understanding of the self. *Human Relations, 58*(9), 1091-1110.

Fisher, M. (2009). *Capitalist realism: Is there no alternative?* : John Hunt Publishing.

Fotaki, M. (2010). Why do public policies fail so often? Exploring health policy-making as an imaginary and symbolic construction. *Organization Science, 17*(6), 703-720.

Giroux, H. (2006). 'It was such a handy term': Management fashions and pragmatic ambiguity. *Journal of Management Studies, 43*(6), 1227-1260. doi:

Glynos, J. (2001). The grip of ideology: A Lacanian approach to the theory of ideology. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 6*(2), 191-214.

Glynos, J. (2008). Ideological fantasy at work. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 13*(3), 275-296.

Glynos, J., & Howarth, D. (2007). *Logics of critical explanation in social and political theory*. London et al.: Routledge.

Glynos, J., Klimecki, R., & Willmott, H. (2012). Cooling out the marks: The ideology and politics of the financial crisis. *Journal of Cultural Economy, 5*(3), 297-320.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Hall, S., & O'Shea, A. (2013). Common-sense neoliberalism. *Soundings: A Journal of Politics and Culture, 55*, 8-24.

Hjorth, D. (2013). Public entrepreneurship: Desiring social change, creating sociality. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 25*(1-2), 34-51.

Jones, C., & Spicer, A. (2009). *Unmasking the entrepreneur*. Cheltenham et al.: Edward Elgar.

Lacan, J. (1977). *The seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XI: The four fundamentaal concepts of psychoanalysis*. New York: Norton.

Lacan, J. (1988). *The seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book I: Freud's papers on technique 1953-1954*. New York: Norton.

Laclau, E. (1990). *New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London and New York: Verso.

Laclau, E. (2004). Glimpsing the future. In S. Critchley & O. Marchart (Eds.), *Laclau: A critical reader* (pp. 279-328). London: Routledge.

Laclau, E. (2005). Populism: what's in a name? . In F. Panizza (Ed.), *Populism and the mirror of democracy* (pp. 32-49). New York: Verso.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Lamertz, K., Heugens, P. P., & Calmet, L. (2005). The configuration of organizational images among firms in the Canadian beer brewing industry*. *Journal of Management Studies, 42*(4), 817-843.

Lash, S. (2007). Power after hegemony: Cultural studies in mutation? *Theory, Culture & Society, 24*(3), 55-78.

Maielli, G. (2015). Explaining organizational paths through the concept of hegemony: Evidence from the Italian car industry. *Organization Studies, 36*(4), 491-511.

Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. *Stanford social innovation review, 5*(2), 28-39.

Morozov, E. (2013). *To save everything, click here: Technology, solutionism, and the urge to fix problems that don't exist*. London: Allen Lane.

Mouffe, C. (2005). The 'end of politics' and the challenge of right wing populism. In F. Panizza (Ed.), *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy* (pp. 50-71). London: Verso.

Mouffe, C. (2008). Critique as counter-hegemonic intervention. *Transversal Mutlilingual Webjournal.* from

http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/souri/mori/2000/0407policy.html

Mouffe, C. (2014a). *The crisis of representative democracy and the need for a left-wing populism*. Paper presented at the Populist Discourse and Democracy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece. https://youtu.be/0Gcz0Fb9kUQ

Mouffe, C. (2014b). Democratic politics and conflict: an agonistic approach. In M. Lakitsch (Ed.), *Political power reconsidered: state power and civic activism between legitimacy and violence* (pp. 17-29). Wien et al.: LIT-Verlag.

Nicholls, A. (2010). The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: Reflexive isomorphism in a pre-paradigmatic field. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 34*(4), 611-633.

Nicholls, A., & Murdock, A. (2012). The nature of social innovation. In A. Nicholls & A. Murdock (Eds.), *Social innovation: Blurring Boundaries to Reconfigure Markets* (pp. 1-30). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Parker, M., Cheney, G., Fournier, V., & Land, C. (2014). *The Routledge companion to alternative organization*. London et al.: Routledge.

Rear, D., & Jones, A. (2013). Discursive struggle and contested signifiers in the arenas of education policy and work skills in Japan. *Critical Policy Studies, 7*(4), 375-394.

Rickert, T. (2007). *Acts of enjoyment: Rhetoric, Žižek, and the return of the subject*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Schneiberg, M. (2013). Movements as political conditions for diffusion: Anti-corporate movements and the spread of cooperative forms in American capitalism. *Organization Studies, 34*(5-6), 653-682

Shaw, E., & de Bruin, A. (2013). Reconsidering capitalism: the promise of social innovation and social entrepreneurship? *International Small Business Journal, 31*(7), 737-746.

Stavrakakis, Y. (1999). *Lacan and the political*. New York: Routledge.

Stavrakakis, Y. (2008). Peripheral vision subjectivity and the organized other: Between symbolic authority and fantasmatic enjoyment. *Organization Studies, 29*(7), 1037-1059.

Tønder, L., & Thomassen, L. (2005). *Radical democracy: Politics between abudance and lack*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Torfing, J. (1999). *New theories of discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.

Toscano, A. (2006). *The theatre of production: Philosophy and individualism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

van Bommel, K., & Spicer, A. (2011). Hail the snail: Hegemonic struggles in the slow

    food movement. *Organization Studies, 32*(12), 1717-1744.

Waddock, S. A., & Post, J. E. (1991). Social entrepreneurs and catalytic change. *Public*

    administration review, 51(5), 393-401.

Appendix

Signifying Chain	Articulation of SE		
	Everyday Heroism based on Pragmatic Solutions	Government-sponsored Work Integration	Spiritual Post-Capitalism
Inclusiveness	'It could be <u>a mobile soup kitchen for homeless people, a new educational concept, a website to mobilise the neighbourhood, an idea of fundraising or something totally new</u> – the important thing is that your project follows a social goal.' (SIA) '<u>*All projects* from social businesses to – for example – *initiatives in civil society are* <u>welcome</u></u>.' (Hub)	/	'In <u>every person</u> there is potential, power and goodness." *[…]* We support people to discover themselves and their gifts, to make a contribution to society' (PoC) 'If partial aspects are not clear to you yet, <u>do not let that deter you from applying</u>. Simply write to us about what is ALREADY THERE.' (PoC)
Exclusiveness	'*We promise it's gonna be <u>special</u>, exciting and impactful – and invite you to join for some of the <u>limited places</u> […].*' (Hub) '*Being part of the SIA comes with a lot of <u>perks</u> for the future social entrepreneurs. One of them is being personally <u>introduced</u> to the HUB collaboration network, the <u>rising star of the global social business incubation scene</u>.*' (SIA)	'Eligible for becoming members of BDV Austria and the respective networks at the provincial level are all <u>enterprises that implement projects on behalf of the Austrian Labour Market Service and are active in a labour market policy context</u>.' (BDV) 'Social Enterprises: All the social enterprises that are connected by BDV Austria are not-for-profit and have the aim to gradually <u>re-integrate difficult-to-place persons into the labour market</u>.' (BDV)	/

Table 3: The social entrepreneurial subject

Signifying chain	Articulation of SE		
	Everyday Heroism based on Pragmatic Solutions	Government-sponsored Work Integration	Spiritual Post-Capitalism
Ideals	'*Social Impact Award 2011 – push the button, change the world!*' (SIA) '*Social Entrepreneurship* is an approach that uses entrepreneurial means (entrepreneurial activities) to solve social problems.' (Trigos)	'Social enterprises are the business form of the present and future. *[…]* They are enterprises that make a difference: By striving to be economically feasible, and by making an effort to fulfil their mandate for social integration by providing quality employment with living wages.' (BDV) 'Work Integration Social Enterprises as a tool for social inclusion.' (BDV)	'The new is coming on strong: It is organised with non-violence, democracy and solidarity.' (PoC) 'Values like the true, humane, noble, good and beautiful have been enslaved for decades to a single maxim, the value of competition. We exalted it by accumulating a single figure: financial capital. This time is coming to an end. Something new is beginning to show. *[...]*. Yes, I know, the time for a new consciousness has come.' (PoC)
Addressed problems	'Start working on letting your own ideas become sustainable solutions for the most pressing social issues' (Hub) 'A *social entrepreneur* is an entrepreneur who aims to overcome a social challenge that so far has not been addressed, or has not been addressed to a sufficient degree.' (Trigos)	'Our goal is to be involved in the decisions and actions at all crucial nodes, in order to prevent the social exclusion of unemployed and difficult-to-place people, to enable new chances, and to counteract the increasing precariousness of employment relations.' (BDV) 'Nonetheless it is still a long way towards fully recognising the importance of social enterprises for educating people who are threatened by social exclusion and precarious employment.' (BDV)	'We are living in a time of great changes: economic, social, ecological. It is a global crisis, because more of the same would plunge humanity into the abyss.' (PoC) 'In the learning programme we encourage *[…]* reaching a fruitful engagement with painful aspects of the global situation.' (PoC)

Table 4: Ideals and addressed problems

Signifying Chain	Articulation of SE		
	Everyday Heroism based on Pragmatic Solutions	Government-sponsored Work Integration	Spiritual Post-Capitalism
Commercial income	'All social entrepreneurs have in common that they generate income where it is possible, and do not give away their services for free. They aim is to help people help themselves.' (Ashoka) *'Financially viable on a commercial basis: at present or at a projected date in the future; entities, which partially cover costs with subsidies will be considered, however, consideration will be given to their willingness to fully accept and adopt commercial principles in order to be financially independent in the future.'* (good.bee)	'Social enterprises work economically, ecologically, and socially sustainable.' (BDV) '[Social enterprises] provide temporary employment that is subsidised by the Labour Market Service to people who are excluded from the regular labour market, and thereby try to support them in (re-)entering the labour market. [… Their] products and services have to prove viable on the market.' (BDV)	'Criteria for participation:; […] the desire to make a living from the project in the long run (also financially).' (PoC)
Co-operation	'Networking with businesses: Ashoka supports the transfer of know-how into both sectors [i.e., business sector and social sector] by getting entrepreneurial investors involved in the work of social entrepreneurs.' (Ashoka) *'Do you know how much the Austrian State and other public entities invest every year in the entrepreneurship sector? Do you know how you can access some of these funds? Join us for the "Meet the (Public) Investor"- [...].'* (Hub)	'We connect and co-ordinate these interests and are an interface for labour market policy decision-makers at the federal level and – through our European Network – also at the European level.' (BDV) 'Since May 2012 BDV Austria is also a member of the newly founded expert group of the European Commission for social entrepreneurship (GECES). There it advises the Commission on implementing and developing measures for the Social Business Initiative – together with other representatives of social enterprises, public administration, and the banking sector.' (BDV)	'The programme team will help you find experts who provide special coaching and counselling (e.g. on finance and legal issues).' (PoC) *'Pioneers of Change* are usually very emotionally involved in their projects and organisations, and take personal risks. Their environment often shows little understanding for their engagement. This can lead to overloading, frustration and loneliness. The programme provides participants with a community of like-minded people, who can provide each other with understanding and mutual support.' (PoC)

Table 5: Means of social entrepreneurship (Part 1)

Signifying Chain	Articulation of SE		
	Everyday Heroism based on Pragmatic Solutions	Government-sponsored Work Integration	Spiritual Post-Capitalism
Professionalism	'*Business development support to acquire <u>management and financial know-how</u> is the key for the creation of a sustainable and commercially viable social enterprise.*' (good.bee) '*<u>Business Basics</u>: Short (3 hours) workshops with expert organisations, giving you the basic knowledge on a specific topic as well as practical tools to advance your venture.*' (Hub)	'Bdv Austria has developed a quality seal for social integration enterprises that stands for the attainment of <u>social, organisational and economic quality standards</u> in social enterprises that aim to integrate long-term unemployed persons into the labour market.' (BDV) '[…L]ong term unemployed receive training, <u>professional guidance</u>, and preparation for the regular labour market.' (BDV)	'The taught tools include: <u>organic project development, business modelling, finance, fundraising, participatory decision-making, media and communication work, CI and brand development, authentic presenting, organisational development, non-violent communication.</u>' (PoC) 'Also <u>bodily needs</u> for activity, exertion and relaxation are attended to and integrated into the programme. <u>Slowing down, consciously taking a break, and silent mindfulness</u> can be a source for <u>pragmatic and engaged action</u>.' (PoC)
Innovation	'*Social Entrepreneurs* work with <u>innovative</u>, far-reaching <u>approaches</u> to sustainably <u>solve a social problem</u> at a large scale.' (Ashoka) 'Social entrepreneurs find <u>innovative solutions</u> for social challenges.' (Trigos)	'A few days ago, the Viennese social enterprise won another award, the Austrian National Prize for Adult Education. Abz*Austria <u>won the prize in the category 'Innovation</u> 2012', which <u>awards extraordinary and path-breaking educational programmes, innovative projects,</u> and excellent strategies for reaching certain target groups.' (BDV) '[Social enterprises] offer services <u>or produce innovative products</u> under the guidance of qualified supervisors and social workers.' (BDV)	'We have to be <u>hospice caregivers for the old and midwifes for the new.</u>' (PoC) 'Pioneers of change […] spread <u>innovations by questioning the politics of 'more of the same'</u>, by creating an alternative practice, and by connecting with like-minded people to establish a durable motivation for sustainable change.' (PoC)
Scaling	'Ashoka finds concepts in an early stage of development and enables the people behind it to fully concentrate on <u>growing their idea</u>.' (Ashoka) '*This year we also prototype the first <u>scaling</u> support service for impact ventures*.' (Hub)	/	'Pioneers of change are brave, confident, creative people who are <u>role models</u> of sustainability […].' (PoC) '<u>Viral culture effects</u>: Deep change comes from within, reaches out, and is '<u>contagious</u>'!' (Poc)

Table 6: Means of social entrepreneurship (Part 2)

Notes

[i] Laclau was aware that the force of discourses cannot be explained solely through recourse to signifying practices: 'Here something else has to be brought into the picture [...]. That is, something belonging to the order of affect has a primary role in [...] constructing the social' (Laclau, 2004:326).

[ii] *Der Standard, Die Presse, Falter, FORMAT, Kleine Zeitung, Kronen Zeitung, Kurier, Neue Kärntner Tageszeitung, Neues Volksblatt, Neue Vorarlberger Tageszeitung, NEWS, Oberösterreichische Nachrichten, Profil, Salzburger Nachrichten, Tiroler Tageszeitung, Vorarlberger Nachrichten, Wiener Zeitung, WirtschaftsBlatt*

[iii] 2008 was the year when the first intermediary began its operations (except for BDV, which was founded in the 1980s).

[iv] '*Social entrepreneur*', '*social entrepreneurship*', '*social business*', 'soziales Unternehmen', 'sozialer Unternehmer', 'Sozialunternehmer', 'Sozialunternehmen', '*social enterprise*', '*changemaker*', '*social venture*', and '*social innovator*'