A theoretical and methodological approach to social entrepreneurship as world-making and emancipation: social change as a projection in space and time

Nicolina Montesano Montessori

Published online: 30 Aug 2016.

Submit your article to this journal ⇗

Article views: 279

View related articles ⇗

View Crossmark data ⇗

Citing articles: 3 View citing articles ⇗

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

OPEN ACCESS

A theoretical and methodological approach to social entrepreneurship as world-making and emancipation: social change as a projection in space and time

Nicolina Montesano Montessori

Faculty of Education, Institute Archimedes (Education), HU University of Applied Sciences Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

This article presents and analyses three cases, which integrate features of both social movements and social entrepreneurship (SE). It is the result of a longitudinal study (January 2012 to September 2015). The study contributes new insights to the theoretical and methodological discussions on SE, focusing on 'the social' in SE literature. The three selected movements, active in the Netherlands, are: 'The Dutch Chapter of Zeitgeist' henceforth Zeitgeist (TZM), (2010–present), 'Giving is All we Have' (henceforth GIAWH, (2011–2014) and 'MasterPeace' (MP) (2010–present). Each movement shows a strong inclination towards social transformation, while being rooted in organizational structures, therefore considered 'social entrepreneurial movements'. Specific contributions entail: the presentation of these innovative cases, the design of a methodology based on critical discourse analysis, state theory, narrative analysis, political theory and discourse theory and a thorough analysis and interpretation of these cases in the national and global contexts in which they emerged. More specifically, it contributes to SE literature on emancipation, defined as 'breaking free' when further developing the method in the direction of world-making, defined as 'creating new worlds'. This study suggests that transition theory can be useful for the study of the impact of social entrepreneurial movements.

Introduction

This study contributes to research on social entrepreneurship (SE) in various ways. SE has been broadly defined by Mair and Martí (2006, 36) as:

> a process that catalyzes social change and addresses important social needs in a way that is not dominated by direct financial benefits for the entrepreneurs. SE is seen as differing from other forms of entrepreneurship in the relatively higher priority given to promoting social value and development versus capturing economic value.

This study aims at inserting the 'social' more firmly in available SE literature, emphasizing the potential for social transformation while also presenting relevant theories and a

---

CONTACT Nicolina Montesano Montessori ✉ n.montesanomontessori@gmail.com

methodology to analyse SE (Steyaert and Hjorth 2006). It draws on and further develops literature on SE in combination with social movement theory (Mair and Martí 2006), SE as emancipation (Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen 2009) and SE as world-making (Sarasvathy 2012) and attempts to be a contribution to help resolve Hjorth's critique that within SE literature, 'the social is too weak, and the entrepreneurship […] too managerialized' (Hjorth 2013, 35).

The three selected cases, Zeitgeist, Giving is All we Have and MasterPeace, combine features of social movements and social enterprises, through their strong focus on social transformation, while maintaining formal organization structures. It therefore broadens and amplifies existing definitions of SE, by adding the element of 'social movements', a suggestion previously made by Mair and Martí (2006, 41–42). I analyse these movements in the national and global contexts in which they emerged.

I designed a theoretical–methodological–analytical framework based on discourse theory (Laclau and Mouffe 1985), critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Reisigl and Wodak 2002; Fairclough 2003), state theory (Jessop 2002), political theory (Chilton 2004) and post-structural perspectives on space (Harvey 1996) and time (Adam and Groves 2007) in order to analyse these movements and to interpret them in the light of recent strands of literature on SE. My model pays strong attention to the aspect of ontology and ontological narratives, making use of Somers (1994)[1] a point which was made by Steyaert and Bachmann (2012). In addition, I recommend using transition theory to look at the impact and processes of constructive power of social entrepreneurial movements (Avelino and Rotmans 2009). My research design and methodology expand Rindova's theory on SE as emancipation in the direction of a model for world-making. In the process, it further develops research methodology of CDA, especially by adding the post-structural notions of 'space' and 'time' to an existing model (Chilton 2004). The need for a methodology to analyse SE has been addressed by various authors. Short, Moss, and Lumpkin (2009) make this point for SE studies in general, while Sarasvathy (2012) and Calas, Smircich, and Bourne (2009) make this point for studies related to world-making.

Selection of the cases, methodological considerations and research questions

The selected cases, the Dutch Chapter of the global Zeitgeist movement, a private corporation entitled 'Giving is All we Have' and a global movement, MasterPeace, either started or are active in the Netherlands. I selected them because they integrate features of both social movements and of social enterprises. In terms of social movements, each of them presents a critical analysis of the status quo of the current world and its underlying power relations and mechanisms; each of them shows a strong focus on social and/or economic transformation, they hold innovative views on leadership and power and they have developed and brought into being innovative mechanisms that help create the more sustainable world that they envision. However, they show features of SE in that each movement invests their efforts under different legal bases: Zeitgeist Netherlands and MasterPeace are foundations, while GIAWH constituted a one-person corporation (Ltd). These organizational bases make them stronger than mere activist groups (Mair and Martí 2006); therefore, I identified them as *social entrepreneurial movements*. A final reason to select them entails their holistic worldviews. Rather than catering to one particular cause, such as the provision of free meals and the construction of homes for the handicapped, (as presented in existing case studies, see Alter 2002; Bornstein 2004) these movements share the intention of changing the general

orientation of humankind, or rather, to create radically new worldviews and engage in world-making to create new 'spaces' for living, thinking and interacting.

These movements have been analysed in the light of 'social entrepreneuring', defined as 'efforts to bring about new economic, social, institutional, and cultural environments through the actions of an individual or groups of individuals'. These innovations can entail new possibilities, new institutions or new ideas (Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen 2009, 477–478). While Sarasvathy (2012) suggests that the entrepreneurial methodology is needed to study processes of world-making, I follow the line of thought presented in the *Handbook of Research Methods on Social Entrepreneurship* (Seymour 2012, xiii) that no new theories or methodologies are needed. I demonstrate that the abductive approach used in CDA offers both enough flexibility to study dynamic processes and worlds in the making, and enough structure to reach scientific conclusions. I provide and apply an example of such a method, thus producing a thorough analysis of these three movements. I situate these movements in the social context of the entrepreneurization of Dutch society, the need for a moral economy to address the current financial and ecological crises (Sayer 2014), and the urge for rethinking humanity in terms of a dialectic 'web of life' (Harvey 2000). Within this context, I strongly suggest that these movements have the potential to play an important role in the emancipation of democratic citizenship and the emancipation and survival of humans and nature, thus representing what Harvey (2000) called 'spaces of hope'. It is for these reasons that I claim that these movements deserve academic attention. In performing this study, I addressed the following research questions:

How can a new methodology be developed that allows for the analysis of social movements in the light of SE as emancipation and world-making?

What are, in these cases, particular moments in the transition from formulating world views to engaging in world-making?

Social entrepreneurship as a potential for social change and emancipation: a review of literature

SE was broadly defined by Mair and Martí (2006, 37) as 'a process involving the innovative use and combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyze social change and/or address social needs'. Much work has been done on describing and rethinking SE in terms of processes of social entrepreneurship, on the individual entrepreneurs or about social enterprises – the outcome of specific initiatives (see Mair and Martí 2006 and Short, Moss, and Lumpkin 2009 for overviews). However, much of the existing mainstream literature was criticized because 'the social in SE is too weak, and the entrepreneurship (…) too managerialized' (Hjorth 2013, 35). The potential for social change through entrepreneurship is being addressed in at least three different but related directions. In general terms, there is a (fast) growing bulk of literature that mostly sets itself apart from the mainstream entrepreneurship literature and claims the need for a stronger knowledge base to study SE (e.g. Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern 2006; Mair and Martí 2006; Steyaert and Hjorth 2006; Short, Moss, and Lumpkin 2009). Others consider 'world-making capacity' as the very heart of the entrepreneurship phenomenon, and view it as 'fundamentally a process of social change' (Calas, Smircich, and Bourne 2009, 553; Sarasvathy 2012). Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen (2009) were influential in sketching an initial research agenda under the header of 'entrepreneuring as emancipation', which involves creating and amplifying cracks in otherwise stable (and

potentially rigidified) social and economic relationships that impose constraints on agents, thus opening the way for emancipation (479). These authors suggest that there are three core elements in entrepreneurial change efforts, namely: 'Seeking autonomy', 'Authoring' and 'Making declarations'. 'Seeking autonomy' refers to 'breaking free from authority and breaking up conceived constraints' (idem, 479).

Breaking up draws attention to 'striving to imagine and create a better world' (Arasvathy, Dew, Velamuri and Venkataraman, 2003, 155, quoted in Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen 2009). 'Authoring' refers to 'taking ownership over oneself and one's actions'. Having broken free from a given authority, one must become one's own author. 'With this, the entrepreneur must necessarily attend to the variety of relationships, structures, norms, and rules within which an entrepreneurial project is undertaken' (idem, 483). 'Making declarations' refers to 'unambiguous discursive and rhetorical acts regarding the actor's intentions to create change – as an important part of the change creation process' (idem, 485).

While these new directions in SE literature are certainly interesting, they present the problem that no methodology has been developed to analyse or compare them. I therefore design, present and apply a method that allows analysis of these movements in terms of their spatial and temporal orientations, their world views and their attempts at world-making. The model has also been designed to analyse processes of emancipation and world-making. Therefore, the outcome of each stage of the research will be related to the three concepts outlined above: authoring, making declarations and autonomy, and I take the concept of 'breaking up' as a crucial concept to relate their theory to the concept of world-making.

Social relevance of the identified movements

Before describing the theoretical and methodological frameworks, I will now place these movements in their national and socio-political contexts.

The national context: neoliberal rule and entrepreneurialization in the Netherlands

Entrepreneurship is 'hot' in the Netherlands, for several reasons. Dominant neoliberal discourse promotes entrepreneurship in the context of the free market economy and the envisioned participatory society. This perspective implies a shift from citizen rights to individual, entrepreneurial responsibilities and freedoms. While the Netherlands traditionally managed to mix capitalism with socialism through a well-developed welfare state and tripartite counselling between representatives of employers, employees and the government, the hegemony of the neoliberal discourse within the EU has caused the government to radically cut down on public budgets, decrease the welfare state and recently (1 January 2015) to hand over the responsibility for health care and the care of vulnerable citizens to the municipalities while simultaneously cutting their budgets. Secondly, we are seeing a transition in Dutch democracy with interplay between the traditional representative democracy and the emerging participatory democracy recently coined as the 'Montessori-Democracy' (Tonkens et al. 2015). The emphasis is on resolving problems through direct action rather than political discussion and deliberation. In addition, there is a tendency for citizens to organize themselves in new bottom-up initiatives that often take the shape of a social entrepreneurship in order to escape the top-down, instrumental control and restrictions of their formal workplace. Critics of current capitalism indicate that a return to entrepreneurship, where the

responsibility for enterprise lies with the entrepreneurs rather than an abstract layer of management, would help integrate multiple – including environmental – values, in the politics and strategies of corporations (Tellegen 2014). Within Dutch society, these movements are relevant in the current political climate of neoliberal austerity policies, its cutbacks on the public sector and the so-called 'Participatory Society'. The Dutch king officially declared the end of the 'welfare state' during his annual speech to the Dutch people in 2013. A pragmacracy (Boutellier 2015) has emerged that introduces neoliberal technocratic rule, while it lacks a moral dimension and ignores the concerns and voice of the people. As Joke Hermsen, a Dutch philosopher states: the current government sees its role as a financial gatekeeper, whereby the realm of politics has been reduced to a budgetary discipline. Initiatives to create new spaces of solidarity are set up in bottom-up initiatives, small-scale neighbourhood initiatives or, indeed, forms of social entrepreneurship, all outside the government's sphere of influence (Hermsen 2014). She refers mostly to groups that distribute food, grow biological food, etc. In this light, the three movements discussed here stand out, in that they create and disseminate new 'myths' as defined as an alternative to the status quo (Laclau and Mouffe 1985). In my view, the three selected movements operate from the desire to create alternative world views, practices and podia that escape the narrow, individualized, economy-oriented frames of the neoliberal era, while creating new podia which can be used by this array of emerging social agents. As opposed to the neoliberal emphasis on entrepreneurialization of the *individual* citizen, they create podia for new forms of *collective* organization through cooperation and co-creation.

The global context: the financial and ecological crises and the volitional period of evolution

The current era of globalization is marked by a financial and ecological crisis that cannot be resolved within capitalism as we know it, since increased growth will further deteriorate the environment. Sayer (2014) suggests a future led by a moral economy, which serves society rather than dominates it. Furthermore, he addresses the need for the majority (99%) of people to reclaim their social, political and economic rights in the light of the current free market economy that shifts too much capital and social and political power to the 1%. Harvey (2000) states that humans, through our accumulated technological and scientific powers, have reached a volitional stage of evolution that provides us with the means either to deliberately destroy the world or to reshape it. He states that humans have become the architects of our future. As such, the question ahead of us is, who do we want to become as a human species and how do we care for other species? Harvey claims that there exists a 'witches' brew' of distinct visions and political arguments with competitive solutions to avoid the end of 'life as we know it' in the light of the ecological crisis. As an alternative to this perspective, Harvey supports the metaphor of human agents being caught in 'a web of life' to reconstruct our life world, which requires a translation of different languages (legal, scientific, managerial, popular, etc.) so that a common language can be construed to imagine and implement new practices away from the current neoliberal hegemony and other forms of authoritarianism. Based on this metaphor, he advocates a solution in which humans take into account their dialectic relations with other species for whom we are also responsible. This vision provides us with agency since humans are in a position to choose new balances and more productive forms of competition in improved harmony with the environment.

The movements presented in this article present a holistic approach to social change as well as innovative podia for creating innovative social relations. It is in this light, and without attributing perfection, that they are worth studying both for their emancipatory potential as well as their potential to represent 'spaces of hope'.

Theoretical and methodological frameworks

In order to fulfil the task ahead, I employ post-structural perspectives on social change as a theoretical and methodological framework (Harvey 1996, 2000). Specifically, I draw on State Theory (Jessop 2002), which claims that capitalism develops in a sequence of various spatio-temporal 'fixes' which are models that are fixed in time and space, such as Fordism, the Keynesian welfare state and the Neoliberal era. Each fix tends to end in a crisis. When a crisis occurs, typically new narratives emerge throughout society, which present (competing) accounts of 'what went wrong in the past' as well as envisioned improvements for the future. My research methodology relies on post-structural approaches to social research, specifically CDA (Fairclough 2003; Reisigl and Wodak 2002, 2009), Discourse Theory (Laclau and Mouffe 1985) and Narrative Analysis (Somers 1994), which are described in greater detail below. Laclau and Mouffe (1985), following Gramsci (1971), developed a theory of hegemony, in which the concepts of 'myth' and 'social imaginaries' play a significant role. They define 'myth' as an alternative to the status quo. A social imaginary exists when a majority of social groups support this myth and/or when it is implemented in social reality (Montesano Montessori 2009, 2011).

The analytical framework

The analysis is performed in five consecutive stages. The first stage consisted of a thematic analysis of the interviews with the three leaders; the second stage consisted on the analysis of the websites of the movements; the third and fourth stages were more interpretive as they analysed the outcome of the first stages through theoretical approaches on narratives (Somers 1994) and on deixis (Chilton 2004). The fifth stage entailed written interviews with participants who had been active during the period of research (2012–2015). I will now explain in more detail the interpretive part of the analysis – the second layer – and the theories it relies on. A detailed account on the collection of data and the first two stages of research will follow below. The narrative analysis used a model developed by Somers (1994), which I have previously applied in my research on the Zapatistas in Mexico (Montesano Montessori 2009, 2011; Montesano Montessori and Morales López 2015) and the Indignados in Spain (Montesano Montessori and Morales López 2015). Somers has designed this model as a new approach to analyse narratives in the social sciences. It is an approach that no longer sees narratives as representing social life, but as powerful instruments to shape social reality (in SE terminology: to shape new world views or to engage in world-making). Somers' model distinguishes between a meta-narrative, an ontological narrative and a public narrative. Meta-narratives refer to the 'master-narratives in which we are embedded' as contemporary actors – 'the epic dramas of our time: Capitalism vs. Communism; The Individual vs. Society' (Somers 1994, 619). Ontological narratives provide 'narrative location', endowing social actors with identities (Idem, 618), and form the basis for action. 'Ontological narratives affect activities, consciousness and beliefs and are in turn, affected by them' (Somers 1994, 618). They contain the basic presuppositions and the vision of the movements related to the status

quo in the present world, and its problems. Ontological narratives are embedded in, and related to public narratives. These are, according to Somers (1994, 619), 'those narratives attached to cultural and institutional formations larger than the single individual'. Public narratives refer to, and consist of, the process of community building and how it is to be achieved (i.e. the main project of each initiative).

The subsequent deictic analysis is based on political theory (Chilton 2004). Deixis refers to the analysis of relational, spatial and temporal references outside the text. A text has a deictic centre – the agent from whose perspective the text is written – and a contextual deixis in terms of social relations, time and space. The analysis of deixis reveals how from the centre, space represents a line from what is considered 'here' to 'there', (for example, the line from 'us' in the West to 'them' in the East). Temporal deixis typically shows a continuum that runs from the past to the present and extends to the future, while the deixis of social relations situates subjects in terms of 'I', 'You' and 'Them' (Chilton 2004). I enriched this model with the post-structural notion of space (Harvey 1996) and time (Adam and Groves 2007). The latter envision social change as a matter of space–time distance. In particular, they move away from a linear approach to time that regards the future as a continuation of the present. They present a perspective on the future as a rupture with the present, visualizing the future as a space in which new knowledge, new ethics and new actions are being projected. Harvey 1996, 2000 sees the concept of 'space' as a less physical form of place, upon which change and hopes can be projected. I inserted these categories in the model for deictic analysis (See Table 4). The outcome of each analytical stage will be related to the theoretical concepts of Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen (2009) and to the concepts of 'worldviews' and 'world-making'.

The research procedure

In this section, I will describe the three cases and data collection methods, and present the analytical procedure in detail.

Description of the cases

This section describes the three social entrepreneurial movements in terms of their history, structures and goals, motivation of the leaders and the public attention they received. Their world view will become apparent throughout the analysis.

Zeitgeist (http://thezeitgeistmovement.com) is a global social movement that started in Canada and the U.S.A in 2008. For this study, I interviewed the coordinator of the Dutch chapter (https://www.zeitgeistbeweging.nl). The legal structure of Zeitgeist Netherlands is a foundation, initiated in 2010. The mission statement of Zeitgeist is to move the world away from a scarcity-based economy to a resource-based economy (RBEM) of abundance. Zeitgeist conducts community-based activism and awareness projects. Their envisioned model for the future is the RBEM in interdependence with the resulting moral behaviour via having the individual's needs met (as understood p.e. via Maslow's pyramid). This goal is made visible in a fragment of the movie: Zeitgeist Moving Forward[2] and fully described in a recent book: The Zeitgeist movement defined and the scientific method.[3]

The interviewee was Seth Lievense; at the time of the interview, he was a bachelor student in his third year. He was the national coordinator (until late 2013) and considered it an honour

to perform that function. He shared the ideals of Zeitgeist and wished to contribute as a volunteer. Zeitgeist international is active in 51 countries around the world.

The main goal of GIAWH (http://www.givingisallwehave.com) is to change the world from 'having' as its central value towards one that revolves around 'giving'. Its mission is to 'mobilize the experience of unconditional giving & receiving to reframe our Economy towards the heart' (website, about us). GIAWH was a private company (Ltd) initiated by the director, Jeroen Timmers, in 2011. He quit his job as a strategy consultant for corporations since he did not feel comfortable with the general focus on capital and interest and was discomfited with his own salary. He travelled to Latin America and found that the true nature of life is 'giving' rather than 'having'. This epiphany started GIAWH. On his return, he gave away an expensive ticket to Lowlands, an annual music festival in the Netherlands.[4] This particular event caused so much public enthusiasm, that it became a trigger to set up his one-person corporation centred on giving. Timmers considers 'interest' as one of the constraints since it automatically creates debt and a perpetual need for economic growth and accumulation. A summary of his philosophy can be seen on the website[5] and his blog.[6] During the first review cycle of this article, I found that the movement is on hold and its director has moved to Austria. In personal correspondence, he clarified this was due to a quest for further personal development (see endnote 12 for details). GIAWH has widely spread his ideas in the (inter)national arena. Films of his presentations are collected on his website. In the Netherlands, he entered the media through the main quality newspaper, NRC, Volzin (a magazine of the church) and presentations on television for national public channels. He has presented the giveshop, a shop where you could only give and accept items and services for free (see endnote 14) various times at Lowlands music festival and elsewhere.

MasterPeace, (www.masterpeace.org), presents its goal as 'to win the hearts of millions of people for the cause of peace'. Its mission is to inspire citizens to contribute to a more sustainable world with less armed conflict. Its legal structure is a foundation. A nickname for MasterPeace is the 'Just Do It Campaign For Peace'. MasterPeace officially started in 2011 in 14 countries and is now active in 47 countries. Its main slogans are: 'Big changes start with small things', 'The opposite of love is not hate: it is indifference' and 'Creating peace together' (website). It is a bottom-up movement that wishes to unleash human talent and energy. MasterPeace seeks to activate and to mobilize people around the world to undertake peace initiatives in their neighbourhood through art and concerts or through conflict mediation. The director, Ilco van der Linde, had previously initiated Dance4life, a campaign for a world without AIDS, which started in 2004 and is still active. His aim to set up social movements started with a request from his father, who gave him a hundred guilders to make liberation day locally attractive for youngsters. Van der Linde organized a pop concert that attracted many young people. He now has over 30 years' experience of organizing concerts and events for peace and human rights. An online video summarizes his philosophy.[7] MasterPeace now has 65 clubs in 47 countries, with 610 initiatives (website, 15 December 2015). The movement received a certificate by Ban Ki-Moon on 18 December 2013, in recognition of its contributions to peace through art and music. The Rockefeller Foundation added both leaders to the list of 'The Top 100 of Next Century's Innovators'. Very recently (2 October 2015), the two founding members won the Luxemburg Peace Prize.

Collection of the data

Research started in early 2012 when the three movements were identified for the reasons explained above. I then invited the leaders of each movement for a face-to-face interview. I interviewed Seth Lievense (then coordinator of the Dutch Chapter of Zeitgeist) at VU Amsterdam (3 February 2012). It lasted one hour. I interviewed Jeroen Timmers (initiator and director of GIAWH at VU Amsterdam (15 March 2012, 46 min). I then interviewed Ilco van der Linde, the founder of MasterPeace, in the Lloyd hotel in Amsterdam (7 June 2012, 50 min). The interviews were semi-structured in that I sent the same set of topics and questions to each of the participants prior to the interview and invited them to address these topics during the interview, while I used the format as a checklist. These topics included: (1) the goals and orientation of the movement; (2) internal and external leadership; (3) communication and decision-making; and (4) integration of new members and how to stimulate activism. These categories were based on the literature on structures of social movements, McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald (1996) and Touraine (1985). I fully transcribed each interview, annotating the recorded times. Between January 2012 and December 2015, I followed the blogs and newsletters of these movements, as well as their websites. In the summer of 2015, I performed three written interviews per movement with people who had been active in these movements since at least January 2012.[8] The purpose was to check if these activists shared the same notions as the leaders and what their experiences were. Therefore, I asked them the exact same questions as the initial interviewees in terms of both their knowledge about and their experience with these very topics. In the case of GIAWH – which had ceased to exist in late 2014 – I asked participants for their opinion about the decision of the founder to stop with the initiative. I performed the same analysis as for the initial interviews. The results are inserted in this article through vignettes and endnotes.

Performance of the data analysis

Following the abductive[9] approach of CDA, I engaged in a layered research process, in which I combined the analysis of empirical data with theoretical perspectives and social context.

   The first layer of analysis was a basic content analysis, in which I used the transcribed interviews to schematically write down the answers that each of the leaders provided for each topic (see Table 1). The second step included an analysis of the three websites in terms of goals and orientation and the temporal and spatial and social relational frames of the worldviews (Table 2). The next layer was more interpretive in that I used theoretical frameworks to perform a narrative analysis based on a model developed by Somers (1994, see Table 3), while a deictic analysis focused on the spatial, temporal and relational orientations of the movements based on Chilton (2004, see Table 4), as will be further explained below.

   In this section, I provide the main results of the initial interviews, especially the topics of: (1) the goals and orientation of the movement; (2) internal and external leadership; and (3) integration of new members and how to stimulate activism. For reasons of space, I eliminate communication – the third topic of the interviews – since it was generally centred around the Internet, emergent processes of communication, decision-taking and trust.

Goals and orientations of the movements

For Zeitgeist, the goal is to create consciousness and awareness, so that new actions emerge, out of which a new mentality will emerge. The desired change is to move away from outdated paradigms that maintain an unjust financial economy that creates scarcity towards an economy based on abundance facilitated by modern technology and science, the so-called natural law/resource-based economy or RBE.

> Our current society is based on outdated technology and outdated paradigms. It is good to see electric cars, but this was possible already 30 years ago. People in power attempt to withhold change, because they gain by an economy based on scarcity. (…) We can create abundance through the use of solar energy. We can create hydrogardens in offices, which makes food locally available to everybody. Money is a symbol of scarcity. It will become redundant in the resource based economy. (Lievense, 5:45–7:45)

The Internet allows decentralization of power: 'modern technology allows decentralization. You are no longer dependent on power structures that resist change. Many of these ideas and possibilities bring us to our goal: the shift towards a RBE of abundance' (4:44–5:38).

GIAWH wishes to change the world from one that is centred on 'possession' to one that is centred on 'giving'. Timmers states that

> all our systems are based on the consciousness of a particular time. Systems are material, consciousness is non-material. This implies that all systems are slower than our consciousness. So if we look at current structures, we look into the past. While our consciousness jumps ahead. Our consciousness now tells us: property does not bring us a happier future. In fact, all crises of today are crises of property. (Timmers, 1:30–2:45)

We need to change from an old paradigm that is centred around reason, control and property to one that is centred around the heart and giving and letting go.

> We need to step out of the traditional frame of rationality that is based on ratio, control, security and having, towards a new frame of freedom, the heart, or 'giving', as our natural drive. (…) We need to articulate, emphasize and disseminate a new vision on growth: immaterial growth of consciousness is always possible. Material growth is reduced, scarce, and relies on an old consciousness based on the Descartian dualism. It blocks growth of consciousness (39:00–41:10).

The goal of MasterPeace is to mobilize millions of people so that they want to become active for the sake of peace.

> We asked a research office to investigate in ten countries how well-known the UN peace week was. It turned out that less than 6% of the population knew about it. Then you can do two things: either you abolish it, or you make it loved. And that is what we want: to make that day an incentive for many beautiful initiatives (Van der Linde, 18:33–18:58).

The wrongs they want to address are the erroneous priorities of our current society where more money is invested in weapons and conflict than in human development:

> Actually, it is too absurd to be true that each year, again, all governments in the world together spend more on buying new weapons. Last year the expenses were 411 billion dollars. And that is enough to feed and educate people and to resolve the problems in Greece. So there is no financial crisis at all – there is a problem to do with priorities. (3:40–4:20)

Internal and external leadership

The interviewee of Zeitgeist stated that he is a coordinator rather than a leader. He will hold his position as long as he wants to do it and others trust him to do it.

During this research we should let go of the term "leader". I am a coordinator. That is not just a difference in words. I facilitate the work of volunteers. I have no formal power. (…) We are now going to improve the website so that people in the regions can find each other. If I have all the information, I have more knowledge than others. That will give me power. But this new website will make the role of coordinator redundant. (19:58–22:00)

> Resp. 1 TZM: TZM is a leaderless movement. There are coordinators and members. The reason is that the general plan needs to be achieved. This philosophy is central to TZM: not to any person.
> Resp. 3 TZM: We arrange among ourselves who does what: the person with most experience and skills will take the lead. People learn from each other and rotate roles.

When asked about the strategy, Lievense said: 'We do not really have a strategy: it is what everybody does. We bring initiatives together' (19:58–20:15). He explained that activists work in teams, for instance, the translation team which translates material from the global movement or the education team which teaches about the philosophy of Zeitgeist. Specific instruments to create change are hydrogardens in offices, which make global transport redundant: people can become self-sufficient. But Lievense also mentioned a person who rented out his garage and used the money to buy an iPad for a young boy who was paralysed. Using the iPad, the boy could express himself and be in touch with the world again (22:57–24:00).

In the case of GIAWH, the founder was on his own. From this position, he organized various initiatives and in the process, he gathered ambassadors around him who shared his ideals. In this context, he sees leadership as a matter of staying close to himself:

> To me, leadership means that I remain close to myself and distant to the expectations of today's paradigm. Because that implies that I need a mortgage and I must earn money. This is what I need to let go of. That, to me is leadership: keeping close to myself and letting go of expectations based on old paradigms. (Timmers, 29:20–30:50)

His main strategy is 'to start initiatives and people organically sense the same and have the same intuition and they also spread the message and bring the mechanism of giving into life' (Timmers: 28:36–29:10). The main envisioned mechanism is 'to make traditional companies give goods and services to social enterprises. And it is not to do with money. It can be space, knowledge, or providing a professional from HR who wishes to use her talents in a different company'. Timmers, (12:00–12:40). 'And in Lowlands 2012 I hope to make sure that 55,000 people start to give. This fits in with the general trend towards a share-economy: look at Wikipedia and Couch surfing' (35:05–35:50).

> Resp.1 GIAWH: Jeroen trusted me and let me be free. I did the same, so people enjoyed autonomy. People were intrinsically motivated.

The founder of MasterPeace, Van der Linde, made his friend Mohammed Helmy in Cairo the director of MasterPeace, and asked him to start an office there. Van der Linde did not want to create another Western concept and spread it around the world; he wanted to create a bridge between the East and the West. Also, he wanted to make the masses and grassroots the leaders of MasterPeace: 'Power is in the streets. Every moment of social transformation is the result of the mobilization of civil society' (24:52–24:56). His own role is that of inspiring, communicating, messaging and finance (23:22–23:52).

As a leader, I want to let go of control. I want to let myself be surprised by the grassroots. I allow others to unleash their talents and creativity and that way I get 10x more than if I would control their contributions. People can start clubs and once we trust them, they become owners of MasterPeace. We expect from them that they 'walk their talk'. (34:11–34:27)

The main strategy is to invite people around the world to start clubs. The main mechanisms are massive concerts, the envisioned concert in Cairo during the Peace Week of 2014. He also maintains contact with people from business and the cultural industry:

After each presentation I say: 'I don't need an applause. Just give me your business card and we set up a product'. Now I have 70 founding partners, who agreed to pay me 75,000 euros per year until 2015, which covers my basic expenses. (32:08–33:00)

> Resp. 1 MP: MP asks everybody to be a leader in their own area, by creating a club. MP wants to stimulate leadership among young people who have the potential to make a difference.
> Resp. 3: MP is more a social enterprise. It aims to create shareholders for peace with existing companies

From slactivism to activism

The terminology comes from MasterPeace, but the issue is: How do you activate the grassroots?

Zeitgeist has yearly meetings – Z-day – the next one was to be held a week after the interview, 10 February 2012. On that day, they would launch a new version of their website, which promised to be more interactive so that people could find each other and join groups in their own area. In terms of the accommodation of new members, Zeitgeist organizes introduction days. People can join existing teams or start new ones. Zeitgeist maintains one principle: activists should be proactive and generate their own activity and fundraising if necessary.

> Resp. 2 ZG: ZG wants us to become active agents, that we learn about the philosophy of ZG and then make our own, personal decisions as to how to contribute to the general idea.

GIAWH did not have a system at the time of the interview. People would follow him on the Internet or join him after activities that he organized.

An organization is growing around me with people who share the same intention. I create a lot of ambassadors around me who help me and who spread their own personal messages. It is a very organic, emerging process. (28:36–29:15)

Last week, I was invited by Princess Irene (the sister of former Dutch Queen Beatrix, NMM) to participate in a round table discussion on the future of our society. Somehow something resonates: people are aligned and then I recognize that we have the same drive. (34:22–35:00)

> Resp.1 GIAWH: The main mechanism was the giveshop: There we invited people to give their talents or goods and people became involved. Resp 2 GIAWH: media and blogging, Lowlands, giveshops, events around Europe.

MasterPeace aims at creating a 'tunnel of engagement: from slactivism to activism. This implies going from "being liked" to activism' (19:38–20:00). He describes Kenya as an example where Kofi Annan operated as mediator in 2007, got global support from the media and public opinion, which in turn helped end violence.

> To me, this was a turning point. I understood what collective action – the sum of many individuals – can reach. Therefore we need to create a movement that can jump into conflict areas to attempt to stimulate dialogue and to avoid escalations. (30:10–31:00)

MasterPeace has a manual[10] which explains the main principles for a club to function. In addition, people can get assistance from a specialized team in Cairo and are invited to start clubs for grass-roots activities around the world. At the time of the interview, there were 19 clubs in 22 countries. For Van der Linde, it is a matter of redefining the question:

> You need to create interesting perspectives, a good brand, to become active, organize good campaigns, (…) develop a lot of local leadership and entrepreneurship and integrate that in the concepts you develop. (…) Internet is normally used for friendships. But the medium has a huge potential to connect people around the world across religious and other boundaries, to connect people in a different way. (5:40–6:49)

Resp1 MP: activism is encouraged in three stages: (1) To support and empower new leaders; (2) to encourage companies to invest in social initiatives and organizations through a business matchmaking program; and (3) by starting more clubs around the world.

Table 1. Summary analysis: original interviews with the leaders of the movement.

	Zeitgeist NL	GIAWH	MasterPeace
Goals and orientations	From consciousness raising to a new awareness and new actions	Turning the world from one that is centred on 'possession' to one that is centred around giving	To become the most heart-warming peace movement To create the 'just do it' campaign for peace To make the annual UN Peace Day more widely known
Desired change	From an outdated paradigm of a scarcity-based financial economy towards an economy of abundance based on technology and science.	From a world that is based around ratio to a world that is centred around the heart	From priorities that emphasize arms and conflict to an open atmosphere of peace From indifference to engagement
Strategies	Chapters, teams	Public performance at universities, on television and in magazines	Clubs
Mechanisms	Education; creating consciousness and awareness; technological initiatives, such as creating hydrofarms in empty offices	Getting traditional companies to give to social enterprises	Concerts
Leadership and power	Coordinator rather than leader Decentralization of power Absence of formal power Power positions based on mutual trust Leadership as a matter of organic growth	Remaining true to oneself To remain close to personal beliefs and distant to the expectations of the current paradigm	Shared leadership Headquarters in Cairo Relationship with advisory board based on confidence The leader wants to be surprised by the grassroots To unleash talents of young leaders Power has to come from the masses Contacts with business and cultural industry

Integration of new members	Introduction
	Days
	The yearly Z
	  Day
	  Invitation to participate in a team or to start a new one
	
	Activists should be pro-active and generate (and finance) their own initiatives
		Resonance: people start to help in their own way
		
		Organizing activities
			Manual for new
			
			Clubs
			
			Grassroots organize their own clubs and become the owners of their initiatives
			The creation of a tunnel of engagement

This thematic content analysis brings to light that the three leaders coincide in their diagnoses that current society hinges on outdated models and priorities, which artificially block potential solutions to the many crises and injustices we face today. Their suggested solutions, an economy of abundance, and an emphasis on giving and peace, respectively represent the change they want to make. This seems to be the nucleus of their 'declarations' in Rindova's sense. It is to be noted that to them the 'constraint' is not one particular blockage, but an outdated worldview and outdated power relations. Their proposed solutions, then, represent their dreams, and also form the basis for 'breaking up' these constraints, or for making change. In terms of leadership – authoring – Zeitgeist and MasterPeace aim at transferring leadership to grassroots, while Timmers (GIAWH) sees leadership as a matter of remaining close to his own values. All three state that solutions will have to be created beyond existing structures. This, by itself, is a statement made by academics such as Harvey (1996) and Sayer (2014), as stated above.

Analysis of the websites

The analysis of the websites was performed throughout the whole period of research[11], but all links were uploaded or checked on 5 October 2015. The movements present themselves and their goals as follows:

Zeitgeist Netherlands (www.zeitgeistbeweging.nl) is a foundation. In its slider (homepage), it represents itself as a non-profit organization which introduces a new economic model that focuses on efficiency and sustainability for the well-being of the world community. All natural resources are considered unconditional gifts to the world community. The desired RBE will give the entire world population access to health, and it will bring war and poverty to an end. It calls on people to 'be the change that you wish to see in the world'.

GIAWH (www.givingisallwehave.com) was a one-person corporation. It 'mobilizes the experience of unconditional giving & receiving to reframe our Economy towards the heart'. It formally stopped in December 2014, but is dormant.[12]

MasterPeace (www.masterpeace.org) is a foundation, and presents itself as 'the most heartwarming peace campaign'. Its passion statements are: Music above Fighting, Dialogue above Judgement, Bread above Bombs and Creation above Destruction. It helps lead the way to a more sustainable world with fewer conflicts. Its target is to mobilize at least 400,000 new peace builders by 2020. Peace building is considered a *verb*. Therefore, it launches the 'just *do* it campaign' (my italics) for peace. It aims at togetherness across identity, colour, religion or walk of life.

In terms of space, Zeitgeist considers the Earth as a planet of resources that need to be distributed more efficiently. It is not that people do not have access to the resources per se, but they lack access to the means of getting it (capital). Zeitgeist started in the U.S. and Canada and has chapters in 51 countries. This video[13] contains an overview of the RBEM. The spatial orientation of GIAWH is a world centred on giving, made possible through the giveshop[14] (initiated at Lowlands 2012). As for MasterPeace, they consider their website a peace platform 2.0, which links members who created an account to grassroots around the world. There are clubs in 47 countries. Since 2014, some countries have private sites, such as Mexico, Netherlands and Nepal. The website shows how concerts were held by people

belonging to communities in conflict, such as from North and South Sudan, Israel and Palestine.[15]

In terms of time, the website of Zeitgeist has a Google calendar with announcements of all its meetings. There was no specific timepath.[16] In its worldview, wrongs are situated in outdated structures from the past and the future is dominated by the RBEM of abundance. GIAWH functioned from 2011 to late 2014. It also did not have an exact timeline: it proclaimed 'change as we are speaking'. It situates wrongs in outdated structures based on rational thinking and envisions a future centred on giving, inspired by the heart. MasterPeace lists a series of key performance indicators in its strategic plan for 2014–2020.[17]

Zeitgeists social relations are arranged through (annual) meetings, Google hangouts and through teams: currently, the media team, the translation team, the IT team, the aquaponics team and the education team in which people work together. For GIAWH, it was through the giveshop and the many ambassadors who supported the movement. For MasterPeace, social relations are maintained through clubs, the recent campaign 'Be a Nelson' and international concerts. Additionally, it maintains social relations with its grassroots through boot

Table 2. Summary of the analysis of the websites.[a]

	Zeitgeist Netherlands (2008–present) www.zeitgeistbeweging.nlwww.thezeitgeistmovement.com	GIAWH (2011–2014) www.givingisallwe-have.com	MasterPeace (2010–present) www.masterpeace.org
Goals and orientation	The promotion of the natural law/resource-based economy (NL/RBE) to resolve current ecological, social and economic problems. (home; slides)	Mobilization of the experience of unconditional giving and receiving to reframe our Economy towards the Heart (our mission)	To reduce conflict around the world and to construct peace To become the world's most heart-warming peace movement (home)
Mission and vision	The movement recognizes that issues such as poverty, corruption, pollution, homelessness, war and starvation appear to be 'symptoms' born out of an outdated social structure. The proposed scientific method should help finding optimized solutions	To move from a rational world to a world that follows the heart :	MasterPeace aims to inspire everyone to use their talent and energy for building peace and togetherness towards a more sustainable world with less armed conflict MasterPeace is the fastest growing grass-roots peace movement in the world, with the ambition to reach out to millions and mobilize at least 400,000 new peace builders by 2020
Place	Zeitgeist sees the Earth as a global planet of resources that need to be distributed more efficiently	A world centred around giving; Lowlands Festival	The website is a peace platform 2.0 which connects grassroots around the world
Time	No specific time path	No specific time path	Strategic plan 2014– 2020 with key performance indicators (endnote xviii)
Social Relations	Teams: translation team, aquaponics team for windowfarms, media team, IT team and education eam	Ambassadors	Clubs, trust, unleash talents and potential of the seven billion inhabitants of this world
		The art of giving and receiving unconditionally	MasterPeaces' main currency is talent
		The giveshop	Partners and Friends (about.masterpeace.org)

[a]I last checked all the links in the table and the article 15 December 2015. See also note 11. In a final review prior to publication, I again checked all links and changed those that had changed on 24 May 2016.

camps and training activities. It also maintains relations with business, sponsors and the UN. It has founding partners (NGOs, a social bank and the peace fund) and business and collaborative partners (among others, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Radio Festival, Movies that Matter and the Lloyd Hotel).[18]

The analysis of the websites makes visible the mission and vision of the movements, their main organizational mechanisms, such as teams (Zeitgeist), the giveshop (GIAWH) and clubs and 'Be a Nelson' (MasterPeace), which correspond to 'authoring' in Rindova's terminology. All websites have additional information through (digital) books, blogs, films and links (considered the realm of 'making declarations'). In the case of MasterPeace, there is also a strategic plan. The spatial scope shows that all movements hold a global worldview. However, GIAWH restricted its activity mostly to the Netherlands, whereas Zeitgeist Netherlands is the Dutch chapter of a global movement. MasterPeace, on the contrary, started in the Netherlands and then went global. A temporal worldview in terms of clear targets is present for MasterPeace, but seemed to be absent for the other two movements.

Findings: radical modification of worldviews as a condition for emancipation

This section presents the results of the interpretive stage of the analysis, which is based on the first two stages of the analysis, and relates the outcome of each stage to the concepts of Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen (2009): making declarations and authoring.

Narrative dimensions

Zeitgeist depicts, in its goals and orientation (Table 1), a *meta-narrative* that analyses the world as situated in an economy of scarcity of resources. The ontological narrative depicts present-day society as the result of old power structures that can now be modified due to the role of technology and science. Powerful groups, considered a symptom of the dominant social–economic system, keep scarcity in place while resisting potential changes towards a sustainable, abundant economy. However, Zeitgeist envisions the world as a place of abundant resources to which all people should have equal access via local, decentralized use of technology providing abundance, which allows the community to shape itself around its personal/communital needs rather than the needs of the elite of the global economy.

These narrative dimensions relate to Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen's (2009) concept of 'making declarations', through which they formulate their worldviews. Zeitgeist's public narrative purports that it is necessary to engage in a process of consciousness-raising so that a new mentality will emerge, which in turn will lead to new actions in the direction of the desired resource-based world order. It corresponds to Rindova's concept of 'authoring' and lays the basis for world-making.

GIAWH presents a meta-narrative of a world that is stuck in old rationalist paradigms, (e.g. dichotomous divisions, such as mind vs. body), and oriented towards possession, accumulation and control. The ontological narrative purports that 'the present-day world' is hindered by this materialist paradigm. It is the mind that wishes to control. Consciousness is immaterial and changes more slowly, but it is in movement now. Again, the meta-narrative and the ontological narrative represent 'presenting a worldview through making declarations'. The public narrative is to reach corporations and to get them to give money, knowledge and other means to encourage social enterprise. Timmers advocates a world centred around the

Table 3. Summary results: narrative analysis (Somers 1994).

Analytical categories, their definitions and data sources	Zeitgeist	GIAWH	MasterPeace
Meta-narrative Source: Goals and orientations found in analyses of initial interviews and websites Mission and vision of websites	The current world is trapped in a financial economy of scarcity, artificially sustained by outdated power structures	The current world is stuck in rationalism that emphasizes accumulation and control of possessions. All current crises are to do with possession	The current world is characterized by conflicts that endanger the potential for peace and predominantly open up the possibility of war
Ontological narrative	Scarcity is maintained by outdated power structures that can now be changed through the decentralizing power of the Internet and modern technology	The world is hindered by this paradigm: the mind wants to control and to accumulate but the essence of life is actually about giving	Conflicts are the result of erroneous priorities and current solutions are overly concentrated in the hands of experts
Source: Goals and orientation initial interviews and mission and vision of websites	The problem of the current world is not that there is a lack of goods, but the means to have access to these resources: capital		
Public narrative	Consciousness-raising and activation of millions of people around the world to take action to enhance the desired resource-based economy	To reach corporations seen as a role model in modern society and to get them to give to social corporations	Create a tunnel of engagement: to break indifference and create involvement
Source: answer to the question in initial interviews: What are your main goals?	Establishment of the RBE economy	An economy without interest, where the purchaser defines the value of the product obtained	Create a movement where many individuals come together so that it can interrupt conflicts, enhance dialogue and avoid escalation of conflicts

heart rather than the mind and an economy focused on sharing, which abandons the concept of 'interest'. This corresponds to 'authoring' and lays the basis for world-making.

MasterPeace depicts a meta-narrative that describes the current world as characterized by conflicts that endanger the potential for peace and open up the possibility of war. The ontological narrative is that conflicts are the result of erroneous priorities which need to be modified. These two dimensions represent the 'declarations'. The public narrative involves the aim of the movement, which is to make the Peace Week of the UN more generally known, as well as the organization of major projects such as global peace concerts, the 'Be a Nelson' campaign and supportive activities by, for instance, corporations. During the UN International Day of Peace in 2014, the movement organized a global wave of MasterPeace concerts in around 50 countries in Asia, the Middle East, U.S. and Europe[19] (www.masterpeace.org, consulted on 29 May 2015). It again corresponds to Rindova's concept of 'authoring' and lays the basis for world-making.

This part of the analysis demonstrates that each narrative entails an account of what went wrong in the past and what is wrong in the present, which reminds us of the narratives as described by Jessop (2002). The problems are stated in both the meta-narrative and in the ontological narrative. The meta-narrative presents the constraints of the current world system, while the ontological narrative in all cases – albeit presented in different terms – presents the need for a paradigm shift, for a radical new vision of the dominant worldviews: from

scarcity to abundance, from rationality to the heart and from conflict and war to peace. This analysis allows us to relate the meta-narrative and the ontological narratives to the concept of 'making declarations' in SE literature on emancipation and 'worldviews', while the public narratives relate to 'authoring' (Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen 2009) and to the concept of world-making (Sarasvathy 2012). Interestingly, it shows that in these cases, the ontological narrative is the key condition to social change. A radically different ontology – or perception of this world – is required for social change to happen. Their movements aim at breaking up outdated visions of the world and create the mechanisms and new relationships necessary to start a process of world-making: the domain of their public narratives.

Temporal, spatial and relational deixis

Zeitgeist presents a timeframe that contains models from the past that are outdated but resilient in the present. It depicts a future dominated by the positive sides of knowledge, the arts, science and technology, which make both money and labour redundant. This envisioned world will be run through arguments and action. Its main ethics is to do with sustainability and making resources publicly available. The past, this 'economy of scarcity', is situated in places, in countries such as Canada and Japan. It is directed by hierarchical power in a top-down structure. The future or the RBE of abundance is global, facilitated through the Internet and characterized by the decentralization of power. Social relations will be horizontal rather than vertical and are shaped through chapters. This new space is, in part, made possible through the technical re-contextualization of traditional places such as offices, that will become gardens and hot-houses for products that no longer need to be imported. In the case of GIAWH, the temporal frame runs from the past as the realm of systems to the present that remains fixed in this old paradigm and is hindered by it. It is heading towards a future that will be centred around the heart and focuses on 'giving'. Physical space is focused on the world at large, but the giveshops are the places where the new ideas are put into practice. The future represents a rupture with the present. Its knowledge base is this new consciousness, and it is essential to listen to our true self. The desired action is giving and embracing positivity. These actions will be ethically inspired and engaged. The past is situated in traditional places that embrace systems, while the future includes space as the realm of a new consciousness in an immaterial world. Social relations are set around the principle of giving and receiving unconditionally.

In terms of social relations, MasterPeace encourages bottom-up initiatives and seeks to empower people to unleash their talents and creativity in processes of co-creation, 'authoring' in Rindova's sense. The present is dominated by erroneous priorities. The future is envisioned as a time in which millions of people will actively contribute to peace. The knowledge base is intuition and truth-finding, along with the work of authors such as Paolo Coelho. Actions entail music, arts and dialogue as part of peace building. Ethics will be 'walk your talk', trust and living up to peace. MasterPeace is certainly rooted in traditional places and cities. Their headquarters are in Cairo, which is meant to create a bridge between the East and the West. Projections in space consist of building a tunnel of engagement, based on connections of the hearts. See Table 4.

Conclusion: the deictic analysis reveals a regular pattern in that these movements see that wrongs in the past and present are due to outdated power structures and worldviews, earlier analysed as public narratives and see the future in terms of knowledge base, ethics

Table 4. Overview of results of relational, spatial and temporal deixis (Chilton 2004).

	Zeitgeist	GIAWH	MasterPeace
Social Relations *Source:* Initial interviews (communication and integration of new members) Website: Social relations	With grassroots, coordinators and people from all ranks of society Empowerment of volunteers and transfer responsibilities	Ambassadors, talking to many people, convincing traditional enterprise to donate to social enterprise	Co-leaders Volunteers Businesspeople and friends from cultural industry UN Co-creation, unleashing energy Pyramids in Egypt Hiroshima
Place *Sources:* Initial interviews: (goals and orientation)	A global planet Economy of scarcity	Material world (systems) Companies	
Websites: place	Hierarchical power (Lack of) office space for TZM	Broadcasting Universities Lowlands The website GIAWH; the giveshop	Kenya, conflict areas and Lloyd hotel Offices in Amsterdam, Cairo and Istanbul. Peace platform 2.0
Space	The RB economy that distributes resources, considered a gift to humanity Decentralized power relations	The realm of a new consciousness directed by the heart and focused on giving A share economy	A world with more peace and less conflict Human involvement rather than indifference
Sources: Initial interviews: Goals and orientations Leadership Website: Goals, mission and vision; place			
Past Interviews: Goals and orientation Strategy	Take a step back in history: and see how change (electric cars) was boycotted	The realm of systems	Using Kenya (2007) as an example for mediation.
Present Interviews: Goals and orientations Website: mission and vision	Current society hinges on old paradigms and power structures.	Old paradigm based on possession and control and the mind above the heart, theory above practice; the realm of a birth of a new consciousness.	Erroneous priorities: too much money is spent on the arms industry.
Future Interviews: Goals and orientation Websites: mission and vision.	Resource-based economy	A world that makes 'giving' a central feature Social enterprises, (in the future, no difference between profit or non-profit)	Millions of people are actively contributing to Peace Points at the horizon Strategic plan 2014–2020

(continued)

Table 4. (*Continued*).

	Zeitgeist	GIAWH	MasterPeace
Knowledge	Consciousness through a critical attitude Innovation through in-depth awareness Technology Social science	Consciousness Listening to the (true) self, it is in the genes Increased awareness	Paolo Coelho, the alchemist Knowledge of numbers (how much capital is spent on arms trade) and history (the example of Kenya)
Based on initial interviews (various moments) Mission and vision and related documents	Empirical, scientific method Arguments		
Action	Arguments and action	Embracing positivity, giving things to others	A pilgrimage to Cairo Activities in 22 (initial interview)/now 45 countries (website)
Sources: Interviews (leadership, strategy)			
Ethics	Sustainability: abundance rather than scarcity	Giving and receiving unconditionally Being true to yourself	Values, peace, music and dance rather than war and conflict, trust, involvement and perseverance Walk your talk Confidence and trust (rather than control)
Sources: Initial interviews Goals and orientation Leadership Websites: Goals and orientation			

and actions. In terms of space, they make use of formal places as we know them, such as offices, but project their ideas in future spaces that still have to come about: a RBEM, a share economy and a peaceful world. Each of them has introduced mechanisms in our present world in their various attempts of world-making. The post-structural take on the future demonstrates that their worldviews, indeed, imply rupture with the present. In relation to Rindova's theory, it now becomes visible that the aspect of 'making declarations' has a time-line that runs from past to present to future. Their ways of 'authoring' play out at the level of social relations. They hinge between concrete places and spaces on which they project their dreams. So far, the analysis indicates that 'public narratives', 'future' and 'space' mark significant dimensions in the process of world-making.

Autonomy, world-making and emancipation

The three movements described in this study, each have a legal structure through which they are given power to legally act and interfere with society. It gives them both autonomy and a place for making declarations and authoring their mission in terms of Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen (2009). These movements formulated new worldviews and made statements about the inefficiency of the current hegemonic worldviews. In this sense, they formulated narratives as described by Jessop (2002), giving accounts as to what went wrong and calling for social change in times of crisis. But they did more: apart from formulating alternatives for the current society (myth in the sense of Laclau and Mouffe 1985), they brought into being innovative social practices, created innovative social relations and mobilized activists and supporters. In SE terms, they did not just present innovative world views; they initiated processes of world-making. If we look at this through the lens of transition theory, it can be argued that these movements enjoy innovative power (Avelino and Rotmans 2009). These authors distinguish between *regimes*, the most dominant configuration of actors, structures and practices which defend the status quo; *landscapes,* which refer to the surroundings of a particular societal social system; and *niches,* which are part of the societal system, but are able to create autonomous space in which non-conformism and innovation can develop. In this article, I argued that global capitalism and neoliberalism represent the *landscape* (implic-itly present in the meta-narratives of the movements), which surrounds a *regime* made of a budget-oriented Dutch Government that stimulates individual entrepreneurship as part of an attempt to break down the public sector. I believe that these movements represent *niches* in that they created autonomous space, mobilized people and initiated global action.

I suggest that 'niches' hinge between the discourse theoretical concepts of myth (formu-lating an alternative) and 'social imaginaries', which implies broad support from other move-ments and sections of society or implementation in a new system – Montesano Montessori 2009, 2011). I suggest that these movements definitely show the characteristics of a niche, but are still in the pre-development stage; they do not (yet) have an impact on the current system. The analysis has indicated that their innovative world views for the future are situated in the domains of 'public narratives', 'future', 'space' and 'myth'. I strongly suggest that these domains represent essential moments in the process of moving from worldview to world-making. These are the domains where imaginations can formulate, share and exper-iment. After all, their worldviews represent (radical) rupture with the current status quo: transition space is needed to start imagining and shaping new worldviews. I furthermore suggest that it is productive to take into account transition theory. The concept of 'niche'

seems to me to be a highly significant concept in relation to a process of 'breaking up'. In fact, Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen (2009) make this point where they argue that 'entrepreneuring involves creating and amplifying cracks in otherwise stable (and potentially rigidified) social and economic relationships' (481). The advantage of relating this idea to transition theory is that it allows for research about the dynamics between niches, structures and landscapes. In other words, it allows for an analysis on structure and agency and how these mutually influence each other in times of social transition. The need for a model which involves studying structuration has been raised in SE literature (Mair and Martí 2006).

Results of the analysis

The purpose of this paper was to emphasize the 'social' in existing approaches to SE, by broadening the existing perspective on SE from organizations in the direction of social entrepreneurial movements, with a focus on emancipation and world-making. A research design was created, explained and executed to analyse three social entrepreneurial movements and to trace their processes from formulating world views to world-making. In terms of SE as emancipation, it has demonstrated that the aspect of 'making declarations' can be fruitfully enriched with a timeline and the narrative distinctions of 'public narratives', 'meta-narratives' and 'ontological narratives'. In these cases, authoring was mostly present in the 'public narratives', while making declarations belonged to the realms of the meta-narratives and the ontological narratives. In fact, the ontological narratives turned out to be crucial since for each of these movements, a radical change of existing, dominant worldviews is a precondition for social change. As for world-making, the analysis has shown that 'public narratives', 'space', 'future' and 'myth' are dimensions in the process of world-making. I suggested taking on board transition theory, with its dynamic concepts of niches, landscapes and regimes.

The designed methodology indicated that these three social entrepreneurial movements are hybrid in form, but represent regular patterns in their ontological narratives, the creation of innovative mechanisms and social relations as an initial attempt at world-making. Each of them problematized power and sought ways of distributing power and relating their new practices to ethics. This methodology was based on existing research paradigms, the abductive approach in CDA. It allowed to fully answer the two research questions – the creation of a new methodology to analyse social entrepreneurial movements in the light of both emancipation and world-making, and the identification of particular moments in the transition from formulating world views to engaging in world-making.

Revisiting the movements

What did the analysis reveal about these movements? We have seen that they correspond in formulating the need for radically new world views, a shift in power relations and a preference for personal approaches initiated by the grassroots and inspired by the heart and personal inspiration. The interviews with the activists in 2015 revealed that the participants in the movements had the same knowledge about features such as goals, leadership and integration of members as the leaders. In providing an account on their experiences, they elaborated examples and insights related to recent history. They provided an overview of these years. They indicated that some intended mechanisms had changed. For instance, the

intended concert in Cairo was replaced by a global wave of concerts in the case of MasterPeace (Resp. 3). GIAWH had not succeeded in getting traditional entrepreneurs to give to social entrepreneurs. Instead, the giveshop had emerged.

When looking at the question on how to create broad support, it is evident that MasterPeace is the most successful in this field. This movement is extremely skilful in packaging its message and making it both attractive and relatively easy for grassroots and business to engage. The participants of both Zeitgeist and GIAWH indicated that the movements had a strong and active nucleus, many interested people around them, but only a few became really engaged. I believe that Zeitgeist needs to find ways to reformulate – perhaps in pictures rather than in text – their sophisticated intellectual message. In this sense, they can learn from the other two movements. GIAWH was the least mature – the youngest movement and the initiative of one person. The question is why this movement did not succeed getting entrepreneurs to give, whereas MasterPeace manages to receive support from corporations.[20] A final observation is to do with the autonomy of the three movements, which is both their strength and their weakness. I would suggest that they seek ways to cooperate with existing political parties and institutions such as the UN and NGOs to create platforms for positive policies and actions formulated by these entities. Co-creating with formal institutions may give hands and feet to intended – but often stagnated – policies within existing institutions, and it might add to the strength and effectiveness of the movements presented above.

Suggestions for future research

Throughout the article, I argued that these movements deserve academic attention. I make the following suggestions for further research.

In the theoretical field, I suggest that further research is done to check whether transition theory can indeed be fruitfully combined with SE theory.

Methodologically, it would be useful to apply this model to other cases, to test it and to further develop it.

As for the movements, it seems helpful to generate knowledge – or make available existing knowledge – as to how to attract and mobilize a substantive group of supporters and participants.

A final suggestion would be to engage in forms of participatory action research to involve the grassroots and coordinators in the research performed, to investigate ways in which these movements can be more closely connected to existing political and institutional forces, so as to create global forms of co-creation in times of financial and ecological crises.

Conclusions

This research offers a methodology to analyse social entrepreneurial movements in the light of both emancipation and world-making, thus filling a gap in existing literature. I designed a methodology that expands the Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen (2009) approach to SE as emancipation in the direction of world-making. I have been able to do this within existing scientific paradigms as suggested by Seymour (2012). It has introduced three radically new case studies to SE literature: Zeitgeist, GIAWH and MasterPeace, which all started within the last seven years. The analysis was placed in the context of the neoliberal Dutch Government,

the entrepreneuriaization of the Netherlands and the need for new social alternatives to envision a way out of the current financial and ecological crises. I created a post-structural theoretical and methodological framework that reveals common patterns in the structure of the three narratives and differences in their worldviews. By combining the narrative framework of Somers (1994) and the deictic analysis of Chilton (2004), and a post-structural notion of space (Harvey 1996) and time (Adam and Groves 2007), it reveals the key mechanisms of 'Entrepreneuring as emancipation' and key dimensions in the process of world-making. As for emancipation, it indicates that 'making declarations' entails meta-narratives, ontological narratives and temporal categories in which the past and present indicate what is wrong, while the desired change is situated in the future. 'Authoring' mostly takes place in the dimension of social relations. In terms of entrepreneuring as world-making, the analysis has pinpointed 'public relations', 'space', 'future' and 'myth' as dimensions within the realm of world-making. Drawing on transition theory, I have suggested that these movements represent 'niches' and are in pre-developmental stages of making social change. I suggest that 'niches' can be considered as a stage between the discourse theoretical concepts of 'myth' and 'social imaginary'.

Without claiming that these movements are perfect, I do claim that they are acutely relevant in a world of increased dehumanization and technological advances since they hold the promise of creating spaces for hope and human agency in a time when democratic governments are failing to do so. They offer space for citizens around the world to contribute to the kind of civic emancipation that Sayer (2014) calls for and the dialectical utopianism that Harvey (2000) advocates.

Notes

1. I used the work by Somers (1994) in earlier research on the Zapatista movement in Mexico. (Montesano Montessori 2009) and on the *Indignados* in Spain (Montesano Montessori and Morales López 2015).
2. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hKqCq_Knnbo&feature=youtu, uploaded on 14 December 2015.
3. https://www.zeitgeistbeweging.nl/media/boeken/, uploaded on 14 December 2015.
4. http://www.givingisallwehave.com/giving-away-my-ticket-lowlands/, 14 December 2015.
5. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k1XAF9zFEtI, 14 December 2015.
6. http://www.givingisallwehave.com/economic-economy-crisis-consciousness-part-1/.
7. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-07AmGcnAgA, 14 December 2015.
8. For Zeitgeist, RP1 is the current coordinator of the Dutch Chapter (active since 2009, he initiated the Dutch chapter by organizing the international Z day in Amsterdam in 2010); RP2 is the regional coordinator Amsterdam, active since March 2011. RP3 is the regional coordinator of the Dutch province Limburg, and active in Zeitgeist international since 2008. For GIAWH, RP1 was project and team leader, active since November 2011. He ran and managed the giveshop throughout 2012–2014; Rsp 2 met Timmers in Costa Rica and is from Denver, Colorado. He was actively involved since August 2011 and assisted the facilitation of the organizations presence at Lowlands Festival 2011 and 2012 in Holland. R3 did the design and was active since February 2012. For MP, R1 is talent banker and part of the Board of Inspiration (active since November 2011); RP2 is the current CEO; RP3 works at the Dutch national office for communication and IT (active since January 2012).
9. CDA considers abduction as a constant movement between theory, social context, methodology and empirical data (Reisigl and Wodak 2009; Montesano Montessori, 2011).

10. http://api.ning.com/files/0TyPLysMYmYf2Vas60cIIIMf9lLQafmnCEuj8*xVMPN4d7XKqJ7
ryww9TVCHqbEV0pDdvNPmuC9Y9y1BaKeppyBPJMyTcFzr/MasterPeaceClubManual3.
0reduced.pdf consulted 15 December 2015. It was available in 2012.

11. Since January 2012, I have followed these three websites. They are in continuous development. Early 2012, the website of Zeitgeist moved from a Dutch translation of the international website to a simplified site prepared for (potential) activists. GIAWH updated itself as it was going and the exact dates of all the uploads are visible today. Remarkable changes were the movie, available since November 2013 http://www.givingisallwehave.com/blog/ and the interactive giveshop. The final blog that announced the end of the movement dates 2 December 2014. With Masterpeace, new developments were the increase of clubs, moving up from 19 clubs in 22 countries during the initial interview to 65 clubs in 47 countries in September 2015. In 2014, the sponsors started to appear on the website. In 2013, a Dutch website was made (masterpeace.nl) (maintained by Respondent 1). In 2014, the Be a Nelson campaign was started.

12. Jeroen Timmers explained that he finished the movement after they had experimented various times with the giveshop. In general, he felt that the giveshop was the end of a stage in his personal development, rather than a beginning. A leading banker of Goldman Sachs had offered to help him grow the movement. Though Timmers went to London to discuss this, he did not want to follow this path (email 29 July 2015). He is now in the personal transition stage towards GIAWH 2.0, still gives presentations and is open for communication about his developing worldview (jeroentimmers.com). The concept of the giveshop is available for others to be taken over. He features on the documentary Normal is Over (normalisoverthemovie.com) by an award-winning film-maker, which was launched on 23 November 2015, one week before the UN environment talks in Paris.

13. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hKqCq_Knnbo, 14 December. 2015.

14. In 2012, however, the giveshop was created, www.givingisallwehave.com/category/give-shop/, a shop which looked like an ordinary shop but it was a place where you could only give something. In the open space at the end of the interview, this respondent who had been one of the main developers of the concept of the giveshop provided a link to a video https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LabMZ1NyGdA. While certainly magic moments happened in the giveshop, the organizers also noticed that people are more eager to give than to receive unconditionally. Often they do not trust it or they find that they should do something in return (interview with Resp.1, received 29 August 2015).

15. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h6uP_y_LZuk, 24 May 2016.

16. However, ZG respondent 2 stated that the movement had passed through three stages since 2008. The formulation of the message, now completed in *the* Zeitgeist *defined* book; the birth of small projects such as the window farms and the future when big projects will happen

17. http://masterpeace2014.nl/bouwpakket/masterPeace-vision-paper.pdf, 24 May 2016.

18. http://masterpeace2014.nl/business-partners/, 24 May 2016.

19. A respondent of the last round of written interviews stated that the political situation in Egypt was too dangerous. They then attempted Istanbul; this is another magnificent bridge between East and West, but it was politically unsustainable. Then they remembered they were grassroots and facilitated a wave. In every country where an MP Club was active, there was a concert, while Amsterdam served as a 'beating heart where artists from conflict countries created new connections' (email Respondent 3, 28 August 2015). See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h6uP_y_LZuk for the official movie (downloaded on September 16, 2015 and link adapted on 24 May 2016).

20. R3MP said that raising support from business is not easy. But often managers understand that they need a sustainable world to do business. Mostly, they want to contribute by providing services rather than money. MP operates as the matching party.

Acknowledgements

Disclosure statement

References

Adam, B., and C. Groves. 2007. *Future Matters. Action, Knowledge, Ethics*. Leiden: Brill.
Alter, K. 2002. *Case Studies in Social Enterprise: Counterpart International's Experience*. Washington, DC: Counterpart International.
Austin, J., H. Stevenson, and J. Wei-Skillern. 2006. "Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both?" *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 30 (1): 1–22.
Avelino, F., and J. Rotmans. 2009. "Power in Transition: An Interdisciplinary Framework to Study Power in Relation to Structural Change". *European Journal of Social Theory* 12 (4): 543–569.
Bornstein, D. 2004. *How to Change the World. Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Boutellier, H. 2015. *Het seculiere experiment. Hoe we van God los gingen samenleven* [The Secular Experiment. How We Separated Our Communal Life from God]. Amsterdam: Boom.
Calas, M., L. Smircich, and K. Bourne. 2009. "Extending the Boundaries: Reframing 'Entrepreneurship as Social Change' through Feminist Perspectives." *Academy of Management Review* 34 (3): 552–569.
Chilton, P. 2004. *Analyzing Political Discourse. Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
Fairclough, N. 2003. *Analyzing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.
Harvey, D. 1996. *Justice, Nature & the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Harvey, D. 2000. *Spaces of Hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Hermsen, J. 2014. *Kairos. Een nieuwe bevlogenheid* [Kairos: A New Passion]. Amsterdam: De Arbeiderspers.
Hjorth, D. 2013. "Public Entrepreneurship: Desiring Social Change, Creating Sociality." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 25 (1–2): 34–51.
Jessop, B. 2002. *The Future of the Capitalist State*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Laclau, E., and C. Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
Mair, J., and I. Martí. 2006. "Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction and Delight." *Journal of World Business* 41: 36–44.
McAdam, D., J. D. McCarthy, and M. N. Zald. (1996). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements. Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. Cambridge: University Press.
Montesano Montessori, N. 2009. *An Analysis of a Struggle for Hegemony in Mexico: The Zapatista Movement versus President Salinas de Gortari*. Saarbrücken: VDM.
Montesano Montessori, N. 2011. "The Design of a Theoretical, Methodological, Analytical Framework to Analyse Hegemony in Discourse." *Critical Discourse Studies* 8: 169–181.
Montesano Montessori, N., and E. Morales López. 2015. "The Study of Innovative Discourses of Change. Reinventing Democracy in Spain: The Case of 15 M." *CADAAD (Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines)*, 7 (2): 200–221.
Reisigl, M., and R. Wodak. 2002. *Discourse and Discrimination. Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*. London: Routledge.
Reisigl, M., and R. Wodak. 2009. "The Discourse-historical Approach (DHA)." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by R. Wodak and M. Meyer, 87–121. 2nd ed London: Sage.

Rindova, V., D. Barry, and D. J. Ketchen. 2009. "Entrepreneuring as Emancipation." *Academy of Management Review* 34 (3): 477–491

Sarasvathy, S. 2012. "Worldmaking." In *Entrepreneurial Action. Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth*, edited by Emerald Group, Vol. 14, 1–24. Bingley: Emerald Group.

Sayer, A. 2014. *Why We Can't Afford the Rich*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Short, J., T. Moss, and G. Lumpkin. 2009. "Research in Social Entrepreneurship: Past Contributions and Future Opportunities." *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 3 (2): 161–194.

Somers, M. R. 1994. "The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach." *Theory and Society* 23: 605–649.

Seymour, R. G., ed. 2012. *Handbook of Research Methods on Social Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Steyaert, C. and M. Bachmann. 2012. "Listening to Narratives." In *Handbook of Research Methods on Social Entrepreneurship*, edited by R. G. Seymour, 51–78. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Steyaert, C., and D. Hjorth, eds. 2006. *Entrepreneurship as Social Change. A Third Movements in Entrepreneurship Book*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Tellegen, E. 2014. *Afscheid van het kapitalisme. Over de aarde en onze economische orde* [Farewell to Capitalism. About the Earth and Our Economic Order]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Tonkens, E., M. Trappenburg, M. Hurenkamp, and J. Schmidt. 2015. *De Montessori-Democratie. Spanningen tussen burgerparticipatie en de lokale politiek* [The Montessori Democracy. Tensions Between Citizen Participation and Local Politics]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Touraine, A. 1985. "An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 35 (4): 30–58.